

# Turkey's Position Paper on Future RTD Programming in Europe

based on National Consultation Process

---

Eighth Framework Programme of the European Union for  
Research and Technological Development (FP8)  
(2014-2020)



EU Framework Programmes National Coordination Office

December, 2010  
Ankara, Turkey

## **CONTACT**

The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK)

EU Framework Programmes National Coordination Office

**Address:** Atatürk Bulvarı No: 221, 06100 Kavaklıdere

Ankara/TURKEY

**e-mail:** fp8@tubitak.gov.tr

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
Building on European Perspective in Research and Innovation:.....	7
1. Methodology & Content.....	8
2. ERA Governance Perspectives.....	9
3. Tackling Societal Challenges .....	11
4. Innovation Governance: Investing in Excellence & Capacity Building.....	13
5. Conclusion.....	16
a. Novelty Matters; Tools & Processes .....	16
b. Innovation Approach; Cohesion& Excellence .....	20

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This position paper aims to reveal Turkey's reflections and tendencies around her final recommendations towards 8<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme (FP8) as the core element of future RTD programming in Europe. The derivations are results of Turkey's experiences acquired through previous Framework Programmes and her expectations towards FP8. Those derivations are also important references for the discussions held among key Turkish Research actors; the ideals and recommendations of whom are thoroughly incorporated in the Paper.

To achieve greater contribution of Turkish Research Community to the content of the Position Paper, a voluntary nationwide consultation process was carried out in 2010. This web based "*National Consultation Process*" which took place between July-September 2010 enabled Turkish Research Community to participate in the discussions concerning the design of FP8. Topics of discussions were identified in a way to reveal the general opinion of Turkish Research Community and the results of the discussions constitute the backbone of this work.

The Paper synchronizes the basic credentials of the Turkish expectations and derivations regarding FP8 under three major titles namely; European Research Area (ERA) Governance Perspectives; affiliating Regional Dimension, Tackling Societal Challenges and Innovation Governance: Investing in Excellence & Capacity Building.

It is no doubt that FP8 should be designed in a way to meet the challenges posed by harsher global competition, increasingly complicated European research system and large scale opportunities waiting to be explored. It is contested that providing a coherent framework for ***better coordination of existing tools and policies*** should set the ground for effective governance system. This coordination should be ensured in 3 levels: policy level, programme level and process/mechanisms level. Multifaceted approaches should be employed for coherently using the different policies such as innovation, education, cohesion and their respective tools. At the programme level, Framework Programmes (FPs), Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP),

Structural Funds (SF) as well as other regional and national research and innovation programmes should be better coordinated. More synergistic use of FPs and SF is needed without curbing the situation for non-Member States especially in terms of eligibility. Finally, other EC triggered processes and mechanisms ranging from Joint Technology Initiatives (JTIs), European Institute of Technology-Knowledge and Innovation Communities (EIT-KICs), European Technology Platforms (ETPs) and Flagship Initiatives to Joint Programming (JP) are also called for a better regulated strategic action regarding complementarity and diversification of those mechanisms.

**Simplification of governance structures** as well as assuring their sustainability is an undeniable need, besides the improvement of governance process with novel mechanisms is acknowledged as an asset.

**For tackling societal challenges**, recently developed processes/mechanisms such as Joint Programming are appreciated given its unique role. For efficiently addressing societal challenges the **industry involvement** into Joint Programming Initiatives is deemed crucial for bringing the research results into applications for identified grand problems. Besides, the added value of joint programming should be rightly assessed for **better reorientation and design of the process** and reach its complementarities with existing tools and FP8. Accordingly for better implementation and results **thematic approach** is deemed necessary to feed cross-cutting research, the processes and strategies designed for tackling grand challenges. Moreover, for greater success **regional dimension** is believed to be incorporated to grand scheme governance structures.

A significant share of public funding has been delivered for **excellent research** in Europe so far which calls for novel strategies to bring the research results into the market. For effective innovation funding and promising results high tech strategy should be incorporated into the entire process of FP8 underpinned by stronger focus on infrastructure development, standardization and cohesion. An unbalanced move towards topping up excellent research, structures and partnerships is believed to distort the

public intervention logic which is believed to serve for greater European good and harmonious development. Moreover overlooking **cohesion aspect** in research funding may result in marginalization of the research results conducted and attained among few excellent partners. **Under investment in capacity building and cohesion** would distort the standardization, reduce the absorption capacity of unexplored markets and thus innovation aspect of research. Hence, rather than solely topping up already excellent initiations and infrastructures, EU money should be utilized as glue in European Research for sustainable solutions. Excellence should be left to flexible structures, transnational cooperation and shared management among excellent few.

