

## LT NON-PAPER CONCERNING FUTURE FP

### General provisions

FP is an important tool to achieve the objectives of the ERA, therefore, it is essential that FP goals, priorities and challenges are formulated explicitly and specific results are foreseen. The result should be measured by criteria which could demonstrate not only the success rate of participation in the MS, but also reflect the orientation and objectives of the ERA. In our opinion, **the future FP should be more focused on key challenges facing the EU, and regional cooperation and partnerships should be emphasized and strengthened**, thereby ensuring not merely cooperation of the MS in the field of R&D, but also a better result. It is important that FP would create added value to what happens in the Member States, as well as strengthen the result of their mutual cooperation.

### Synergy Development

It is crucial that all **the European R&D initiatives, programmes and tools are better coordinated with each other**, focusing on clear objectives and specific goals to achieve them. At the same time the structure and objectives of the future FP should ensure the continuity of FP7, including the content and tools, however, it is essential to strive for improved compatibility among them and expediency. Also, more attention should be paid to secure the publicity of the programme and better accessibility for researchers and scholars.

In order to overcome the challenges facing Europe and consolidate efforts aimed to this end, it is necessary **to improve compatibility and coordination of the EU SF Programmes, FP and CIP support measures in the new EU financial perspective**. We propose to identify the different elements of EU funding instruments which could be the connecting blocks. For example, **“Research potential” development would be appropriate** in the future FP to ensure the compatibility and better cohesion of FP and SF support. We would also suggest **to expand the scope of “Regions of Knowledge”** of the FP7 in order to strengthen the coherence between FP and innovation-friendly programmes.

Long-term measures should be planned to ensure systematic integration of EU12 into the ERA (that was carried out under FP6, but EU12 participation results show that such short-term measures are not adequate).

### Structural elements of the programme and continuity of the activities

At this stage when a new FP is being designed, it would be important **to determine the relationship between frontier and applied research and innovation** as well as the shares assigned for individual projects, cooperation networks and infrastructures. As to the R&D infrastructure, it is important to highlight the geographical location of the facilities in the EU and **strive for more even distribution** thereof both on the EU level and in the MS, thus contributing to the strengthening of the R&D potential and the development of regional cooperation.

We propose **to increase the role of the Programme committees**, composed of representatives of the MS, **in the development of annual Working programmes** (through their representatives

and experts in the committees of FP7), and in making other important decisions. We would suggest to define transparent principles for the formation of the Working programmes.

**A part of the budget in each thematic area should be assigned for the "bottom up" type projects** (small-budget and short-term) that would target to identify and solve specific issues in the relevant field. Those could be small projects (STREP-type). **We suggest that two thirds of the financial support for research projects were assigned for small Strep-type projects.**

We call attention to the fact that such FP measures as **ERA-NET** and **ERA-NET Plus** schemes maintain their **importance** as they contribute to coordination of national R&D policies and research in MS.

We propose to continue to develop **OMC-NET** type projects that unlock the potential of developing the dimension of research policy coherence across the EU and of strengthening partnerships of MS in this area.

### **Evaluation and Selection**

We note the importance to improve the FP project evaluation system. Equal regional representation in expert selection should be sustained - the project evaluation process should involve more evaluators from the EU-12 countries.

We would suggest to maintain and develop the FP7 specific programme "Ideas", however, **a greater weight in application assessment criteria should be attached not to the researcher's personal excellence**, which is, beyond a doubt, a prerequisite for realization of the idea, **but rather to the scientific concept** of the application. This would enable to extend the range of potential candidates, which in turn, would "bring" more new promising projects within FP.

### **Attention to young researchers**

**Greater attention in the future FP must be paid to young researchers, not only from the third countries, but also from the EU itself:** both in calls for proposals and in project evaluation process, we propose to adopt special measures for young researchers or their teams. This would not only increase the competence of young researchers, but also contribute to joint efforts to address EU-wide challenge to increase and rejuvenate human potential in R&D.

### **Simplicity and transparency**

Considering the need of continuous and quick response to rapidly changing global environment and its challenges, it is necessary to significantly **reduce the time-frame between application and receipt of funds.**

In the future, different terms for funding different types of players should be maintained in FP, but **it is essential to simplify project cost accounting and audit procedures, e.g. to apply wider lump sum and flat rate financing.** Audits of the projects most frequently reveal confusion and errors caused by calculation of staff costs. We propose to introduce a flat rate for staff costs

adjusted by a coefficient of a state, as it is the case in the Marie Curie schemes. In that case, calculation of the project budget, administration and audit procedures would become simpler. Thus, the issue of compatibility of national and ES legal acts would be solved. This would contribute to creation of a single scientific market.

In order to avoid interpretations, it is necessary to clearly define the terms "**excellence**", "**result-based funding**," "**science-based funding**", "**lump sums**."

It is necessary to create an appropriate **web-portal** to guide **researchers and scholars** through the existing programmes and initiatives in ERA.

### **Continuity and innovation potential**

We think that it is important to ensure the continuity of certain elements of the FP, e.g. frontier research, specific measures for SMEs, various mobility schemes, capacity building, international cooperation. There is no need to create entirely new FP regulations or principles, rather it would be worth building on proven and well-operating mechanisms and simplified rules, which are lucid and understandable to researchers, policy-makers and the general public. However, given the need to strengthen the innovative element of the ERA, new elements targeted at this end could be considered.

We propose to introduce the concept of a **high risk project**. It should be made possible to implement these projects in two phases, when the pilot part of the project could sustain or deny feasibility of the whole project; in case of a negative result, execution of the project could be terminated with the declaration of already incurred costs.