



## **ECTRI ANSWER TO THE ERA FRAMEWORK PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

**“Areas of untapped potential for the development of  
the European Research Area (ERA)”**

**November 2011**

The European Conference of Transport Research Institutes (ECTRI) is an international non-profit association that was officially founded in April 2003. It is the first attempt to unite the forces of the foremost multimodal transport research centres across Europe and to thereby promote the excellence of European transport research. Today, it includes 28 major transport research institutes or universities from 20 European countries. Together, they account for more than 4,000 European scientific and research staff in the field of transport. ECTRI is committed to provide the scientifically based competence, knowledge and advice to move towards its vision to have “an efficient, integral European transport system that provides completely safe, secure and sustainable mobility for people and goods”.

**European Conference of Transport Research Institutes | ECTRI aisbl**

Rue du Trône 98 | 1050 BRUSSELS | Belgium

Tel: + 32 (0)2 500 56 87/88 | Fax: + 32 (0)2 500 56 89

Number: 831 370 370

Website: [www.ectri.org](http://www.ectri.org)

**Questionnaire**  
**ERA Framework Public Consultation :**  
**Areas of untapped potential for the development of the European Research Area (ERA)**

**1. Publication of data**

A synthesis of your contributions received via this online questionnaire, as well as any individual contributions, together with your identity or the identity of your organisation/affiliation, will be published on the web.

Therefore, in order to take part in this consultation, you must indicate prior agreement to the publication of your personal data (opt-in).

**I agree (opt-in)**    I disagree

**2. Information about the respondent**

2.1) I am replying as/on behalf of a (if you represent more than one category, please choose the most relevant one):  
(at most one answer)

[national government, regional/local government, research funding organisation, public research organisation, university/ higher education, doctoral candidate/early-stage researcher, experienced researcher, citizen, private organisation (less than 250 employees), private organisation (250 or more employees), international organisation, **other** (please specify [free text maximum 250 characters])]

**Non Profit Organisation**

2.2) Please indicate your field of work (more than one may be indicated)  
[Agriculture, Biotechnology, Energy, Environment, Security, **Transport**, Food, Health, Industrial technology, Socioeconomic sciences and humanities, International co-operation, Nanotechnology, policy making/management, Regional development, Research infrastructures, Space, **Other** (please specify below -free text maximum 250 characters)]

**ECTRI additional fields of work are those related to transport e.g. Energy, Environment, Security, Health, ITS, SSH, and horizontal issues like International cooperation, Mobility and Training, Research infrastructures, and policy making.**

2.3) Please provide your name/organisation's name (will be published) (if you are responding as a citizen, enter "citizen")  
[free text] (between 2 and 100 characters)

**ECTRI – European Conference of Transport Research Institutes**

2.4) Please provide your email address (will not be published) [free text]  
(between 5 and 100 characters)

info@ectri.org

2.5) Please provide your country of residence/establishment [Austria, Belgium etc., EU level organisation, other [drop-down menu]]  
(at most 1 answer)

Belgium

2.6) Have you or do you intend to submit an additional separate written contribution?  
(maximum 10 pages) [yes, no]

Yes

### 3. Introduction

*If there are any data/facts/surveys of your country/region/organisation available to underpin your answer to any of the questions in the questionnaire, please provide a reference or a hyperlink if available.*

The Heads of State and Government of the European Union have called for the measures necessary to achieve a unified European Research Area (ERA) to be put in place by 2014.

**3.1) Can you indicate what are the most important gaps to be filled for the achievement of ERA, and where the European Union should step up its efforts most urgently?**

*(please rank each area according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important)*

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Researchers' careers and mobility</b>					★	
<b>Research infrastructures</b>			★			
<b>Cross-border operation of research actors</b>					★	
<b>Knowledge transfer</b>			★			
<b>Open Access</b>				★		
<b>International dimension</b>					★	
<b>Cross-cutting governance issues</b>				★		
<b>Other, to be filled in (max 200 words)</b>						

**3.2) Which areas will be an issue for longer term efforts at EU level, even beyond 2014?  
Please explain (600 characters)**

**ECTRI considers that all areas are issues for long term effort (beyond 2014), except open access which can be addressed in a shorter term.**

#### 4. Researchers

Please respond from either a national or a European perspective, as appropriate.

##### Supply of well-qualified researchers

4.1) The European research system/your national research system produces sufficient numbers of leading researchers.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, **D) Strongly disagree**, E) No opinion

4.2) The European research system/your national research system attracts sufficient numbers of leading researchers.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, **D) Strongly disagree**, E) No opinion

4.3) The European research system/your national research system retains sufficient numbers of leading researchers.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, **D) Strongly disagree**, E) No opinion

4.4) University curricula at undergraduate level reflect emerging disciplines and markets.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, **C) Disagree**, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

4.5) Doctoral training in Europe/your country is of high quality.