## **Building on European Perspective in Research and Innovation: Addressing Global and European Challenges through FP8**

Given the recent global challenges Europe facing and accordingly the possible scenarios for realizing the expected leap forward; the need for a more strategic, straightforward and intensive investment in S&T&I through indispensable policy choices is triggered. Future strategies in Research and Technological Development (RTD) should be based on the previous achievements but should also set forth novel mechanisms to go beyond. As a highly influential policy tool, investing in research calls for better varied, simpler implemented strategies those would yield in excellent S&T outcomes throughout Europe.

Developing on the common ideals for European Research Area those are set through "2020 Vision for the European Research Area" and "Ljubljana Process" in a broader context, FP8 should be one of the key components of a policy mix designed for realizing the goals of Lisbon Treaty as promoting the competitiveness of the Union. Research and Innovation, fleshing out the main credentials of Lisbon Treaty, should be handled in a way to achieve "Europe 2020" as a strategy for attaining "smart, sustainable and inclusive growth".

Establishing effective governance arrangements for each of the five ERA initiatives namely;

- i. Joint programming in research,
- ii. European researchers' partnership,
- iii. Legal framework for European Research infrastructures,
- iv. Intellectual property management,
- v. Wide opening of the ERA to the world necessitate stronger commitment of European Commission (EC), Member States (MSs) and Associated Countries (ACs).

Besides, in order to achieve an improved political governance of ERA based on a partnership between the Member States and the Commission built on relevant specialised fora such as European Technology Platforms, European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI), European Science Foundation (ESF), European Heads of Research Councils (EUROHORCS), and other structures are emphasized in importance.

The basic motivation behind reconfiguration of European Research Landscape through feasible processes and structures would be based on sustainable excellent structures and collaborations in research harmoniously serving European competitiveness and cohesion in a globalized world. However European level coordination respecting public intervention logic together with open method of coordination rationale would be the main driving force to achieve European Research Area deeply rooted in society.

## **1. Methodology & Content**

This Position Paper is generated upon the discussions held under online “*National Consultation Process*” which took place between July-September 2010 with the participation of around 700 stakeholders varying from academia, private sector to public authorities. Discussion topics were identified to reveal the general opinion of Turkish Research Community on the future research programming period with the aim in mind to propose a strong Position Paper of Turkey towards FP8.

Based on the National Consultation Process this Position Paper aims to illustrate Turkey’s reflections on the central elements of 8<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme debate revolving around Europe 2020 Strategy of March 2010, Research and Innovation Plan of September 2010, ERA Action Plan of 2011, Commission’s Proposal for the Next Financial Prospective of Summer 2011 together with Simplification, FP7 Interim Evaluation of September 2010, and Implementation of ERA initiatives launched in 2008.



Main arguments of the Paper are raised respectively within the context of the *ERA Governance Perspectives* those are argued to employ an inclusive strategy for healthier development and implementation of Community Research Policy; advanced processes for *Tackling Societal Challenges* those are expected to provide European level wise integration and coordination mechanisms for demand driven approaches; *Innovation Governance* aspect for boosting market orientation of excellent knowledge.

## 2. ERA Governance Perspectives

Governance of ERA is crucial as pivotal pillar for realizing competitiveness and growth throughout Europe via Research and Innovation. Given the recent challenges Europe facing, it is clear that a newly orchestrated commitment between MSs, ACs and EC is needed for a stronger ERA marked by closer links between differentiated policy domains such as cohesion, education, innovation, industry, etc.

- For the future research programming period, FP8 is believed to foster new approaches for ERA governance but mainly with existing instruments through enhancing coordination of programmes. Otherwise the governance structure would be threatened by further complication of the European RTDI fabric and artificial allocation of the budget among excessive number of instruments and objectives.
  - **Turkey believes that** there is still room for improvement to fully exploit the EU's RTDI potential; coherence and synergies should be optimized among various ERA programmes and tools established and implemented at different layers through more efficient and smooth functioning methodologies.
  - **Thus Turkey acknowledges that** there is a need for multifaceted approaches in order to coherently employ and harmonize FP, SF, Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP), Lead Market Initiatives; National and Regional research & innovation programmes, public procurement, infrastructures in terms of their European level coordination.

However, seeking synergies between FPs and SF would yield in neglecting the case of enlargement countries in terms of capacity building calibration of research funding. Thus, research capacity component of Instrument of Pre-Accession (IPA) should be introduced.

