

Strengths of the proposed approach

Aka as “corner 1”



- Flexibility
- Funding for coordination and management activities
- CSA
- Easy to understand; entry point for Cofund – a staged approach; engages less research intensive countries; used to consolidate; open to MS agendas
- Cofund
- Clearer role of COM; flexibility of blending Structural funds and others such as Innovative Public Procurement; critical mass



Challenges and issues to be clarified

Aka as “corner 2”

Common issues

- Who decides when on what ?
 - Clear selection criteria: financial leverage factor?, impact?, added value?
 - Transparent processes: evaluation procedure (reviewers), topics (foresight?)
 - > Simplification: common rules vs. national budget /national rules
 - Eligibility and well delineated responsibilities and roles of actors (e.g., cofounding in kind by RPO's ?)
 - Involve civil society
- Practical ways to combine various “monetary sources” remain unclear/uncertain
 - ESIF (-> change of rules), financial instruments, public procurement
- How to facilitate involvement of less R&I intensive countries (respecting excellence) ?
- Do not forget the international dimension

CSA

- Possibility upgrade to CoFund
- Duration, sustainability
- No top-up
 - Less attractive to participate ?
 - Problems with “gap filling”
- Uncertainty in financial planning for RFOs
- “regular” CSAs vs. “ERA-net CSAs” ?

CoFund instrument [art.185]

- Manageable for smaller agencies ?
- Reasons for restricting the use of art. 185
- Will existing art. 185s be continued ?
- Funding of regional programmes (ERA+ Russia, Bonus 2, ...) still possible vs. wanted ?



How to improve efficiency of implementation (Within and across initiatives)

Aka as “corner 3”

- centralised implementation structures: yes -but optional
- Cofund instrument: fewer rules, clearer rules –but flexible
- who is going to rationalise the current landscapes of P2P (& decide the future network landscape), and how ?
 - EC, MS ?
 - topics vs topics
 - criteria ?
 - duration of instruments / individual initiatives, incl long-term
 - budget lines for instruments / individual initiatives
 - specific support for network interaction ?

Which other issues have to be addressed?

Aka as “corner 4”

- **Governance P2P in FP9:** transparency, priority setting, decision taking
- **Strategy:** How can FP and P2P support each other – envisaged achievements
- How will **third countries / associated countries** be affected?
- More integration of **P2P and PPP** – meaningful combination
- **Impact:** long term perspective needed; collaboration EC - P2P to define instruments and measurement criteria
- **Coherence** of funding instruments for R&D and implementation
- How to ensure joint ownership with **Member States?**