

HORIZON 2020 association workshop for GEORGIA

Tiblisi, 31 May 2016

LEARNING CYCLE FOR THE PARTICIPATION Klaus Schuch

Company Logo

Once upon a time

... there was a huge European funding machine, the legend says, with a simple work programme, strongly influenced by Member States, leaving it to the individual competition of their most talented researchers



Main messages

- This legend does not hold true anymore. HORIZON 2020 is an instrument for policy-delivery and policy-steering.
- HORIZON 2020 is embedded in policy contexts (“Europe 2020 strategy”, “innovation union”, ERA, 3Os: open innovation, open science, open to the world).
- Funding from HORIZON 2020 is diversified and has to be strategically used for and with national RTI

Learning cycles at different levels

- Governance level (ministry, top-down responsibility, but inclusive and multi-actor-centred) to design policy
- Agencies level to implement policies
- NCP level to deliver best information and advice
- Research delivery level at universities, research organisations, companies

Governance level: New and old cooperation opportunities for Member States

- What has changed?
- A slightly exaggerated before and after comparison based on a study by Tiefenthaler, B. and Ohler, F. (2016): Die unterschiedliche Rolle von großen und kleinen Mitgliedsstaaten im Kontext von HORIZON 2020. Technopolis

OLD

1. Paradigm:

The FP is the European research policy.

2. Role of EC:

The MS Programme delegates (PD) design the work programmes (WP), which are implemented by the EC.

3. Role of MS:

The PD take care about

NEW

1. Paradigm:

The FP is one of several instruments which are related to each other.

2. Role of EC:

The EC is a self-contained political actor with an explicit coordination role. EC is in contact with many actors on all levels of the RTI system.

3. Role of MS:

The PD take care, but

OLD

4. The FP:

is a huge project funding machine. Therefore many researchers should participate.

5. Success 1

= high juste retour

6. Design of WP:

PD were in the lead of designing the work programmes.

NEW

4. The FP:

There is more than just the FP. Project participation is only part of the cake.

5. Success 1

= formative agenda setting and best combination of national and European policy and juste retour.

6. Design of WP:

MULLATs and Advisory Groups have a more formative role in designing

OLD

7. Success 2

= *“I had a typing error in my contribution and it was visible in the final version of the WP”.*

8. National/intern.

Focus is on projects.
Complementary national measures to increase participation and juste retour in FPs.

NEW

7. Success 2

= policy spill-overs to enhance a national agenda by handling it also on the European or multi-lateral level or to activate, enrich or change a national agenda (e.g. national funding policy, regulation, strategic orientation of important stakeholders)

8. National/international

Focus is on agenda setting and strategic participation

OLD

9. Research implementer:

Research organisations implement jointly international projects. They are occasionally consulted.

10. Main activity

is a joint research project.

11. Approach

Open competition for

NEW

9. Research implementer:

New actors appear (e.g. demand-sided actors). RORs and companies work directly on strategy and agenda setting on the European level. The “implementers” are also becoming “strategists” and “policy-designers”.

10. Main activity

Joint policy-design and strategy reviews.

11. Approach

Th

Role and Selection of PD

- They still give an official opinion on the WPs.
- They are an essential link between HORIZON 2020 and national funding.
- Thus, they should have a solid backing in the national RTI policy.
- The national RTI policy should actively cultivate the relations between the national and the international level.

Definition of MULLATs

Def.= MULLATs are initiatives for which a thematic and strategic coordination between national and European research priorities exist or which exists between self-organised research communities and/or for which at least 3 different countries provide co-financing/shared costs.

Types of MULLATs

- **JTI:** dedicated organisational structure formulating research calls along the demand of industries
- **FET Flagships:** multi-disciplinary large scale initiatives to realise a long-term vision
- **PPP:** launched in H2020 to support industrial innovation capacities
- **EUREKA:** inter-state initiative for applied R&D (without EU funding)
- **Art. 185:** organisational structure to integrate national research programmes (with EU funding)
- **JPI:** coordination mechanism for national research programmes to contribute to solving societal challenges

Bodies and board types of

MULLATS
General Assembly, 2. Board of Stakeholders, 3. Governing Board, 4. Board of Directors, 5. Executive Board, 6. Management Board, 7. Steering Committee, 8. High Level Steering Group, 9. High Level Group, 10. Industries Consortium, 11. Industry Delegation, 12. Topic Groups, 13. Taskforces, 14. Operational Groups, 15. Thematic Working Groups, 16. Horizontal Working Groups, 17. Action Groups, 18. Focus Groups, 19. States Representatives Group, 20. Scientific Committee, 21. Stakeholder Advisory Board, 22. Scientific Advisory Board, 23. Industrial Research Advisory Group, 24. Strategic Advisory Committee, 25. Mirror Group, 26. National Project Coordinators, 27. Funding Agencies Working Group, 28. Funder's Forum, 29. Public Authorities Committee, 30. Stakeholder Forum, 31. Stakeholder Platform, 32. Stakeholder Advisory Board, 33. Research Alliance.