- **Turkey underlines that** new forms of cooperation appeared to be urgent for greater success expected from ERA governance. Thus coherence between the works of Programme Committees (PCs), Standing Committee on Agricultural Research (SCAR), ESFRI, Advisory Boards, High level Group on Joint Programming (GPC), Strategic Forum for International Cooperation (SFIC), European Research Area Committee (ERAC) and among EU level processes such as Lisbon process, ERA, Ljubljana process, FPs, CIP, Innovation Plan, Bologna Process is important.
  
- It is widely contested that European research system is increasingly being complicated in terms of structure and management given the recently developed ERA structuring instruments, i.e. JP, SET-PLAN, ERA-NETs, JTIs etc. The existing mechanisms and processes provide enough strategies and capabilities for attaining the ambitious policy goals for ERA. Those mechanisms even need reform as an answer to the dilemma between employing the existing ones with revision and inventing new tools.
  - **Turkey asserts that** there is a need for continuity with no additional mechanism, simplifying the structure and identifying new strategies for Europeanization of national and regional programmes through topping up community support.
  
- Turkey advocates that the rationale and legitimacy of research support through public funding at the European level should be illustrated in terms of its societal benefits including economic growth and creation of jobs. Using public funds for mainly frontier research with no direct benefit for greater European Good, would not comply with the public intervention logic.

- **Turkey considers that** the regional dimension of R&D – regional capabilities, actors, infrastructures and funding tools- would be reflected in ERA governance structures in the new period for an efficient and effective management of regional public tools.

In sum ERA is one of the most important pillars in Europe enabling its international visibility and enhancing its power to tackle with global challenges and meet its long term strategic goals.

### **3. Tackling Societal Challenges**

Europe is in need of reviving cooperative national initiatives in order to tackle grand challenges of our time with the aim in mind to enhance strategic acting for providing solutions to societal problems, building up novel mechanisms to handle them, going beyond so far accumulated knowledge and experience.

Embraced by Member States and Associated Countries, Joint Programming is a highly promising process directed towards boosting national take up to collaboratively address societal challenges through greater strategic and political involvement. It is an ambitious public-public cooperation model marked by European Commission's notable facilitation. Moving beyond thematic approach, joint programming process serves well to publicly lead strategic cooperation between nations enabling utilization of national and European level knowledge mostly acquired through collaborative research projects funded by EU Framework Programmes.

For remarkable success the process would be implemented through highly integrated smooth functioning of existing tools and mechanisms at regional, national and community levels. In this sense, ***it is crucial to note that;***

- Better coordination of the process with FPs, EIT, KICs, etc. is needed for developing a demand driven market orientation for Joint Programming and attaining greater efficiency.
- Decisive Community intervention in financial terms to JP process would increase the efficiency and impact of public research funding refocusing national programmes towards common objectives.
- Once a comprehensive framework for Joint Programming set through better correlation of existing tools, mechanisms and policy objectives, the process is believed to yield in benefits for regions and countries those are lagging behind in terms of research investment and performance.
- The added value of joint programming should be rightly assessed and this assessment should be utilized in a way to better reorient and design the process in terms of implementation, funding, complementarities with existing tools and FP8.

High level strategic coordination directed towards building upon a common mind on the agreed global threats is much in need of collaborative research through international partnerships for thematic considerations that is hard to realize nationally. EU funding provides the cement for thematically oriented collaborative research that is meant to create real structuring effect which facilitates addressing major societal challenges. Thematic funding at EU level is crucial in the sense that it fleshes out national research potential for the sake of European added value and provides the basis for efficient results to be attained by grand scheme political mechanisms.

Thematic approach is not a rigidity to block Europe's current and forthcoming ability to tackle Societal Challenges. On the contrary thematic priorities illustrate a great constituency with the mechanisms those are and could be devised to tackle Societal Challenges. ***In this respect;***

- Thematic priorities should sustain also to feed cross-cutting research, the processes and strategies designed for tackling grand challenges.
- Cooperation Specific Programme Model is advised to be adapted to more and more research funding strategies and should be sustained for a strongly interlinked and competitive ERA also for the next research programming period.

European level initiations are expected to develop strategies to increase nation state and regional level involvement to community level activities. This would yield in a tailor made approach in tackling grand challenges that would bring greater success in terms of implementation and results to be obtained. ***Thus Turkey emphasizes that;***

- Regional dimension of research should be considered for tackling societal challenges. Regions should be mobilized for units of excellence as indispensable elements for tackling global challenges and boosting competitive power.