**A) Strongly agree**, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

4.6) Researchers in Europe/your country are well trained for the academic labour market.

**A) Strongly agree**, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

4.7) Researchers in Europe/your country are well trained for the business labour market.

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

##### Attractiveness of researchers' careers

4.8) The working conditions of public sector researchers are as attractive as those of other professionals with similar qualifications.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, **D) Strongly disagree**, E) No opinion

4.9) The career prospects for public sector researchers are as attractive as for other professionals with similar qualifications.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, **D) Strongly disagree**, E) No opinion

4.10) The career prospects for private sector researchers are as attractive as for academics with similar qualifications.

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

If your response is C) or D) to Questions 8, 9 or 10:

4.11) The low level of attractiveness of research careers is caused by the following factors: (please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Limited availability of research positions in <u>academia</u>				★		
Limited availability of research positions in the <u>private sector</u>				★		
Lack of information about vacancies	★					
Inadequate <u>public</u> equipment/infrastructures for performing top-level research			★			
Absence of adequate <u>private</u> equipment/infrastructures for performing top-level research			★			
Lack of career prospects and development opportunities					★	
Insufficient possibilities for participation in decision-making processes			★			
The profession of researcher is not well recognised					★	
Gender discrimination is present, especially in senior positions				★		
Gender discrimination is present, especially in the remuneration of researchers	★					
There are relatively low wages in academia as compared to other sectors				★		
Lack of social security coverage	★					
Universities and research institutions are underfunded					★	
Universities and research institutions do not have sufficient autonomy to recruit researchers and set wages				★		
Academia and the private sector do not cooperate sufficiently			★			
Research departments in academia / public research organisations do not cooperate sufficiently			★			
The European Charter for Researchers and the Code of			★			

<b>Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers are not sufficiently known or implemented</b>						
<b>The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (that aims to facilitate the implementation of the Charter and Code) is not sufficiently known</b>			★			
<b>Other (to be filled in, max 200 characters)</b>						

**Transnational and inter-sectorial mobility of researchers in Europe**

4.12) **The mobility of researchers across borders is hampered in Europe because:**  
(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>There are not enough fellowships and grants specifically aimed at mobility</b>					★	
<b>Publicly-funded grants are, as a general rule, not easily portable</b>					★	
<b>The funding sources in other EU countries are not accessible to non-nationals / non-residents</b>					★	
<b>Recruitment procedures are not sufficiently open and transparent</b>			★			
<b>Mobility is not recognised positively in the career path</b>					★	
<b>There is a lack of information on social security and pension rights</b>				★		
<b>Rights under EU law related to social security and pension are not adequately enforced</b>				★		
<b>Rights under EU law related to social security and pension are not sufficient</b>				★		
<b>Diplomas are not easily recognised in other countries</b>					★	
<b>Immigration rules and procedures can be burdensome and complicated</b>					★	
<b>It is difficult to settle into a host country (accommodation, family arrangements, etc.)</b>				★		
<b>Universities and research institutions do not have sufficient autonomy to recruit researchers and set wages</b>				★		
<b>The European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers are not sufficiently known or implemented</b>			★			
<b>The Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (that aims to facilitate the implementation of the Charter and Code) is not sufficiently known</b>			★			
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

4.13) Grants are not easily portable for the following reasons:

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Funders want to keep control over their funds</b>					★	
<b>Institutions want to keep their staff</b>					★	
<b>Institutions face legal and administrative barriers</b>				★		
<b>Lack of clear and transparent transfer conditions</b>				★		
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

4.14) The recruitment of public sector researchers is transparent and open.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

If your response is C) or D):

4.15) Recruitment is not transparent and open for the following reasons:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	No opinion
<b>The existence of national/regional/university level rules prevents it from being so</b>		★			
<b>There is no obligation for it to be so</b>		★			
<b>Explicit policy choice on the part of the hiring institution</b>		★			
<b>Lack of a Human Resources strategy in institutions</b>		★			
<b>Additional workload for Human Resources departments</b>		★			
<b>Legal uncertainty associated with transparency (e.g. risk of increased complaints)</b>					★
<b>Protectionism/nepotism</b>					★
<b>Lack of awareness of job portals such as EURAXESS Jobs</b>		★			
<b>Other (to be filled in - max 200 characters)</b>					

4.16) It is easy for public sector researchers to move to the private sector.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

4.17) It is easy for private sector researchers to move to the public sector.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

**4.18) Have you experienced a specific initiative(s) which failed or was hampered by one or more of the issues mentioned in this 'Researchers' section?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

The following case can be reported as an example: a detached Professor in abroad University in Europe does not get the permission to extent his period abroad due to original University constraints (teaching needs and recruitment and payment for another teacher for the course that the detached Professor could not assure). This type of situation clearly hampers the mobility and should be avoided.

