



**Contract no. 036195 (ERAC) Complexity-NET**

**European Network of Funding Agencies  
Coordination of National Complexity Research and Training Activities**

**Instrument: Coordinated Action  
Thematic Priority: ERA-NET**

***D1.1 Report on complexity relevant national programmes  
D1.2 Report on implementation approaches***

**Due date of deliverable: 1 September 2007  
Actual submission date: 19 October 2007**

**Start date of project: 1. September 2006  
Duration: 42 months**

**Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:**

***Engineering and Physical Sciences Council (EPSRC) /***

***Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO)***

**Revision [*draft 3: 12.09.07*]**

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2006-2010)</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>PU</b>	Public	
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	<b>X</b>
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

## Table of contents

Introduction	2
Conclusions:	
1. Position and status of participant in Complexity funding	4
2. Funding modes	5
3. Funding instruments / programmes	15
4. Legal and administrative considerations	17
5. Role of industry	19
Comparative tables:	
1. Position and status of participant in Complexity funding & 2. Funding modes	20
3. Funding instruments / programmes	23
4. Legal and administrative considerations	36
5. Role of industry	36
Annexes*:	
I – Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC)	37
II – Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS)	89
III – Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MSTI)	103
IV – Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia (EAS)	130
V – General Secretariat for Research and Technology (GSRT)	157
VI – National Office for Research and Technology (NKTH)	186
VII – Irish Research Council for Science, Engineering and Technology (IRCSET)	251
VIII – Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR)	281
IX – Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO)	297
X – Fudacao para Ciencia e Tecnologia (FCT)	337
XI – Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (MEC)	354

\*restricted to programme participants, including the Commission Services

## Introduction

This report provides an overview of the programmes and their implementations relating to the field of complexity for the respective countries of the Complexity-NET participants. Using a standard questionnaire, the partners provided all relevant information concerning their organisation, RTD priorities, decision processes, existing programmes, running projects and criteria for funding.

The standard questionnaire has been designed based on the description of work for Task 1.1 (Programme contents and implementations) of Workpackage 1 for Complexity-NET. The task description is as follows:

*For each programme, the content, evaluation process, tools for reporting and dissemination, the management approach and the administrative procedures are described. A questionnaire may be used to aid the gathering of relevant information and to enable useful comparisons.*

The questionnaire addresses the key information of the partners organisation and funding systems. Subsequently, information is gathered on the different steps, in chronological order, of the application, award and follow-up process. The questionnaires provide data about the implementation processes, peer review and timescales for programme decisions. IPR requirements are also discussed.

Comparative tables focusing on key issues are presented. They indicate the essential differences and similarities. The information has been collected in a set of tables and relate to the:

- status of the participant,
- funding modes,
- funding principles,
- applications processing, and
- evaluation of the proposals.

The purpose of the present exercise with the questionnaire is to prepare the participants for the work as described in Task 2.1. At that time the practical limitations should be outlined for coordinated networking of national research activities, inclusive of the mutual opening of national programmes. In Task 2, essential differences between the funding bodies will be addressed in detail, followed by conclusions about the potential for future collaboration.

## Conclusions

Following is a concise overview of the information received through the individual questionnaires followed by brief conclusions.

### 1. POSITION AND STATUS OF PARTICIPANT IN COMPLEXITY FUNDING

*This section covers the position and status of the partner organisations involved in Complexity-Net and how (or if) they make strategic decisions.*

#### **Who prepares the science policy guidelines for your organisation?**

EPSRC: Research council, own budget, own strategy

FNRS: Research council, own budget, own strategy based on excellence

MSTI: Ministerial funding agency, strategy also provided by ministry

EAS: Not a funding body, no own budget, strategy formulated together with others

GSRT: Funding body, own budget, strategy formulated jointly with others

NORT/NKTH: Funding body, no own budget, strategy formulated together with others (RTIC)

IRCSET: Research council, own budget, few specific strategies

CNR: ISC-CNR is not a funding body, budget for institute only, strategy decided by ministry

NWO: Research council, own budget, own strategy

FCT: Research agency, own budget, no official research strategy

MEC: Ministerial organization, strategy prepared by Commission of experts

Conclusion 1.1: The majority of the participants are funding bodies that control their own budgets and develop their own strategy, although there is often significant steer from Ministries.

#### **What are the main strategies in and priorities for complexity funding in your organisation?**

EPSRC: Complexity in own strategy, mostly in responsive mode

FNRS: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

MSTI: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

EAS: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

GSRT: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

NORT/NKTH: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

IRCSET: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

NWO: Complexity in own strategy, responsive mode as well as through dedicated complexity programmes

CNR: No national strategy for complexity research

FCT: No official strategy for complexity, no priority for complexity

MEC: No specific strategy for complexity research

Conclusion 1.2: In general Complexity research is funded primarily by bottom up research proposal applications rather than strategic activities designed to stimulate research in this area. There are some exceptions however where a specific strategy for Complexity Science has been developed (such as in EPSRC and NWO).

**Describe your organisation's decision-making bodies concerning complexity research funding (strategic decisions and individual funding decisions), e.g. tasks, composition, number and qualification of members, etc.**

EPSRC: Council decides on funding

FNRS: Council decides on funding

MSTI: independent councils under the Ministry's Agency decide

EAS: Ministry decides

GSRT: GSRT decides

NORT/NKTH: Final decisions taken by RTIC

IRCSET: Decision structure still under construction

CNR: On institute level and by ministry

NWO: Council decides on funding

FCT: Ministry decides

MEC: MEC decides on funding for physics which includes projects about complex systems

Conclusion 1.3: Most participants are budget holders that make their own decisions concerning complexity research, although in some cases the decisions lie with budget holders outside the participating organisation.