Given the excessive number of tools and processes introduced and utilized at European level, JP process is expected to be strategically further developed upon a wide array of research components - research infrastructures, existing tools and mechanisms, gaps identified for selected topics based on a feasible mapping exercise – concerning identified grand challenges dealt through single Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs).

#### **4. Innovation Governance: Investing in Excellence & Capacity Building**

Increasingly evolving international conditions render Europe strikingly novel initiatives, roles and responsibilities both regionally and globally to adopt and lead recent changes. Gradually harshening global competition, financial and economic crisis set the conditions against which Europe should define strategies, improve and revise the existing ones and illuminate its future growing role. Europe has introduced and in a process of continuous development of political initiatives those would set the framework

for empowering Europe as a leading global player marked by a sustainable, innovative and knowledge based economy deeply rooted in societal needs.

Putting stronger emphasis on innovation by forging new instruments as Innovation Partnerships, Europe 2020 strategy within the context of ERA Vision 2020 sets the recent trend for public spending on research through various tools. To remarkably strengthen the innovation dimension of FP8 ***Turkey asserts that;***

- The logic of public spending, its role for risk absorption and bridging the innovation gap, leveraging private sector together with its impact and redeemed priorities especially for the next research programming period should be considered.
- It should be designed in a way to invest for the interplay between education, innovation and research with a significant emphasis on research infrastructures.
- New and assertive dimension concerning capacity development to promote innovation in thematically defined fields as well as in cross-cutting fields are needed. Promising policy actions of EU level such as CIP, EIT, ETPs, SME measures and Regions of Knowledge should be incorporated in FP8.
- For effective innovation funding and promising results high tech strategy should be incorporated into the entire process of FP8 underpinned by stronger focus on infrastructure development, standardization and cohesion.

Earlier and recently developed EU level coordination actions are marked with orientations of research funding favouring a significant drift towards boosting excellence for Europe's being a strong global player. A significant share of public funding has been delivered for excellent research in Europe assertively based on competition on quality at various capacities accumulating resources into units of excellence. In the long run

investing in excellence undoubtedly serves for the European good, but for more sustainable and instant results ***Turkey recommends in FP8 that,***

- Cutting-edge research of excellence stress should be handled through flexible regional or national based funding instruments enabling instant, bottom-up regulated approaches those would efficiently boost excellence via transnational and/or interregional initiations. Seeking excellence out of excellence would call for tailor made strategies for selected partnerships.
- Excellence should be seek not only for knowledge creating mechanisms as largely done in Europe so far, but for knowledge sharing and implementing measures those call for immediate action at Community level.
- Knowledge creation would be carried out through indirect/bottom-up actions based on shared management, ad hoc structures and flexible partnerships at transnational levels and would be enhanced through a synergistic and complementarily use of existing measures of high profile such as JPIs, KICs, ETPs, SME measures, Research Infrastructures, Public Private Partnerships (PPPs), etc.

The desire for enhancing excellence does not automatically calls for solely investing in already excellent research centres, projects and infrastructures. The optimal use of resources calls for harmonious development of research capabilities throughout ERA for boosting excellence with the aim in mind to improve global competitive power. Besides, ERA should not be based on short-term oriented policies such as rapidly boosting excellence through excellence however would include planning to yield long-term sustainable results. ***Within this context FP8 should invest in excellence through considering below mentioned aspects;***

- Concentrating projects with small number of excellent partners would also include mentoring activities with promising partnerships and institutes to signify the

excellent partnerships of the future which would enhance sustainability and growth.

- Excellent partnerships are only meaningful when they are successfully integrated with research clusters, public and private institutions and cooperation models and transfer their excellence to wider research community and market through the facilitation of European level initiatives. Cohesion in terms of research is crucial in the sense that it enables successful implementation of industrial, labour and social policies in greater context.

Rather than solely topping up already excellent initiatives and infrastructures, EU money should be utilized as glue in European Research for various reasons justified by long term achievements.

## **5. Conclusion**

Based on the achievements of previous FPs, FP8 should concentrate on further inclusive mechanisms to suffice the Lisbon Treaty, Ljubljana Process and ERA Vision 2020 for successful realization and governance of ERA. In this respect below mentioned specific considerations are set forth to further materialize more generalized framework discussed under ERA governance, tackling societal challenges, excellence, capacity building, and innovation governance perspectives.