Another problem related to the accounting of years of service and experience to evaluate the level and salary of researchers when moving abroad in another University; in some case, these years are not fully taken into account which directly penalised the researcher. Again this type of situation should be addressed.

**4.19) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this 'Researchers' section, which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

According to above question, a concrete suggestion would be that EU claim for fair and transparent procedures to put in place in University and their Department for facilitating the mobility of researchers.

In addition, some of the difficulties encountered in the transport domain are being addressed by the running FP7 DETRA project. Part of the work is dedicated to build up a new generation of transport researchers to favour their trans-national mobility in a multicultural and multidisciplinary context. A set of initiatives (e.g. design of a European PhD in Transport, organisation of an “ad hoc” training program, and setting up of a dedicated Mobility web portal in transport) is planned in this frame. This represent a further step in the implementation of EC recommendations on Mobility of researchers and the fifth freedom, and will pave the way to propose complementary actions that could be included in the future EC programmes and actions related to Mobility. These recommendations could be extended to other research domains.

*Any additional comments on the section Researchers:*

## 5. Cross-border operation of research actors

*Please note that in the questionnaire 'cross-border operation' covers any research initiative by research actors (research performing organisations, funding agencies and foundations and researchers) with a transnational character within the EU, e.g. research programme coordination between Member States, coordinated calls between Member States, coordination of research organisations' programmes, etc.*

### 5.1) What is the optimal degree of transnational operation of research actors needed to jointly tackle major societal challenges (e.g. scale of effort, budget level...)?

Please explain (600 characters)

**In our domain (transport and ICT research), the French/German cooperation is insufficient to tackle major societal challenges by transnational operation of research actions (even if 70% of the EU private and public effort is German or French). At least 6 to 10 research actions from the Northern, Western, Southern and Eastern EU countries would be needed to complement this effort.**

**In the case of an academic or RTD partnership, the budget should be increased to a level up to 20 million euros to 40 million euros; for industry partnership or industry RTD academic partnership, it should be placed at a level of 50 million euros to 1 Geuros.**

### 5.2) At what stages of research and development, or for which specific activities, do you think a more coordinated approach is necessary and would be more suitable than at national level?

Please explain (600 characters)

**A more coordinated approach at EU level is absolutely necessary and more suitable than at national level when:**

- Pan-european added value is proved
- Standardization and pre-rule making evidence is at stake
- Global leadership of Europe is concerned
- Scientific national smart specialisation is necessary and coordinated at European level for international excellence legibility.

### 5.3. What are the most appropriate mechanisms for making progress in cross-border operation (e.g. joint research programmes between Member States, research alliances involving research institutes)?

Please explain (600 characters)

**Best practices developed by ERAC/GPC are of utmost importance. Nevertheless the most appropriate mechanisms are allowing the lowest transactional costs of coordination and the quickest time frame from proposal to project funding.**

**The best way to use the incentive efforts of the EU research programme process is to align quicker joint research activities (following EARTO model).**

**In any case, research alliances are essential to be put in place for research institutes and Universities, as well as a dedicated funding instrument like the Joint Research Initiatives' instrument. Transport is subject to an FP7 funded project called DETRA to develop a transport research alliance.**

**5.4) What conditions need to be in place for national funding agencies to increase their support to research carried out through joint research programmes?**

Please explain (600 characters)

**The following conditions need to be in place for national funding agencies to increase their support to research carried out through joint research programmes:**

- lowest transactional cost
- one contract for one virtual pot
- the quickest time frame from the proposal submission to the project funding

**If the Member States are not in favour of using the community method, the funding agencies could re-create a soft 'EUREKA' type secretariat.**

**5.5) Describe which specific factors (can) facilitate the cross border operation of joint research programmes implemented by funding agencies, research-performing organisations including universities, etc.**

Please describe (600 characters)

**In the case of funding agencies, the following factors may facilitate cross-border operation: virtual common pot, joint call, joint evaluation, and joint contract model.**

**In the case of research performing organisations: the "collaborative project" supported by EC is the best manner to facilitate such operations, as partners are voluntarily bringing their resources by respecting their autonomy.**