**General conclusions for section 1:**

**The Complexity-Net partners are funding bodies representing their countries, but with budgets decided and controlled by their Governments or Ministries. They generally develop their own strategies, but on the whole complexity science research is driven by bottom up applications. In most cases, but not always, the funding decisions are made by organisations outside of the network.**

## 2 - FUNDING MODES

*This section covers the funding modes in the partner organisations.*

### **What are the funding modes in your organisation?**

#### **Does your organisation prefer project-based, person-based or laboratory-based funding?**

EPSRC: Flexible and diverse portfolio

FNRS: Thematic funding only

MSTI: Mostly project funding; both thematic and non-thematic

EAS: Mostly project based, in different modes

GSRT: Project based, thematic funding

NORT/NKTH: Mostly project based, in different modes

IRCSET: Mostly person funding, mostly non-thematic; and no laboratory funding

CNR: Thematic funding, mostly person or laboratory based

NWO: Flexible funding modes, mostly person based

FCT: All modes available with no specific preferences

MEC: Project funding only, both thematic and non-thematic

**Conclusion 2.1: In general most participants prefer the thematic funding mode. There is one exception, IRCSET uses primarily the non-thematic funding mode.**

### 3 - FUNDING INSTRUMENTS/PROGRAMMES

**The most important funding instruments relevant for complexity research in detail.**

*This section covers the most important funding instruments of the partner organisations which are relevant for complexity research and their processes, rules and procedures, from the application to process to the final report and the dissemination and valorisation of the results.*

#### **Funding principles**

##### ***Size of funds, eligibility of expenses***

##### **Who provides the finances?**

##### **Who and what can be funded? Can the funds be used for other purposes than for those originally planned?**

EPSRC: Flexible funding, no significant limitations on maximum amount

FNRS: No significant restrictions in size and use of funds

MSTI: Flexible funding but not for fixed staff

EAS: Funds mostly for Centers of Excellence program

GSRT: Funds mostly from EU, no significant restrictions

NORT/NKTH: Flexible funding with maximum of k€ 50

IRCSET: Maximum k€ 72 for PD and graduate projects, not for permanent staff

CNR: Flexible but mostly internal ICS funding

NWO: Minimum funding k€ 50, not for permanent staff.

FCT: Maximum k€ 200, no funding of permanent staff

MEC: No minimum or maximum amount of funding, no funding of permanent staff

**Conclusion 3.1: A large variety exists for the size of the actual funds. About half of the participants do not intend funds to be spent on salaries for permanent staff.**

### ***Eligibility of applicants***

#### **Who is formally the applicant?**

#### **Who is eligible to submit a proposal in your country? Can a researcher take his/her funding with him/her if he/she moves to another country?**

EPSRC: Both researchers and organisations can submit applications.

FNRS: The applicant is a researcher working at a university or public research institute

MSTI: The applications are submitted by the researchers themselves

EAS: Both organisations and researchers themselves can apply. Transfer of money abroad not possible in practice.

GSRT: Both organisations and researchers themselves can apply.

NORT/NKTH: Mostly organisations apply

IRCSET: Applications come from researchers themselves, they cannot take the funds abroad.

CNR: Researchers submit the applications themselves.

NWO: Researchers apply themselves; generally, person based funds follow researcher abroad.

FCT: Organisations apply; researcher cannot carry funds abroad.

MEC: Researchers apply, money but not equipment follows the researcher when moving

Conclusion 3.2: In general a researcher or a researcher group is formally the applicant, although for about half the participants the administrative body of the organisation (e.g. university) can also be the applicant formally.

Most of the participants allow a researcher who is moving abroad to take his/her funding with him/her. However, there are some exceptions where this is either impossible or possible only after negotiations with the participant.

### **Application processing**

#### ***Calls***

#### **Do you have special calls or can funds be applied for continuously?**

#### **How many calls do you have per year? What are the deadlines for the calls?**

#### **How much time does it take on average from application to decision?**

#### **Does your organisation have any standards for the length of the application to award process?**

EPSRC: Varying arrangements, responsive mode no deadline, 26 weeks processing time as guideline

FNRS: Special calls but February 1 is the deadline for all calls (except for FRIA), 4 months processing time.

MSTI: 2 calls per year, 2-4 months processing time

EAS: Special calls, annual or less often; processing time varies.

GSRT: Mostly specific calls and deadlines; five months processing time.

NORT/NKTH: Special calls with fixed deadlines, usually 2 months processing time.

IRCSET: Special calls, 3 per year with fixed deadline, processing time varies.

CNR: Varying regulations and processing times

NWO: Special calls with special deadlines, maximum processing time 5 months.

FCT: Calls opened on purpose, mostly in spring; six months processing time.

MEC: One special call per year for physics, about 9-12 months processing time

Conclusion 3.3: The majority of the participants have special calls for proposals. There are some exceptions however where funds can be applied for continuously through the responsive mode (EPSRC and MSTI).

***Content submission and processing of the applications***

**What items are required in the applications?**

**Do you have a special application form?**

**What kinds of instructions are applicants given to prepare the proposal?**

**In what language are the applications required?**

**How can proposals be submitted?**

**How are applications processed after receiving them?**

EPSRC: Web based submission and instructions

FNRS: Proposals in French through the internet or on paper

MSTI: Proposals come in through the mail; English is often used.

EAS: Web based instructions and applications, in Estonian or English

GSRT: Applications through the mail, mostly in Greek

NORT/NKTH: Special instruction and application forms, in Hungarian/English, by (e-)mail.