MULLAT board participation

- In mid 2014, Austria had 130 delegates in these boards!
 - 24% from ministries
 - 9% from agencies
 - 15% from universities
 - 14% from research organisations
 - 29% from enterprises
 - 6% from unions, NGOs, public service providers

HOW DO THESE RELATE TO EACH OTHER?

THE HIERARCHICAL POLICY MODEL DOES NOT WORK

MULLAT Challenges for MS/AC

- Think about MULLATs in terms of strategic options.
- MULLATs often receive funding from national side and HORIZON 2020. Thus, participation of researchers depends on the participation and the contribution of a MS/AC in a specific MULLAT.
- Personnel capacities are necessary to capitalise MULLATs.
- It is important to be well organised.
- It helps a lot if you have a national agenda, which is represented by nationally well embedded actors who have sufficient resources available

Good National Agenda = Profound answers to the

following questions
What do we want to achieve in this specific field with our R+D policy?

- With which actors are we going to cooperate?
- Which means are necessary for this?
- How do we act vis-à-vis the European level – what do we contribute and what do we expect from there? (policy spill-overs)

What can MS/AC do to exploit the new configurations of HORIZON

- Pre-Meetings and alliances with other MS/AC to prepare agenda-setting
- Mirror European level at national level, e.g. in performance contracts with universities (e.g. participation in agenda setting, successful projects)
- Knowledge of domestic and foreign stakeholders and networks and engage broad spectrum of domestic organisations ('problem ownership')
- Strategic ERA consultancy with main national research performers (at institutional level) = NCPs or PD = change of role – Training offers for the 200-400 persons

2020? (1)

What can MS/AC do to exploit the new configurations of HORIZON

2020? (2)

Good relations to domestic sector policies

- Awareness of domestic sector policies for RTI
- No frequent changes of personnel in ministries (keyword: organisational memory)
- Make best use of returning national experts from Brussels
- Monitor participation in agenda setting and MULLATs (not only 'classical' FP statistics = "lantern evidence")

What can MS/AC do to exploit the new configurations of HORIZON

2020? (3)

Order English as main language for national research proposals

- Evaluate national policies, programmes and approaches (also their relation towards “Brussels”)

IN GENERAL: Design national RTI policy by knowing the European developments and decide on case-by-case basis, how these two levels relate to each other!

Ideally they complement and enrich each other, contribute to tackle problems and blockades, and draw attention to new agendas.

ERA Governance in Austria

- Dedicated unit in the ministry coordinating across ministries and sectors
- ERA forum – open discussion among experts (80 persons)
- www.era.gv.at – dedicated website
- ERA advisory
- Monitoring
- Working groups – e.g. on “FP9”



ERA OBSERVATORY AUSTRIA

Impact

Information
Communication
Analysis

Support for
HORIZON 2020

Strategic Policy
Advice for ERA

Structural
Reforms

Monitoring

Output

- Policy Briefs
- ERA News
- Semantic Search Function
- ERA Helpdesk
- "Social ERA"

- NCPs
- Job Profile for H2020 Delegates / Experts
- Effective Reporting

- Advisory Opinions
- Studies
- Annual ERA Conference

- National Reform Programme
- ERA Roadmap
- EIT, Joint Programming...

- EU Performance Monitoring
- ERA Dashboard
- Ex-Ante Impact Assessments

Input



- Steering Board FFG (EIP)
- Thematic Expert Groups H2020
- Round Table for Delegates



- ERA POLICY FORUM AUSTRIA
- Round Table for ERA-related Groups
- WG on EIT, JPI...
- University ERA Correspondents

- Steering Board FFG (EU-PM)
- ERA Reporting Board

www.era.gv.at



**ERA PORTAL
AUSTRIA**

A new club good of the EU (1)

- The **Horizon 2020 Policy Support Facility (H2020 PSF)** is a new instrument of the European Commission that gives Member States and countries associated to Horizon 2020 practical support to design, implement and evaluate reforms that enhance the quality of their research and innovation investments, policies and systems.
- Services are paid by the EC and carried out through a framework contract funded with up to €20m

A new club good of the EU (2)

- PSF operates different formats:
 - R&I peer reviews (policy mixes)
 - Pre-reviews and post-peer reviews for evaluation
 - background analysis on national research and innovation policies
 - input to **mutual learning events** bringing together EU Member States and associated countries
- Cooperation with RIO, S3 Platform, OECD
- Examples:
 - Peer reviews of BG, UA, MD ..

A new club good of the EU (3)

- MS/AC request support
 - Annual expression of interest via ERAC
 - Spontaneous requests
- EC assesses the requests
 - Engages government peers and high-level experts
 - Gets support from service provider
- Service provider undertakes all supporting tasks (analytical, logistics, organisation)



Klaus Schuch
Center for Social Innovation
Linke Wienzeile 246
1150 Vienna
Austria

schuch@zsi.at
www.zsi.at