**5.6) Describe which specific factors (can) hamper the cross border operation of research programmes implemented by funding agencies, research-performing organisations including universities, etc.**

Please describe (600 characters)

**Bureaucracy and heavy control of the public money really hamper the cross border operation.**

**In the case of funding agencies: multi-call answers for the same proposal or project, and several steps of evaluation (by both Member States and EC for instance), and thus multi-contractual agreement or grant directly hamper the cross border operation.**

**In the case of research performing organisations, the administrative burden and bureaucratic control by the EC of the research not funded by the EC is the major obstacle to cross border operations.**

**5.7) How can joint research programmes best be implemented (e.g. co-ordination of nationally selected and implemented projects, transnational consortia selected by international peer review but funded nationally, transnational consortia selected by international peer review funded through a "common pot")?**

Please explain (600 characters)

**Joint research programmes can be implemented when the EC financially inputs the process with alignment to the lowest transactional cost and the less bureaucratic process, and focus the process on the main aim which is to make innovation possible and allow creativity to spring.**

**Transnational consortia can be funded at regional, national and community level or through real and virtual common pot, but we recommend that there should be only one desk to submit the proposal, one evaluation process and common administrative and financial rules.**

**5.8) Potential difficulties with cross-border operation are caused by the following factors:**  
(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Lack of availability of systematic information on national programmes or other initiatives suitable for cross-border operation</b>						
<b>Lack of mechanisms that enable cross-border research projects to access national project funding</b>						
<b>Lack of common principles for evaluation, selection and funding of transnational research projects</b>						
<b>Insufficient commitment from Member States to transnational coordinated research</b>						
<b>Insufficient commitment of financial resources when the implementation of coordinated programmes can only be achieved by pooling of resources</b>						
<b>Lack of trust in transnational cooperation at the level of researchers</b>						
<b>Lack of incentives in transnational cooperation at the level of researchers</b>						
<b>Lack of trust in transnational cooperation at the level of research funding agencies</b>						

Lack of incentives in transnational cooperation at the level of research funding agencies						
Lack of incentives in transnational cooperation at the level of research organisations						
Lack of trust in transnational cooperation at the level of research organisations						
Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)						

5.9) Have you experienced a specific initiative(s) which failed or was hampered by one or more of the above-mentioned issues?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

We find it difficult to cite one specific initiative that hamper the above-mentioned issue ; the difficulties come from the implementation: (i) transactional cost for stakeholders that should not be too heavy, (ii) common submission process, common evaluation process and common administrative and financial rules are required.

5.10) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this section 'Cross-border operation', which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

In the first place, we would like to underline the primary importance of funding. Besides, the following actions could also remedy some of the major difficulties:

In the case of funding agencies:

- To develop a set of common criteria of evaluations
- To develop a common contract model agreement
- To use ERAC rule even for research agencies

In the case of research organisations:

- to create Focused Joint Research Initiatives (FJRI)

Any additional comments on the section Cross border operations of research:

## 6. Research infrastructures

### 6.1) Potential difficulties for an optimum exploitation of existing research infrastructures of pan-European interest might be decreased by acting on the following factors:

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Mapping, on a regular basis, the existing national research infrastructures of pan-European relevance				★		
Reinforcing their open, excellence-based access through improvements of national research infrastructures policies and programmes					★	
Increased EU support for transnational access to research infrastructures of pan-European relevance					★	
Developing more synergies between European and national actions				★		
Strengthening inter-operability of instruments and of scientific data at EU level					★	
Increasing awareness of access opportunities to researchers in all EU countries offered by existing national research infrastructures				★		
Increasing awareness of access opportunities of national and pan-European research infrastructures to industrial stakeholders				★		
Improving management of the existing research infrastructures, e.g. through more EU-wide training activities			★			
Fostering remote access to research facilities, e.g. through the efficient development of appropriate e-infrastructure				★		
Developing harmonized evaluation / assessment protocols (at EU level) for national research infrastructures				★		
Improving training of scientists to manage and exploit research infrastructures					★	
Other recommendations (to be filled in - max 200 characters)						

### 6.2) Potential difficulties for the realisation of the next generation of research infrastructures of pan-European interest might be decreased by acting on the following factors:

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Increased public funding					★	