IRCSET: Submission through the internet

CNR: Submission mostly through the internet, sometimes in English

NWO: Instructions and applications using the internet, in English

FCT: Applications through the internet in English

MEC: Applications mostly through internet forms, in Spanish

Conclusion 3.4: Most participants require an application to be submitted electronically through an internet form. However, this is impossible for some participants (MSTI, GSRT and NKTH).

Generally, the proposals are required to be submitted in the national language, although English is often required as well.

Generally, the information required to be included in the application are:

- the personal details of the applicant or the research team,
- a summary of the research proposal,
- a full description of the research proposal, and
- a work plan.

## Evaluation of the proposals

### ◆ *Evaluators*

Describe the evaluation procedure (peer review, panel review, international evaluators, etc.).

(How much) are the reviewers paid for the evaluation?

What are the criteria for selection of proposal evaluators?

How is the objectivity of the proposal evaluators ensured?

What is the number of evaluators per application?

How do the evaluators work?

Are the evaluators national/international?

Are the evaluators anonymous?

Is a standard evaluation form used?

EPSRC: Evaluators are invited for both panel duty or individual reviews

FNRS: A standard evaluation form is used; evaluators (half from the French community) are not anonymous

MSTI: Evaluators receive approx. € 200 per project, evaluators are not anonymous

EAS: Evaluators are paid a small fee.

GSRT: Both individual and panel evaluators are anonymous

NORT/NKTH: Panel board members are paid € 450.

IRCSET: Only international anonymous evaluators are used, 1 to 2 per application.

CNR: Mostly national evaluators are used,

NWO: Generally, no national evaluators are used

FCT: Normally two evaluators are assigned per project, the majority being non-resident

MEC: The evaluators work individually and in panels

Conclusion 3.5: Scientific competence is the most important criterion in choosing an evaluator. Most participants pay individual evaluators, although there are exceptions (FNRS, CNR and NWO). All participants have a specific evaluation form.

***Evaluation criteria and instructions for reviewers***

**What are the evaluation criteria? Does your organisation have gender requirements in relation to scientists involved with research proposals? What kind of instructions are the reviewers given?**

**Are there specific programme conditions for minorities?**

EPSRC: Scientific quality most important criterion

FNRS: Industrial relevance is not an evaluation criterion

MSTI: Scientific quality, industrial quality and relevance are most important

EAS: Low researcher training or gender requirements

GSRT: No gender or minority related requirements

NORT/NKTH: Industrial relevance is an important evaluation criterion

IRCSET: No gender and researcher training requirements

CNR: Industrial relevance, gender factors and researcher training do not play a role in evaluation

NWO: Innovativeness is important criterion

FCT: No gender or minority related requirements

MEC: Low gender factors but approved projects are increased by 5% (**not clear!**)

Conclusion 3.6: Evaluation criteria are common to all participants. They include the:

- o feasibility of the research plan,
- o scientific quality of the research plan,
- o scientific method,
- o competence of applicant,
- o innovativeness,
- o industrial relevance,
- o potential impact of the research,
- o national networking and cooperation,
- o international networking and cooperation,
- o researcher training,
- o quality of the research environment, and
- o managerial competence.

### ***Feedback to the applicant***

**Do the applicants receive the evaluations?**

**Are the names of the reviewers told to the applicants?**

**Are the applicants given a chance to improve their proposal before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation (or comment on the evaluation)?**

EPSRC: Applicants are allowed to respond to the anonymous referee reports

FNRS: Reviews are not passed on to the applicants

MSTI: Applicants receive the evaluation and are allowed to clarify misunderstandings in it

EAS: No improvement of proposal allowed

GSRT: Applicants are not given the review

NORT/NKTH: A summarized version of the evaluations is given to the applicants

IRCSET: Postal reviewers remain anonymous but their assessment is given to the applicant.

CNR: Sometimes applicants are given a opportunity to improve on their proposal

NWO: Applicants are allowed to respond to the anonymous referee reports

FCT: Final reviews are sent to the PI, but no improvement or response cycle is in place

MEC: Applicants receive summaries of the evaluation but are not allowed to comment.

Conclusion 3.7: The majority of the participants gives the applicant the evaluation of his/her proposal, but do not allow him/her to improve the proposal before the decision is made. However, there are exceptions where no evaluation is given to the applicant (FNRS and GSRT) or where the applicant is sometimes allowed to improve the proposal before the decision is made (CNR). Some other participants (EPSRC, MSTI and NWO) allow the applicant to comment on the reviewer remarks.

### **Decision-making**

#### ***Decision-making process and criteria***

**What kind of decision-making process concerning research funding does your organisation have?**

**Who does the ranking of the proposals? How is the decision making prepared?**

**Who decides on funding? In what sense is the evaluation and decision confidential?**

**What other issues and criteria besides scientific quality are considered in the decision-making process?**

EPSRC: The peer review panel prepares the ranking, the programme manager decides

FNRS: The scientific committee prepares the ranking, the Governing Council decides on awards

MSTI: The relevant council/committee decides

EAS: The deciding body also makes the ranking of the proposal

GSRT: The General Secretary of GSRT decides; the ranking is made public

NORT/NKTH: The evaluation board and the President have the right to modify the final ranking

IRCSET: The assessor panel decides on a ranking of the proposal, the highest be awarded

CNR: The decision making process depends on the specific case

NWO: Peer review panel prepares the ranking, the board decides

FCT: The panel prepares the ranking; the FCT board decides; the ranking is not made public

MEC: The scientific panel decides on ranking and funding

Conclusion 3.8: For the majority of the participants the tasks of preparing a ranking and deciding on the funding are carried out by the same body. However, there are exceptions where these tasks are carried out separately (EPSRC, FNRS, NWO, and FCT). The final ranking of the proposals is generally not made public. There is only one exception where it is made public (GSRT).

