



Project no. 266545
Project acronym: ERA-LEARN 2
Project full title: Supporting the ERA-NET Learning Platform: expanding application of the ERA-NET toolbox to a broader trans-national coordination community
Funding scheme: Coordination and support action
Start date of project: 1 June 2011
Duration: 36 months

Deliverable D3.2 (A)

Report of high level workshop on the ERA-NET experiences of Member and Associate States to date

Due date of deliverable: (Month 10)
Actual submission date: (Month 8)
Dissemination Level: PU

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:
EI



From the DoW:

The potential for more flexible relationships with the European Commission, possibly via a shift towards the development of a regulatory framework capable of reinforcing stakeholder ownership and control over both strategic direction and modes of implementation, has been welcomed but specific detail relating to operational matters remains unclear. Task 3.2 will solicit input from both existing users and programme owners to clarify such matters.

Task 3.2 will therefore include:

- A high level workshop on user experiences and expectations for the implementation of the ERA-NET scheme and other routes to organisation of cooperation and coordination of regional and national programmes. The workshop will comprise breakout sessions on:
 - Potential for mergers or creation of larger management structures within the ERA-NET model;
 - Potential for modifications of the current ERA-NET scheme and its implementation against the background of the changing political context (Europe 2020, Innovation Union);
 - Potential role of the ERA-NET model in related or overlapping activities such as the emerging Joint Programming Initiatives, and indeed in the design of the framework conditions for such undertakings.

It is envisaged that the high level workshops will bring together members of both the ERA-NET and Joint Programming communities i.e. maximising the access to relevant expertise within and outside the ERA-LEARN environment.



WP 3: Development and Evolution of the ERA-NET

Task 3.2: Forward-looking activities and future of the ERA-NET scheme

Report of high level workshop on the ERA-NET experiences of Member and Associate States

1 Introduction

The Workshop at the side of the Annual Joint Programming Event 2011 addressed experienced ERA-NET workers interested in the experiences of Member States and Associated Countries with the ERA-NET instrument.

Participants were provided with some facts and draft policy implications arising from an informal analysis by the ERALEARN Team (see D3.1).

Areas discussed in detail included:

- Comparison of topic focus in moving from the FP6 bottom-up approach to FP7 top-down selection of topics by the European Commission;
- Review of merging of multiple ERA-NETs in related areas or creating cost-effective management structures on a larger scale; and
- Analysis of boundary conditions and environmental factors influencing the number of projects and level of funding achieved across existing ERA-NETs.

2 Participants and Agenda

See Appendices 1 & 2 for the list of participants and the agenda.

3 Key responses on the experiences of Member and Associate States

The following ERA-LEARN 2 assumptions were reported as input to the Joint Programming Conference 2011 Parallel Session on 'the future ERA-NET instrument: increasing impact and flexibility'.

- Continuation of 50% of FP6 ERA-NETs in FP7 is indicative of reluctance to 'impose a strategic 'top down' element on the initiative';
- Variable range of topic is indicative of an ad-hoc approach to selection and is out of step with 'the field of the potential topic being of major interest for the Community as a whole' ;
- Since FP6 to FP7 ERA-NETs represent the mature communities it is vital that they should be intricately relevant to EU objectives. Failure to 'rein them in' will limit the European Commission potential to filling gaps and nurturing new communities only;
- The issues of overlapping themes and potential duplication of topics between ERA-NETs do not appear to be influencing topic continuation or selection in the majority of cases;
- ERA-NET topic selection will be influenced by 'criteria identified for selecting cases requiring adoption of the Joint Programming approach';
- Significant resource issues remain for organisations with multiple ERA-NET commitments;
- It remains unclear if ERA-NET and Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) communities are fully aware of their potential for complementarity or, in some cases, direct competition. Both scenarios can occur and there may be the need for intervention to ensure efficient use of resources;



- There may be a need for a JPI-equivalent in areas not covered by the emerging JPIs e.g. in Industrial Technologies;
- There is an 'inner circle' in terms of ERA-NET and JPI communities which is actively influencing future direction. It does not currently include the major European universities and research providers, organisations which will be substantially affected by the influence of the JPIs on national programmes.