Increased role of the EU in helping Member States to reach agreement on sharing costs of construction and operation					★	
Developing more harmonized rules between public research funding and structural funds					★	
Increasing use of private funds for the implementation and operation of research infrastructures					★	
Revision of the state aid rules to ease public investments in research infrastructures				★		
More extensive and quality-based <i>ex ante</i> assessment studies to generate greater support from the decision-makers				★		
Improving the functioning of the European Strategy Forum on Research Infrastructures (ESFRI)			★			
Improving training of research infrastructure managers as well as of coordinators of large-scale projects				★		
Stimulating development of distributed facilities through increased inter-operability of instruments and/or of scientific data					★	
Setting-up Regional Partner Facilities to involve and exploit the potential for scientific excellence and technological growth of convergence and peripheral regions				★		
Integrating national research infrastructures into pan-European entities				★		
Allowing the EU to speak with one coherent voice at international level					★	
Other recommendations ( <i>to be filled in , max 200 characters</i> )						

6.3) How could, in your opinion, national, regional and pan-European research infrastructures best contribute to raising the quality of the research base across the ERA? Could you please describe (600 characters)?

The DETRA project addresses this issue and foster elements that would raise the quality of the research base across the ERA. The project investigates the existing opportunities to develop the Research Infrastructures (RI) in the transportation domain needed for the ERA of today and the future challenges. An updated catalogue of relevant RI in Europe is under development. From this research, recommendations to develop missing RI and optimize the use of the existing ones will be made available.

6.4) Have you experienced specific initiatives which failed or were hampered by one or more of the issues mentioned in this 'Research infrastructures' section? Could you please describe (600 characters)?

-----

6.5) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this section 'Research infrastructures', which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues? Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**In addition to funding, which is of utmost importance, the following actions should be envisaged:**

- **Helping Members States to reach agreement to share costs of construction and also operational costs**
- **Reinforcement of interoperability (standardization) between instruments and scientific data at EU level**
- **Foster sustainable solutions for management of existing RI in their technical, legal, financial, environmental and social dimensions to tackle the grand challenges**
- **Through research, actions should seek the development of new material and tools leading to the analysis and improvements of the RI lifetime and assessment of their financial, social, environmental costs as regards their construction and maintenance**

*Any additional comments on the section Research infrastructures:*

**7. Knowledge circulation: knowledge transfer and open access**

**Knowledge transfer**

**7.1) Knowledge transfer can be optimised by acting on the following factors:**

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Increasing the awareness amongst researchers about Intellectual Property Rules and Knowledge Transfer opportunities				★		
Stimulating the <u>development</u> of national strategies and policies on KT			★			
Stimulating the <u>implementation</u> of national strategies and policies on KT			★			
Incentivizing universities and public research organisations to <u>develop</u> strong KT strategies and structures			★			
Incentivizing universities and public research organisations to <u>implement</u> KT strategies			★			
Strengthening Knowledge Transfer Offices		★				
Further developing existing KT guidelines at European level		★				
Making the existing KT guidelines binding		★				
Developing European legislation on KT		★				
Creating patent pools in Europe			★			
Making KT activities a criterion for job assessment and promotion				★		
Monitoring KT on a regular basis in Europe				★		
Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)						

**7.2) Private firms experience difficulties in finding public research results or competences.**

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, **C) Disagree**, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

If your response is A) or B):

**7.3) In what ways, and what remedies could there be?**

Please explain (600 characters)

Despite the fact that ECTRI believes that private firms does not experience major difficulties in finding public research results or competence, we think that forums and interactions with Alliances, and local clustering would increase such findings.

**7.4) How should a strategic relationship between the public research sector and the private sector best be established and strengthened?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**Agreements could be established between universities/public research sector and enterprises (or public bodies) to facilitate the involvement of universities in solving the problems of “real” world. Establishment of Framework agreement on important topics would also strengthen strategic relationship between public research sector and the private sector.**

**7.5) Have you experienced specific initiatives which failed or were hampered by one or more of the issues mentioned in this 'Knowledge transfer' section?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**We have three particular remarks regarding KT that should be reflected in the current debate:**

- **experimented staff is a concern**
- **KT is a costly activity**
- **Only very few American Universities makes money with KT. It has generally to be granted or subsidized.**

**7.6) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this section 'Knowledge transfer', which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**We believe that having a joint point of view and orientation on KT between EU bodies and Member States including their Parliaments especially linked to Open Innovation, would help. Unitary Patent and other IPR issues rules are also needed at EU level.**

*Any additional comments on the section on Knowledge Transfer:*

**Open access**

*Please note that the European Commission is preparing a Communication and Recommendation on access to and preservation of digital information. All interested parties were consulted via an on-line survey on scientific information open between 15 July and 9 September 2011. The outcome of this survey will be taken into account when developing the ERA Framework. The following questions are more specific to the remit of ERA policy actions.*

*Please note also that 'open access' in this questionnaire refers to the practice of granting free online access to research publications and/or data.*

7.7) Do you think that the circulation of scientific knowledge in the form of scientific publications needs to be improved in the European Research Area?