### **Budgets**

**Are the applicants allocated as much funds as they have applied for or are the budgets cut?**

**If the budgets are cut, by how much and why?**

**If the budget is cut, is there any negotiation with the applicant?**

**Are there any fixed amounts of funding e.g. fixed salary categories for persons?**

EPSRC: No cut in the budgets

FNRS: Sometimes budgets are cut, but always without negotiations with the applicant

MSTI: Full funding of awarded projects is the general rule

EAS: Budgets are generally cut by 10-60%, without negotiation

GSRT: Budgets may be cut by 20-30%

NORT/NKTH: Usually applicants receive as much as they have applied for

IRCSET: Fixed funding for PD's and graduates

CNR: There can be cuts of 20-30 %

NWO: Budgets are not cut, unless there are unjustified items

FCT: Awarded budgets can be 40% below the request

MEC: Budgets might be cut for the lower ranking proposals

Conclusion 3.9: For the majority of participants cuts in the awarded budgets are quite common.

### **Success rates**

**What percentage of the applications is funded on average?**

**How many of the proposals that have got the best marks in the scientific evaluation are not funded and why?**

EPSRC: Funding success rates are approx. 30%; based on the panels recommendation only it could be up to 50% at times

FNRS: **no answer**

MSTI: Funding rate varies from 20-30%

EAS: Varies between 30-60%

GSRT: About 30% success rate

NORT/NKTH: Award rates vary between 10-25%

IRCSET: in practice over the years funding varies between 15-40%

CNR: Success rates vary between 20-50%

NWO: Success rate about 30%

FCT: 35% success rate

MEC: Success rate is 70% of the proposals submitted

Conclusion 3.10: The success rates (percentage of applications funded on average) vary largely, from 10% up to 70%.

### ***Follow-up of projects***

**How are the scientific progress and financial matters of the projects followed-up?**

**Is intermediate project evaluation conducted? Who carries out the evaluation?**

**What happens if the funded project does not progress in the planned and desired way?**

EPSRC: Only for large grants a mid-term evaluation is conducted

FNRS: An intermediate evaluation is carried out using the mandatory yearly reports. No second year funding in case of lack of progress.

MSTI: Sometime mid-term evaluations are carried out using the annual progress reports.

EAS: Internal evaluators carry out an intermediate evaluation based on the progress reports

GSRT: Intermediate project evaluation is carried out using the 6 or 12 month progress reports

NORT/NKTH: An external evaluator carries out an intermediate evaluation using the mandatory annual financial and scientific reports.

IRCSET: Internal evaluators carry out an intermediate evaluation using the required 10 month report and questionnaires.

CNR: Sometimes intermediate project evaluations are conducted

NWO: Yearly reports are to be supplied. Only for large grants intermediate evaluations are conducted.

FCT: Each grant is subject to the presentation of mid-term and final scientific and financial reports.

MEC: Intermediate evaluation is conducted each year, by internal evaluators.

Conclusion 3.11: All participants ask for mid-term or yearly reports, including financial reports. There is one exception where mid-term reports are only asked for large grants (EPSRC).

In case of lack of progress the funds may be cut or interrupted.

### ***Final reports***

**What kinds of scientific and financial reports are required for the project?**

**What kinds of instructions are the researchers given for preparing the scientific report?**

EPSRC: Electronic web-based forms for a final report need to be submitted

FNRS: A final report is foreseen and a 5-year report for the permanent researchers

MSTI: A final scientific and financial report is written using a standard web form

EAS: A financial and scientific report is requested using the web-based guidelines

GSRT: A scientific and financial report has to be supplied according to GSRT instructions

NORT/NKTH: Both a scientific and a financial report is required

IRCSET: A final scientific and financial report is required, using written instructions

CNR: For Ministry awarded projects a final report form needs to be submitted

NWO: An overview of the deliverables is requested

FCT: Report forms and instructions for final reporting are available

MEC: A final scientific and financial report is required.

Conclusion 3.12: All participants ask for a final report, including a financial overview.

### ***Evaluation of the outcomes***

**How are the scientific final reports (or the outcomes of the research) processed and evaluated?**

**Who does the final proposal evaluation? What material is used for final evaluation?**

**Is a final evaluation report written?**

EPSRC: Peer reviewers are involved in the final evaluation, also including self assessment; no final evaluation report is written.

FNRS: Final evaluation is performed by the scientific committee.

MSTI: Final report is accepted by the council if satisfactory but no final evaluation report is written

EAS: Final evaluation is performed but no self assessment

GSRT: Both internal and external evaluators are employed, no self-assessment is included

NORT/NKTH: External evaluators will produce a final evaluation report, not including self assessment

IRCSET: Final reports mostly evaluated internally, no final evaluation report is written

CNR: Final evaluation is not a standard formal procedure

NWO: Only internal evaluators are involved with final proposal evaluation

FCT: The scientific council does the final proposal evaluation, no- self assessment is included

MEC: Proposed objectives are compared to the ones achieved. A final evaluation report is written.

Conclusion 3.13: In general a final evaluation is performed, but no final evaluation report is written and no self assessment is done. However, there are exceptions where no final evaluation is performed (CNR) or where self-assessment is included in the final evaluation (EPSRC and MEC).