### **a. Novelty Matters; Tools & Processes**

Dilemma between developing novel instruments and sustaining the already successful tools and/or structures should be dealt seriously depending on the added value offered by novelties. Offering new strategies, novel mechanisms should be continuously built on the experience gathered and lessons learned by already implemented tools and mechanisms which would bring dynamism and progress. **A breakthrough change in FP8** such as abolishment of thematic research, international collaboration, SMEs,



research infrastructures and accordingly capacity building the successful results of those are already proven; or mostly channelling the national resources pooled at EU to excellent partnerships **without actually considering the cohesion and enlargement objectives would result in unfavourable circumstances** for European Research community at large in long term perspective.

- *The basic motivation behind reconfiguration of European Research Landscape should be based on sustainable excellent structures and collaborations in research harmoniously **servng not only to European competitiveness but also to cohesion**. Appropriate governance modes should be devised to highly suffice the public intervention logic.*
- *Given the recent challenges Europe facing it is clear that a newly orchestrated commitment between MSs, ACs and EC is needed for a stronger ERA marked by closer links between differentiated policy domains such as cohesion, education, innovation, industry, etc.*
- *New methodologies should be applied to optimize the coherence of programmes & instruments of different layers and targets: EU level programmes such as FP, CIP, SF, Lead Market Initiatives; National and Regional research & innovation programmes, public procurement, infrastructures in terms of their European level coordination. However, seeking synergies between FPs and SF is crucial but would yield in neglecting the case of enlargement countries in terms of capacity building calibration of research funding. Thus, **research component of IPA should be introduced**.*
- *Interaction among different DGs of varying responsibilities and policy areas namely; DG RTD, INFSO, ENTR, ELARG, MOVE, ENER, EAC, etc is needed as new forms of cooperation; thus coherence between the works of PCs, SCAR, ESFRI, Advisory Boards, GPC, SFIC, ERAC and among EU level processes and*

*activities of greatest importance such as Lisbon process, ERA, Ljubljana process, FPs, CIP, Innovation Plan, Bologna Process.*

- ***The role and participation of the Associated Countries in PCs, Advisory Boards, Ad-hoc Committees through specific measures such as acquisition of voting rights.***
- *Highly ambitious programmes of JTIs, KICs, PPPs and Flagship Initiatives of near future somehow apply overlapping processes and mechanisms for participation, eligibility criteria, date of calls, evaluation, etc. They are in need of specific orientations together with differentiated mechanisms for **efficiency, success and easy management.***
- *Given the excessive number of tools and processes introduced and utilized at European level, JP process is expected to be strategically further developed upon a wide array of research components - research infrastructures, existing tools and mechanisms, gaps identified for selected topics based on **a feasible mapping exercise.***
- *Developing a demand driven market orientation for Joint Programming thus better coordination of the process with FPs, EIT, KICs, etc. is needed. Reorientation of the JP process in line with the market needs is strengthened through intensive Community funding from FPs.*
- *Cooperation Specific Programme Model hence thematic approach should sustain and be adapted to more research funding strategies in FP8. Meanwhile **cross thematic calls** should be maintained and elaborated.*
- *The budget share of Ideas Programme should not be bigger in FP8 than it is currently in FP7 with the aim in mind to keep a balance between applied and basic research.*

- *Marie Curie Model for supporting Researcher Mobility should be sustained to achieve free movement of knowledge. In this respect **scientific visa** should be applied to actualize the “fifth freedom” ideal.*
- *The COFUND action is expected to have a primary role in the upcoming framework programme. In that respect, the support for the joint bilateral, multilateral and regional fellowship programmes is expected to be enhanced.*
- *A more strategic Career Support for the Researchers/Engineers in Industry via providing Community level support to PhD/Post Doc studies would be designed and implemented. Besides, Joint Research Center activities should be sustained in FP8.*
- *Simplification at micro level for management, participation, evaluation, etc. is crucial. However the simplification tendency would be reflected to the overall design of the FP8 with no breakthrough change in the structure of the Programme. Large extent continuity is expected to ease the process for beneficiaries in a trust base system they are highly familiar with.*
- *Regional dimension of R&D should be reflected in ERA governance structures. More efficient and effective management of regional public tools through a well orchestrated interplay between policies at different domains should be targeted.*
- *Geographical coverage of the proposals, namely selection of the partners and location of the implementation of the proposals (field studies etc.) from different regions of Europe should be emphasized and given utmost importance in FP8. Given the specific conditions and experience cumulated in different geographies European Commission should have the initiative to underline the importance of geographical coverage of the proposals in FP8. Moreover **geographical***

**coverage should be raised as an evaluation criterion in multi partner projects** that is expected to extend the current 3 country (MSs, ACs) criterion.