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

7.8) Do you think that the circulation of scientific knowledge in the form of scientific data needs to be improved in the European Research Area?

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

7.9) Do you think that open access (free online access) to scientific publications and data can enhance knowledge circulation in the European Research Area?

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

7.10) Please assess the following potential barriers to enhanced knowledge circulation through open access to publications and/or data in the European Research Area:

1-Strongly agree, **2-Agree**, 3-Disagree, 4-Strongly disagree, 5-No opinion

	1	2	3	4	5
Researchers are not sufficiently aware of the issue of open access to <u>publications</u>		★			
Researchers are not sufficiently aware of the issue of open access to <u>data</u>		★			
Actors working to advance open access fail to negotiate collectively with scholarly publishers		★			
EU copyright and ownership rules do not sufficiently address the specificities of the area of research and science					★
EU VAT rules for digital publications are unsatisfactory					★
Repositories for <u>publications</u> across Europe are not sufficiently interoperable.		★			
Repositories for <u>data</u> across Europe are not sufficiently interoperable		★			
The pan-European e-infrastructure for depositing scientific publications and data is insufficient		★			
Member States' policies on open access to <u>publications</u> are insufficient.					★
Member States' policies on open access to <u>data</u> are insufficient					★
Member States' policies on open access to publications and data are insufficiently co-ordinated in the European Research Area					★
Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)					

7.11) Have you experienced specific initiatives which failed or were hampered by one or more of the issues mentioned in this 'open access' section?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

-----

**7.12) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this section 'open access', which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**The publications of database and data result of EU projects should be made mandatory in order to enable anybody to use them; the publication of data collected by public bodies (State, regions, etc.) should follow the same rule.**

**Today it appears difficult even impossible to researchers to use data that they have not collected personally. When funds are not available to organize survey, the use of data coming from other sources and public would allow exchanging knowledge and methods to analyse data. Currently the data are generally “private” and the researchers working in the countries with less resource in data collection have unfortunately not the possibility to carry out certain type of research. Actions are clearly necessary to answer to this need.**

*Any additional comments on the section on open access:*

## 8. International dimension

Please note that 'third countries' are considered in this questionnaire as countries that are not members of the European Union. 'International cooperation' S&T in this context means scientific and technological cooperation with third countries.

### Coordination of international S&T actions

8.1) How could the Member States and the EU better coordinate their international S&T cooperation actions and policies so as to bring more benefits to both individual Member States and the EU overall?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

International S&T cooperation actions are much more effective if centrally controlled, coordinated and integrated to the maximum possible degree. In this sense the EU Commission is a better placed entity to design, and implement international S&T cooperation programmes throughout the world. National governments should be asked to participate actively in designing the actions, co-fund them and monitor their execution / implementation but towards the outside world the overall coordination and interaction with the third countries should be done by the Commission. This would of course mean that the Commission services should be appropriately strengthened internally, to do so.

In addition to such "centrally" planned and funded actions, National governments can always pursue their own international S&T cooperation actions and policies, but on a much more focussed and modest way in order to promote specific and well defined "National" interests.

Also COST appears as a good example for the International S&T cooperation. Such programme should be pursued and strengthened to better perform its role of cooperation. Many tools are not necessary, one good tool to manage the cooperation on a large scale could be sufficient.

8.2) A risk of **duplication** of the international S&T cooperation activities between the Member States and the EU is due to the following factors:

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Information sharing by Member States with each other and with the EU about their international S&T policies and actions is insufficient / inadequate				★		
The international R&D policies and programmes of the EU and of the Member States are not sufficiently coordinated with each other					★	

<b>There are insufficient possibilities for researchers and research organisations of one Member State to participate in the international cooperation programmes of other Member States</b>					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

8.3) **A lack of critical European S&T mass at the global level is due to the following factors:** (please rank them according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Too few EU Member States have dedicated international S&amp;T cooperation strategies</b>				★		
<b>The international research cooperation priorities and initiatives of the Member States continue to be primarily driven by national objectives</b>					★	
<b>The international S&amp;T policies and programmes of the EU and of the Member States are not sufficiently coordinated with each other</b>					★	
<b>There is a lack of mechanisms for EU and Member States' international S&amp;T policies and programmes to reinforce each other</b>					★	
<b>Sensitive technological sectors prevent Member States from opening up their international policies and activities towards each other</b>					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