### ***Impact of the outcomes***

**How is the information in scientific reports utilised?**

**How does the success of the project influence the further funding of the applicant?**

EPSRC: Final reports are actively used.

FNRS: The report of the first two years determines further funding for the second two years

MSTI: Further funding depends little on success of previous project

EAS: Final reports are only used indirectly

GSRT: No formal follow-up process in place, information used for annual report

NORT/NKTH: Scientific reports are utilized for PR purposes

IRCSET: The success has no influence on further funding

CNR: Final report info appears in official documents

NWO: Success of the project is not formally administered but indirectly has an impact on the reputation of the researchers

FCT: The output of the past project is listed in the proposals

MEC: Success of the project influences further funding

Conclusion 3.14: The majority of the participants do not administer the success of a project. Generally, the success of the project only determines further funding only indirectly or often not at all.

**How is dissemination of the research results organised? What is the procedure of valorisation of the knowledge obtained in the research?**

EPSRC: Up to the individual researcher

FNRS: No information

MSTI: Using website

EAS: No active involvement in this

GSRT: No procedure for valorisation; results are published in annual reports

NORT/NKTH: Through publications, press conferences, valorisation part of award criteria for large projects

IRCSET: Dealt with by universities

CNR: No active CNR activity for dissemination or valorisation

NWO: No procedure for valorisation, dissemination is one of NWO's responsibilities

FCT: No procedure, up to the individual

MEC: Dissemination is not organised.

Conclusion 3.15: In general there are no procedures for valorisation in place. The dissemination of the results of the project is mostly left to the researchers.

**General conclusions for section 3:**

**The funding instruments and programmes of the Complexity-Net partners show similarity in their overall procedures, although the details can vary largely.**

## 4 - LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

*This section covers the legal and administrative considerations of the partner organisations regarding granting research funding abroad, conflicts of interest, publicity and intellectual property rights.*

### Granting funding abroad

#### **What kinds of national legislation and regulations concerning granting research funding to foreign institutes/foreign persons do your country and your organisation have?**

EPSRC: PI's must be UK resident; no a priori rule about impossibility of international funding

FNRS: Nothing mentioned

MSTI: Delegation of decision can be transferred to non nationals.

EAS: Foreign nationals can receive PD positions in Estonia, no regulations mentioned

GSRT: No existing legislation

NORT/NKTH: No funding abroad allowed

IRCSET: Funding abroad is not offered, funding to non-nationals working in Ireland is possible

CNR: agreements in place for some large scale projects

NWO: Regulations are in place with some foreign councils regarding joint evaluations.

FCT: No funding abroad allowed; non nationals can receive funding in Portugal

MEC: Granting funding abroad is not possible.

Conclusion 4.1: For most participants funding of non-nationals working in their country is accepted. Granting research funding to (persons working at) foreign institutes is generally not allowed.

### Conflict of interest (= incompetence due to the likelihood of bias)

#### **What kinds of administrative regulations concerning conflict of interest does your organisation have?**

#### **What is the definition for 'conflict of interest' in your organisation? How is it ensured that the reviewer/decision maker/administrator does not have a conflict of interest with the applicant?**

EPSRC: Definition in place; control by EPSRC administrators

FNRS: No regulations issued by FNRS

MSTI: Definition in Danish legislation. Actual control by MSTI secretariat

EAS: Regulations in place; declaration requested

GSRT: Reviewers are not allowed to be applicants in same competition; declaration requested from reviewers.

NORT/NKTH: Regulation available; active and passive control in place

IRCSET: Only international assessors are approached; checks are in place on previous work with applicants

CNR: No strict definition; declaration of reviewer is requested.

NWO: Regulation available; passive control in place

FCT: Definition in place; no active control

MEC: Evaluators have to declare conflict of interest.

Conclusion 4.2: For most participants written regulations are in place, in most cases written statements are requested from the reviewers.

## **Publicity**

### **What kind of information is available to the general public?**

EPSRC: Resulting knowledge is available and accessible

FNRS: General information is available on website

MSTI: Reports and strategy papers are published

EAS: All funding decisions are public

GSRT: All scientific results are public except patent related info

NORT/NKTH: Results are publicized

IRCSET: Programme information is available on website

CNR: No standard procedure for making results available

NWO: All scientific results are public

FCT: All info about beneficiaries of grants and size of grants available

MEC: Overall data are available

Conclusion 4.3: General information on the funding programme is always available, but the efforts put into the publishing of the results vary.

#### **General conclusions for section 4:**

**In a general sense the legal and administrative regulations related to the issues considered are similar. Most Complexity-NET partners: can fund non-nationals only if they are working in their country; have written regulations regarding conflict of interest, in most cases written statements are requested; and provide general information on the funding programmes, but not always on the results of the programme.**

## 5 - ROLE OF INDUSTRY

*This section covers the role of industry in the programmes of the partner organisations.*

### **Does industry participate in your programme design?**

EPSRC: yes  
FNRS: no  
MSTI: sometimes  
EAS: no  
GSRT: no  
NORT/NKTH: yes  
IRCSET: sometimes  
CNR: sometimes  
NWO: sometimes  
FCT: no  
MEC: sometimes

Conclusion 5.1: For most participants industry is sometimes involved in programme design.

### **Do you have specific requirements in relation to industry participation?**

EPSRC: no  
FNRS: no  
MSTI: sometimes  
EAS: no  
GSRT: only sometimes a special requirement  
NORT/NKTH: no  
IRCSET: yes  
CNR: sometimes  
NWO: no  
FCT: no  
MEC: no

Conclusion 5.2: Generally there are no specific requirements in relation to industry participation. However, there are some exceptions.