- *The in depth analysis and ex-post evaluation of emerging tools (i.e. high impact projects, flagship initiatives) is needed for better design of FP8.*
- *European Level IPR management and information providing mechanisms should be immediately reviewed to increase the efficiency and attractiveness of FP8.*
- *Given the increasing pressure on public budgets, **rather than allocating funds to defence related research** marked by highly national priorities, civilian oriented security theme should be maintained considering the dual use character of security technologies in FP8.*

#### **b. Innovation Approach; Cohesion& Excellence**

The new research programming period is expected to be built on actions directed towards bridging the innovation gap from which Europe suffers. Research and Innovation are the key components for building capacities, enhancing growth and boosting excellence coherently throughout Europe and should be employed through strategically oriented tools and processes at Community level. Below stated strategies would be utilized for attaining long term strategic impact rendering ERA a cohesive and sustainable setting for public at large.

- ***A shift towards output-based funding*** is needed for forging market orientation of research, translation of research results into applications, increasing business engagement, enhancing the role of universities in innovation chain - for supply side- and boosting the impact of public intervention in economic terms.

- **The entire chain of innovation** should be considered when seeking complementarily between ERA structuring instruments and processes such as FPs, CIP, Innovation Union etc.
- As commercialization of the project results is growing importance thus precommercial procurement should come to the front in future RTD Programming period in order to enhance the synergy between FP8 and Innovation Union.
- Coherence between different policy tools with the aim in mind to overcome the lack of consistency between research and innovation policy is crucial but it is not about solely merging existing tools into structural funds/regional programmes.
- To promote innovation in thematically defined fields as well as in cross-cutting, horizontal innovation activities a new and assertive dimension concerning capacity development are needed.
- **More diversified and multifaceted capacity development mechanisms** should be employed in order to better exploit the research outcomes for the citizens' benefit.
- Excellence should be fostered as an important criterion for knowledge sharing and implementation as it is for knowledge creation. Topping up excellence in knowledge creation should be increasingly left to indirect/bottom-up actions based on shared management, ad hoc mechanisms, voluntary structures, flexible partnerships at transnational levels. This would be enhanced through a synergistic and complementarily use of existing measures of high profile such as JPIs, KICs, ETPs, SME measures, Research Infrastructures, PPPs, etc.
- Top down research programming and funding is crucial for building on Community perspective; however **bottom-up funding** is key to ensure the long term capacity building and **should be sustained** for more committed action.

- *FP8 should be strongly designed for providing coherence in ERA, for sharing the risk, bridging the innovation gap and leveraging private sector that is highly in line with public intervention logic.*
- *Community research funding to short to medium term policy objectives has often the risk to neglect the fact that research takes a long time in many cases to produce effective socio-economic impact. Thus an immature move towards incorporating the capacity development phases of current Research Funding Programmes with Regional Policy Programmes would distort the research calibration of the former.*
- *Mechanisms of regional and industrial research such as regions of knowledge, ETPs, CIP should be reconsidered to work synergistically together with JP to reveal region specific industrial research to boost competitiveness at ERA level.*
- **End user involvement** *to the Projects should be enhanced to define the technological challenges of the future to improve the dissemination and the appropriation of projects results.*
- **A high-trust risk tolerant approach** *in funding research should be applied. In this sense the financial risk shared by the R&D providers in SME measures should be somehow increased.*
- *Research and innovation activities should be linked better which is expected to be reflected in the quality of the consortiums. Thus the participation of more SME's in collaborative projects should be encouraged by European Commission in order to better bring the research results to the market on the one hand and conduct research in line with industry needs.*
- *To enhance SMEs participation, simplified methodologies should be incrementally introduced for the whole process varying from application to*

*implementation through simplifying complex and discouraging procedures, **reducing bureaucracy.***

- *The current approach of a 15% target for SMEs in the Thematic Priority Areas should be further increased. This tendency should be coupled by appropriate mechanisms in FP8.*
- *In the multi partner projects the participation of SMEs should be introduced as an evaluation criterion.*
- *Rather than funding large scale projects with same or lesser number of participants with bigger budgets, **small-medium scale projects should be maintained** in FP8 for better dispersion of risk.*
- *EUREKA's role should be enhanced and should be increasingly utilized for synergistic use of resources stimulated by different policy tools.*
- *FP8 should provide significant funding to EUROSTARS 2.0 Programme.*