8.4) **The Member States and the EU do not derive the maximum benefit from their international S&T cooperation activities with third countries due to the following factors:** (please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>The international S&amp;T policies and programmes of the EU and of the Member States are not sufficiently coordinated with each other</b>					★	
<b>European scientists and research organisations have no or insufficient reciprocal access to the scientific and technological programmes of third countries</b>		★				
<b>There are no common guidelines for EU scientists and research organisations for the application of rules on the ownership of, and access to, intellectual property resulting from cooperation with third countries</b>			★			
<b>There is a lack of coordinated initiatives by the EU and the Member States to remove access barriers to third</b>				★		

countries' markets, to facilitate standardisation, and to ensure access to public procurement in third countries						
Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)						

**Attractiveness of Europe as an S&T location**

8.5) The global attractiveness of Europe as an S&T location (for researchers, companies, and capital) is decreasing.

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

If your response is A) or B):

8.6) The attractiveness of Europe as an S&T location (for researchers, companies, and capital) could be increased by the following factors:

(please rank them according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
Making Europe's labour market conditions and policies for researchers more attractive					★	
Reducing the fragmentation of the European market, including employment conditions				★		
Improving employment and career prospects for researchers in the EU				★		
Enabling third-country researchers to obtain long-term visas, including working visas, more easily in the EU than in other countries			★			
Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)	<p><b>Make fiscal conditions more attractive for innovation and S&amp;T related foreign capital to be invested in the EU (e.g. special tax status). This policy taken to the extreme could mean creation of Science &amp; Technological innovation "Free zones" very much like the customs "free tax zone" parks.</b></p>					

8.7) Have you experienced a specific initiative(s) which failed or was hampered by one or more of the above-mentioned issues?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

8.8) Given the ensemble of issues addressed in this section 'International dimension', which action, other than funding, is needed at EU level to remedy some of these issues?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

- 1. Greater cooperation with member states on establishing a joint (i.e. EC and National government) procedure for planning, designing, and executing International Cooperation actions.**
- 2. The Commission should undertake more central role in international S&T cooperation activities with third countries**
- 3. Establish incentives for third country researchers to come and work in the EU for a period of time (e.g. up to 3 years).**
- 4. Establish incentives for third country capital to be invested in the EU for innovation and research related activities.**

*Any additional comments on the section International dimension:*

## 9. Managing and monitoring the ERA partnership, Cross-cutting issues and next steps

### Managing and monitoring the ERA partnership

9.1) How can ERA best contribute to reducing the current research and innovation gap within Europe and the large disparities between research systems at national and regional level?

Please explain (600 characters)

ERA can contribute to reduce the R&I gap if actions and measures are conducted both on the demand and on the supply sides. In particular, European large scale activity using CSFRI, Regional and Structural Funding or policy instruments should help both the demand and supply sides.

Research organisations are essential for tackling societal challenges and competitiveness. A dedicated instrument like FJRI is necessary.

The R&I infrastructures, including incubators and test beds, need to be articulated at regional or metropolitan, national and European levels (for the biggest).

The autonomy of the research operations and systems shall be respected.

9.2) What structures and processes at the level of policy development, coordination, implementation are required to achieve the well functioning of ERA at national and/or EU level?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

ECTRI is a research provider so focus primarily its answers on issues which relate to the supply side of the ERA.

The assessment of research organisations, research teams and scientists and other research personnel has to follow the frame of a code of practices depending on the type of organisations. The fluidity of the mobility is very important.

Relaunching European interest research organisations would be an interesting path.

9.3) What structures and processes at the level of policy development, coordination, implementation are required to monitor and evaluate progress of ERA initiatives?

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

The following structures and processes should be created to monitor and evaluate progress of ERA initiatives:

- a European Research assessment Agency
- a set of code of practices

- a European R&I Administration Academia (equivalent to the War Academy for the staff and top officers of the Armies).
- European S&T Awareness Academy (comparable to the model of the British, German, French Academy for Defense and Security).

9.4) The involvement of stakeholders (research performing organizations including universities, funding agencies, researchers, private sector, civil society etc.) in participatory ERA policy processes (fixing objectives, priorities, monitoring, etc.) needs to increase substantially.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

If your response is A) or B) please respond to 9.5) and 9.6):

9.5) What would have been the potential gains resulting from a higher level of involvement of stakeholders?

Please explain (600 characters)

-----

9.6) What is the best way for providing stronger bottom-up input by stakeholders (research performing organisations including universities, funding agencies, researchers, private sector, civil society etc.) to the processes and structures for ERA policy development and implementation?