### **Please describe how industry is involved?**

EPSRC: through different partnerships with EPSRC funding  
FNRS: not involved  
MSTI: financially or in kind  
EAS: not applicable  
GSRT: not applicable  
NORT/NKTH: supervision  
IRCSET: financially, supervision or in kind  
CNR: no details  
NWO: financially, supervision or in kind  
FCT: not applicable  
MEC: through transfer of knowledge

Conclusion 5.3: In general when industries are involved, this is mostly on the planning and supervision level.

**What is your IPR policy?**

EPSRC: university regulations apply

FNRS: university regulations apply

MSTI: no own policy, national law is applicable

EAS: no policy

GSRT: no own policy

NORT/NKTH: no policy

IRCSET: no own regulations, national guidelines are applicable

CNR: none

NWO: depends on the specific situation

FCT: no FCT policy on IPR

MEC: Spanish law of intellectual property

Conclusion 5.4: The organisations of most participants do not have their own IPR policy. Instead, university or national IPR policies apply.

**General conclusions for section 5:**

**For most Complexity-NET partners industry can have a role in their programmes, mostly on the planning and the supervision level.**

CHAPTER 1 & 2: STATUS OF THE PARTNER ORGANISATIONS & FUNDING MODES

	Status		Funding modes										Strategies and priorities	
	Ministry / Other	Research Council	Programmes	Institutes / Centres	Special Complexity Programme / Institute / Centre	Project-based funding	Laboratory-based funding	Person-based funding	Core strategic funding	Call for proposals		Continuous submission	Priorities	Strategies
										Thematic	Open <sup>1</sup>			
EPSRC		X	X	(X)	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	s	Build complexity science research by supporting people.	Provide extended research and training capacity in complexity science.
FNRS		X	X			X	X	X		X			Scientific excellence	There are no specific strategies for complexity.
MSTI	X		X		X	50%	30%	20%	X	X	X	s	-	No specific strategies or vision areas focussed on complexity funding.
EAS	X			X		60%	20%	20%	X	X	X		Scientific excellence	Strategies and priorities for complexity funding are worked out by the Centre for Nonlinear Studies and the Centre for Dependable Computing.
GSRT	X		X			100%			X	X		s	- Encourage interdisciplinary collaborations, - Strengthen research teams - Support of young researchers	
NKTH		X	X			70% <sup>3</sup>	20% <sup>3</sup>	10% <sup>3</sup>	X	X	X			There are no specific strategies and priorities for complexity science (yet).

	Status		Funding modes										Strategies and priorities	
	Ministry / Other	Research Council	Programmes	Institutes / Centres	Special Complexity Programme / Institute / Centre	Project-based funding	Laboratory-based funding	Person-based funding	Core strategic funding	Call for proposals		Continuous submission	Priorities	Strategies
										Thematic	Open <sup>1</sup>			
<b>IRCSET</b>		X	X			10% <sup>4</sup>		75% <sup>3</sup>		Rarely	X		Scientific excellence	IRCSET has few theme specific strategies, rather supporting individuals and small groups.
<b>CNR</b>		X		X	X	20%	40%	40%	X	X		s	The basic idea is to cover a broad range of subjects and focus on quality and interdisciplinarity. CNR has various activities in the development and study of complex materials and gives attention to the possible practical applications of the results.	
<b>NWO</b>		X	X		X	20% <sup>5</sup>	30% <sup>5</sup>	40% <sup>5</sup>	X	X	X		NWO's strategy is to increase the amount for the NWO thematic programmes (including four complexity related themes). Through the thematic programmes postdocs and PhD students will be funded next to workshops and required instrumentation.	
<b>FCT</b>		X		X		24% <sup>6</sup>	30% <sup>6</sup>	15% <sup>6</sup>	X	X	X		FCT does not have a specific programme on complexity, but it supports the bottom up efforts of the research community.	
<b>MEC</b>	X		X			100%			X	X	X		MEC does not have any specific financing programme on Complexity. MEC finances several "National Programs". A rough estimate says that about 15% of the projects in the Phycis National Plan are about Complex Systems.	

<sup>1</sup> any kind of research – no predefined topic

<sup>2</sup> s: sometimes

<sup>3</sup> NKTH prefers to fund consortia consisting of public and private partners. In this way, 40% of the research project funding is received by companies.

<sup>4</sup> the remaining 15% is spent on graduate programmes and schools

<sup>5</sup> the remaining 10% is spent on investment grants and telescopes

<sup>6</sup> another 16% is spent on infrastructures

CHAPTER 3: FUNDING INSTRUMENTS / PROGRAMMES

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>FUNDING PRINCIPLES</b>											
<b>Does a minimum amount of funding exist?</b>											
<b>(Yes,) amount</b>			~ 10 k€			Depends	24 k€ (MSc 1 yr)		50 k€ (postdoc 1 yr)		
<b>No</b>	X	X		X	X			X		X	X
<b>Does a maximum amount of funding exist?</b>											
<b>(Yes,) amount</b>						Depends	72 k€ (PhD 3 yrs)		Programme budget	200 k€	
<b>No</b>	X	X	X	X	X			X			X
<b>Which kinds of costs / expenses are eligible for funding?</b>											
<b>Basic infrastructure</b>		X	s	s		X		X		X	X
<b>Overheads, %</b>			X, 20%	s, 20%	s, 5 - 10%	X, 10%			X, 30%	X, 20%	X, 21%
<b>Scientific instrumentation</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Permanent scientific staff</b>	X	X		X	X	X		X			
<b>Temporary scientific personnel</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
<b>Administrative / Technical personnel</b>	X	X	Seldom	s	X	X		s	X	X	X
<b>Travel and subsistence</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>VAT</b>				s	X	s					