The following key responses were subsequently reported as input to the Parallel Session on 'the future ERA-NET instrument: increasing impact and flexibility'.

On Topic Focus:

- It is actually the research communities that influence the agenda;
- There has been little difference between FP6 and FP7;
- Some communities are better at influencing than others;
- It is an informal process initially and depends on the activities of the Member States;
- Added-value on the national level is important;
- Trans-border added value is not always recognized by national evaluators;
- New Member State participation is an issue – especially in topic interpretation;
- The types of people you bring together are of critical importance;
- For RTOs a major issue is non-funding of projects that are rated excellent;
- Several key needs are recognized:
 - The need to broaden the discussion to instruments other than joint calls (and define which ones)
 - The need for framework conditions for sustainable organisation of activities (involving research driven approaches);
 - The need for a legal framework, glue money and tangible results;
- Intrinsic motivation for cooperation needs to be apparent;
- Cost-benefit needs to be proved;
- Risks include policy changes / budget uncertainty / competing interests of beneficiaries.

On JPI Overlap:

- JPIs need to create or adapt instruments – there are not many options;
- JPIs could influence ERA-NET topics if tailor-made ERA-NETs were to be set up;
- ERA-NETs could evolve into JPIs (although it is unlikely that they would aim to do so);
- Some research fields are not covered by JPIs;



- JPI Framework Conditions are irrelevant and will not influence ERA-NET topic selection (why should they?);
- It still depends on what is the most appropriate instrument;
- The type of funding organisation is important – more focussed;
- ERA-NET will be a good tool in some cases and not in others:
 - Not if there is no corresponding national programme;
 - Sometimes not strong enough a tool (what do JPIs need or expect?);
- JPIs require commitment of the Ministries: ERA-NET within a JPI will not be the same tool:
 - If there is interest to employ ERA-NETs for call implementation, JPIs should approach ERA-NETs (not the other way round, even if the hierarchy would suggest this);
 - Current ERA-NETs are hardly compatible with JPIs, based on the topics they cover:
 - JPIs do have a wide topic frame and will concentrate on a very small fraction within this frame for a single call (otherwise there is a danger that the calls will be “abused” by addressing the frame but doing different projects);
 - In contrast, ERA-NETs are specific or even generic, but limited in topic, and know their research area very well. No (current) ERA-NET will be able to address all call-topics a JPI might want to launch within their wide frame;
 - Moreover, current ERA-NET consortia will almost certainly not match the composition of MS involved in JPIs;
- Smart specialization is needed – in particular in transition to JPIs;
- ERA-NET -> JPIs:
 - At operational level;
 - Building upon trust established;
 - As a blueprint for JPIs.

4 Utilisation of the Workshop Findings

Use of the Workshop findings led to the following responses:

a) From the Joint Programming Conference Parallel Session:

- An overwhelming majority of JPI representatives opted for broad thematic coverage versus a more narrow focus.
- The primary reasons for this included:
 - Availability of national programmes within the theme;
 - Larger coverage of Member and Associated States;
 - Suitability for smaller countries to take part;
 - Scale of Joint Call achievable.
- Participants differentiated between the Network and the Call focus. In general they opted for a broad Network focus with narrow Call topics.
- For future use, the Joint Programming Initiative was described as the element of broad coverage where the ERA-NET could be used as the instrument to facilitate narrow (focused) Joint Calls. A range of ERA-NETs would be needed to cope with this task.



b) From the ERALEARN2 Advisory Board:

- There are currently some examples of JPI-ERANET overlap and complementarity which could be considered further by ERALEARN2:
 - JPI FACCE has organised a meeting with 16 relevant ERANETs (schematic of overlap of strategic research agendas provided by Joerg Niehoff);
 - JPI on Cultural Heritage will use the strategic research agenda produced by the ERANET on cultural heritage;
 - JPI on Neurological Disease has used the Neuron ERANET secretariat for the first Call.
- Another layer of overlap, the European Innovation Partnerships, may need to be considered later.
- Developments in terms of shared personnel could be considered e.g. Slovenia has a policy to nominate only personnel with ERANET experience into JPI.
- There remains a high level of misinformation which should be addressed.
- Many JPI participants are inexperienced in networking and should learn from the ERANET communities.
- The role of the European Commission to encourage JPIs to use ERANETs effectively should be considered further, keeping in mind that these are different actor groups with differing expertise and (usually) different levels within their national hierarchies.