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Establishing an ERA stakeholders' platform</b>				★		
<b>Sharing more information with stakeholders (e.g. ERA portal Forum)</b>			★			
<b>Active participation of stakeholders in dedicated working groups</b>					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

9.7) At what level does the achievement and implementation of ERA require strengthened political commitment?

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Strengthened political commitment at regional/national levels</b>					★	
<b>Strengthened political commitment both at national and EU levels</b>					★	

<b>Strengthened political commitment at EU level</b>					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

**9.8) In what ways should national governments include the European dimension when deciding their research policies and allocation of budgets?**

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Systematic inclusion of dedicated EU research policy content in national research policy programmes/ documents</b>					★	
<b>Systematic inclusion of dedicated ERA-related policy in National Reform Programmes</b>				★		
<b>Fixed dedicated research budget lines allocated to EU initiatives</b>					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						

**9.9) Considering the whole ensemble of ERA-related issues addressed in this consultation, what is the best way to develop ERA, beyond funding measures, in order to have everything in place for the completion of ERA by 2014?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

The best way to develop ERA is to have a mix of policies measures like rules, directives, code of practices and guidelines, recommendations, and a dedicated forum.

Even if the national landscapes for education and research and innovation are moving quickly, we believe that the set target of 2014 for achieving ERA is not realistic, and that the ERA will not be completed by that date. In some ways, ERA is comparable to the Euroland: the Lisbon Treaty is a step forward, but only a step.

**9.10) The ERA Framework would have to insist on the primacy of a number of principles such as non-discrimination, equal opportunity, transparency, subsidiarity and proportionality. What other cross-cutting principles and conditions among those listed below should be enshrined or fostered in the ERA Framework?**

(please rank each factor according to importance : 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
<b>Balance between coordination, cooperation and competition</b>				★		
<b>Diversity</b>		★				
<b>Simplicity, low administrative burden</b>					★	
<b>Scientific autonomy, freedom of research</b>		★				
<b>Scientific integrity, ethical principles</b>			★			

Trust and dialogue between science and society			★			
Balanced EU-wide development and inclusiveness, openness			★			
Sustainability, environmental responsibility				★		
Precautionary principle		★				
Gender aspects in research		★				
<b>Other (to be filled in , max 200 characters)</b>						
If the EU funding is impacting the other public funding delivered on the same basis (call for proposals) at a level of one third, the subsidiarity is not at stake (and that even if the main countries are less impacted).						

## Gender and ethics

9.11) A higher involvement of women in science will increase the impact of research on European socio-economic growth.

A) Strongly agree, B) Agree, **C) Disagree**, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

9.12) Mixed research teams enhance the quality and relevance of research outcomes.

A) Strongly agree, **B) Agree**, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

9.13) Progress in achieving gender balance and integrating gender dimension in research content has been slow. Please assess the relevance of the following possible factors:

(please rank each factor according to importance: 1-not important, 2-not very important, 3-medium importance, 4-important, 5-very important.)

	1	2	3	4	5	No opinion
The benefits of gender equality are not sufficiently acknowledged by the scientific community			★			
Research institutions do not have gender equality strategies and/or adequate capacities to implement them					★	
Lack of top-level support in research institutions				★		
Slow progress in modernisation of research institutions					★	
Lack of collaboration between Member States' policies			★			
Inconsistent top level policy support to implement gender equality in science				★		
Inadequate implementation of policy related to gender in research				★		
Lack of quota						
General persistence of gender stereotypes on the labour market					★	
<b>Other (to be filled in - max 200 characters)</b>						

**The quota is an incentive constraining factor; nevertheless it represents a direct risk to create some prejudices against the recruited women.**

9.14) **How could EU policy on gender in research be made more effective?**

Could you please describe (600 characters)?

**We acknowledge that the gender issues in research have been generally addressed at scientists' level. Nevertheless problems remain at top level research administration. EU policy should therefore strive to address also this situation.**

**In addition, one problem to be addressed related to the family organization. In the current period where the labour market is highly "competitive" and where the working pressure is high and continuous, this induces impairment for the person in charge of the family. Policy family is at stake, and the EU should, whenever possible, intervene to regulate it.**

9.15) **There should be a common European approach and practices to research ethics and scientific integrity.**

**A) Strongly agree**, B) Agree, C) Disagree, D) Strongly disagree, E) No opinion

*Any additional comments on the section Managing and monitoring the ERA partnership and cross-cutting issues:*

**As of today, the ethics and scientific integrity are based on UN or OECD families' documents and linked to the European citizens' rights chart. European basic rule should be drawn and applied.**