s: sometimes

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Who can be funded?</b>											
<b>Researchers at:</b>											
- public (state) universities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
- private universities	-		X	X	-	X	X		-	X	X
- other public research institutions	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		s	X	X
- other private institutions			X	s	X	X	X			X	X
Private companies			X		X	X		s		X	
Foreign researchers <sup>1</sup>	X	X	X	s	X	s	X	s	X	X	X
National researchers working at foreign institutes	X	X	X	s		s		s		X	
Foreign researchers working at foreign institutes			s	s						X	
<b>Can the funds be used for other purposes than for those originally planned?</b>											
Yes	X	X	X			X				X	
No				X	X		X	X	X		X
<b>If yes, does it require negotiations with your organisation?</b>											
Yes	X	X	X	-	-	X	-	-	-	X	-
No				-	-		-	-	-		-

<sup>1</sup> working at the organisations selected above

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Who is formally the applicant?</b>											
<b>Researcher / Researcher groups</b>	X	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Administrative body of organisation (e.g. university)</b>	X			X	X	X				X	
<b>Who is eligible to submit a proposal in your country?</b>											
<b>Researchers at:</b>											
<b>- public (state) universities</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>- private universities</b>	-		X	X	-	X	X		-	X	X
<b>- other public research institutions</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>- other private institutions</b>			X	X	X	X	X	s		X	X
<b>Private companies</b>			?	s	X	X		s		X	
<b>Foreign researchers<sup>1</sup></b>	X	X	X	s	X	s	X	X	X	X	X
<b>National researchers working at foreign institutes</b>	s	X	X			s		s		X	
<b>Foreign researchers working at foreign inst.</b>	s (fellow-ships)		X							X	

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Can a researcher take his/her funding with him/her if he/she moves to another university / institute / country?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	s		X	s (person-based)	s (national)	s	s (person-based)	s (national)	X
<b>No</b>				X							
<b>APPLICATION PROCESSING</b>											
<b>Do you have special calls or can funds be applied for continuously?</b>											
<b>Special calls</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Continuously</b>	X		X		s			X			
<b>How many calls do you have per year?</b>	As required	1 (exc. FRIA)	1 – 3 (2)	Depends	1	1 - 2	1 (PD) 2 (PhD)	1	1	1	1
<b>What are the deadlines for the call?</b>	As required	Feb. 1 <sup>st</sup> (FRIA Sept.)	(Mar., Sept.)			Apr. (Sept.)			Sept. 1 <sup>st</sup>	Spring	
<b>How much time does it take on average from application to decision? (months)</b>	3 - 6	4	2 - 4	3 / 4 - 6	~5	~2	~1.5 (PhD) – 5 (PD)	3 - 6	~5	~6	9 – 12
<b>Does your organisation have any standards for the length of the application to award process?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X (26 weeks)	X (4 mnths)		X		X	X	X			
<b>No</b>			X		X (6 – 12 mnths)				X (~5 mnths)	X	X

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>What items are required in the applications?</b>											
<b>Project description</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Research plan</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>CV of the applicant(s)</b>		X	X	X	X	X		s	s	X	X
<b>Dissemination plan</b>	X	X	s	X	X			s		X	X
<b>Researcher training plan</b>			s		s			s	X	X	X
<b>Industrial involvement plan</b>			s	s	s	X		s			s
<b>International cooperation plan</b>		X	s	X	s	X		s			s
<b>Result utilisation plan</b>		X	X (part of research plan)	s	s	X			s		s
<b>Budget plan</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
<b>Do you have a special application form?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>No</b>											
<b>Is it available in English?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X		X	X	s	X	X	
<b>No</b>					X						X
<b>In what language are the applications required?</b>											
<b>English</b>	X		Or	X	s	X	X	Mostly	X	X	s
<b>National language</b>	Is English	X (French)	Or	X	X	X	Is English	s			X

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Proposals can be submitted:</b>											
<b>Electronically through an internet form</b>	X	X		X			X	X	X	X	X
<b>Electronically by email</b>						X					
<b>On paper</b>		X	X		X (signature)	X		s			s
<b>EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSALS</b>											
<b>Are the reviewers paid for the evaluation?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	s		X	X	X	X	s			X	X
<b>No</b>		X						X	X		
<b>If yes, how much? (€)</b>	points or £ 80 / day	-	200	Small fee	40 – 100 / proposal	Small fee	250 / day	-	-	per diem + small fee	40 / project
<b>What are the criteria for the proposal evaluators?</b>											
<b>Position</b>		X	X			s	X	s		X	
<b>Scientific competence / merit</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
<b>Nationality</b>		X				X	X	s	X		
<b>Gender</b>		s									
<b>Multidisciplinary</b>				X	s	X	s	s	s		s
<b>How is the objectivity of the proposal evaluators ensured?</b>											
<b>By an explicit declaration of no conflict of interest</b>	X			X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
<b>By clarification of linkage before appointment</b>		X	X		s	X	X	s	X		

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>What is the number of evaluators per application?</b>	1 + 2	10	2 – 3	3 – 4 or 2	2 – 5	2 or 3, + 1	1 - 2	~5 (CNR) 2 (Ministry)	3 (referees) 5 – 8 (panel)	2	4 – 6
<b>How do the evaluators work?</b>											
<b>Strictly individually</b>	s		X	X		X		s	Ministry		s
<b>Individually and in panels</b>	X	X	s	s	X	X	X	s	CNR	X	X
<b>Are the evaluators national / international?</b>											
<b>National</b>	X	X	s	X	X	X		X	s (panel-members)	X	X
<b>International</b>	X	X	X	s	s	X	X	s	X	X	s
<b>Foreign evaluators are allowed</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Are the evaluators anonymous?</b>											
<b>Individual reviewers of proposal</b>	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Panel members</b>				s	X	X	s	s			
<b>Is a standard evaluation form used?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
<b>No</b>											