Based on these inputs, the following will be considered:

- That new ERA-NETs, which are tailor-made for JPIs, could be a solution;
- 2 constraints for review:
 1. The establishment of new ERA-NETs supportive to JPIs is incompatible with the new ERA-NET scheme in Horizon 2020. The European Commission should foster the building of experienced ERA-NETs and will do this via the new scheme (as there is evidence that experienced ERA-NETs perform better than new ones), However, there is strong need to allow for the development of new ERA-NETs,
 2. The suggested solution could be middle-term, but we need short-term solutions, since operation in JPIs is already delayed.



The workshop findings have been made available to the ERA-NET and JPI communities via the **NETWATCH** portal:

http://netwatch.jrc.ec.europa.eu/static/download/jpi_2011/session1_3/session1.3.1%20Imelda%20Iambkin.pdf

Attachments

WS_Experiences Presentation: input to Workshop

WS_Responses Presentation: input to Joint Programming Conference, Parallel Session 1



APPENDIX 1

PARTICIPANTS LIST

First name	Last name	Organisation	ERA-NET
Frederic	Lemaitre	French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity	BiodivERsA2
Eric	Regouin	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation	EUPHRESCO
Tom-Espen	Møller	The Research Council of Norway	None
Ralf	Fiedler	Projekträger Jülich, Geschäftsbereich MGS, Nationale Kontaktstelle "Schifffahrt und Meerestechnik", Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH	ERA-NET MARTEC
ALINA	GHINET	Ecole des Hautes Etudes d'Ingénieur	HEI
Peter	KEET	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and innovation	Research coordinator European affairs, agriculture, nature and food
Wendy	Sonneveld	TNO	AERTOS
Almut	Miebach	AiF FTK GmbH	CORNET, EraSME
Doroteja	Zlobec	Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology	MNT-ERA.NET II
Sabrina	Legies	International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research at the Project Management Agency c/o German Aerospace Center (DLR)	ERAfrica
Nicholas	Harrap	JRC-IPTS	NETWATCH
Leïla	MEHNANE	Regional Council NPDC	CROSSTEXNET
Juan Francisco	Reyes	CDTI	Airtn
Carita	Aschan	Finnish Institute of Occupational Health	SAF€RA, NEW OSH ERA
Anabela	Isidro	Foundation for Science and Technology	HIVERA, E-Rare, PathoGenoMics, TRANSCAN, ERA-IB, EuroNanoMed



APPENDIX 2

Workshop on "Experience of Member States and Associated Countries with the ERA-NET instrument"

8 November, 2011, MCE Brussels, 118 rue de l'Aqueduc, Brussels

Draft Agenda:

14.00-14.30	<p>Objectives and proceeding of WS session Imelda Lambkin, Enterprise Ireland</p> <p>Tour de Table – Background and expectations of participants</p>
14.30-14.50	<p>Setting the Scene – ERA-LEARN findings Imelda Lambkin, Enterprise Ireland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Shift of topic focus in moving from the FP6 bottom -up approach to FP7 top -down selection of topics by the European Commission• Merging of multiple ERA -NETs in related areas or creating cost -effective management structures on a larger scale• Boundary conditions and environmental factors influencing the number of projects and level of funding achieved across existing ERA -NETs
14:50-16:15	<p>Development and evolution of the ERA -NET 2 parallel working groups</p> <p>Group A: Comparison of topic focus in moving from the FP6 bottom -up approach to FP7 top-down selection of topics by the European Commission & merging of multiple ERA -NETs in related areas</p> <p>Group B: Consideration of boundary conditions and environmental factors influencing the number of projects and level of funding achieved across existing ERA -NETs</p>
16:15-16:30	(Coffee break)
16:30-17:15	Rapporteurs reporting from groups A&B
17:15-17:30	<p>The way forward? Imelda Lambkin, Enterprise Ireland</p>