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>What are the evaluation criteria on a scale "No / Low / Medium / High" emphasis?</b>											
<b>Feasibility of the research plan</b>	H	H	M – H	H	H	H	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Scientific quality of the research plan</b>	H	H	H	H	H	H	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Scientific method</b>	H	H	M – H	H	H	L	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Competence of applicant</b>	H	H	H	M – H	H	H	H	M – H	M	H	H
<b>Innovativeness</b>	H	L	L – H	M	M	H	H	M – H	H	H	M
<b>Industrial relevance</b>	N	N	L – H	M	M	H	L	Depends on call	N	N	M
<b>Gender factors</b>	N	M – H	L	L	N	L	N	N – L	N	N	L
<b>Potential impact of the research</b>	H	H	M	M	H	H	H	M – H	N	H	M
<b>National networking and cooperation</b>	N	M	M	M	H	M	L	M – H	N	N	M
<b>International networking and cooperation</b>	N	M	M	M – H	M	M	L	M – H	N	N	M
<b>Researcher training</b>	N	H	H	L	H	M	N	N – L	L	N	H
<b>Quality of the research environment</b>	H	H	M	M	M	L	H	M – H	L	H	M
<b>Do you have a specific evaluation form?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X	X	s	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
<b>No</b>											

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Does your organisation have gender requirements in relation to scientists involved with research proposals?</b>											
Yes		X	(s)		s			s	X		X
No	X		X	X		X	X			X	
<b>Are there specific programme conditions for minorities?</b>											
Yes									s		
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X
<b>Do the applicants receive the evaluations?</b>											
Yes	X		s	X		X	X	s	X	X	X
No		X			X						
<b>If yes, do they receive full evaluations of summaries of them?</b>											
Full evaluations	X	-	X	or	X		X (PhD)	X	X	X	
Summaries of the evaluations		-		or		X	X (PD)				X
<b>Can any other persons receive the evaluations?</b>											
Yes			s	(panel-members)			(panel members)		(panel-members)	s (board institution)	
No	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X
<b>Are the names of the reviewers told to the applicants?</b>											
Yes		X	s	s			s (only names of panel-members)		s (only names of panel-members)	s (only names of panel-members)	
No	X			X	X	X		X			X

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Can any other persons receive the names of the evaluators?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>		X	s				X				
<b>No</b>	X (only names of panel members)			X	X	X (only names of panel members)		X	X (only names of panel-members)	X (only names of panel-members)	X
<b>Are the applicants given a chance to improve their proposal before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation (or comment on the evaluation)?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>								s			
<b>No</b>	X (may comment)	X	X	X	X	X	X		X (may comment)	X	X
<b>DECISION MAKING</b>											
<b>In what sense is the evaluation and decision confidential?</b>											
<b>The results of the evaluation are made public</b>	X			X	X		X	s			
<b>The ranking is made public</b>					X						
<b>The funding decision is made public</b>	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	s	X	X	X
<b>Are the applicants allocated as much funds as they have applied for or are the budgets cut?</b>											
<b>Allocated as much funds as applied for</b>	X	s	s		s	X		s	X	s	X
<b>Budgets are cut</b>		Depends	Very often (by 10 – 50%)	X (by 10 – 60%)	s (by 20 – 30%)	s (by up to 10%)	X	s (by 20 – 30%)		s (by up to 40%)	s (by up to 50%)

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>If the budget is cut, is there any negotiation with the applicant?</b>											
Yes	X			Rarely		s		s		X	
No		X	X	X	X		X		X		X
<b>Are there any fixed amounts of funding, e.g., fixed salary categories for persons?</b>											
Yes	s	X	s	s	X		X	s	X	X	X
No						X					
<b>What percentage of the applications is funded on average?</b>	30%	Un-known	20 - 30%	30 – 60%	~30%	10 – 25%	15 (PD) – 40% (PhD)	20 – 50%	aim ~30%	35%	70% (projects) 50% (funding)
<b>How many of the proposals that have got the best marks in the scientific evaluation are not funded?</b>	0	Un-known	worst case: 50%	0	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	20 – 50%	worst case: 50%	0	0
<b>FOLLOW-UP OF PROJECTS</b>											
<b>Is intermediate project evaluation conducted?</b>											
Yes	s	X	s	X	X	X	X	s	s	X	X
No											
<b>What is the frequency of intermediate evaluation?</b>	once, mid-term	once per year	once, midterm	once every 2 – 3 years	once every 6 – 12 months	once per year	once every 10 months	once	once, midterm	once per year	once per year
<b>What is the form of the evaluation?</b>											
<b>Progress reports</b>	s	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
<b>Questionnaires</b>							X				
<b>Interviews</b>	s			s		s			s		

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Who carries out the intermediate evaluation?</b>											
Internal evaluators	s		X	X	X		X	s			X
External evaluators	s		X	s	X	X	s	s	X		
Proposal evaluators	s	X				s		s	s		
Other experts	-	-	-	funding body	-	-	-	-	-	Scientific Advisory Council	-
<b>Who does the final proposal evaluation?</b>											
Internal evaluators		X	X	X	X		X	s	X	None of these, Scientific Advisory Council	X
External evaluators	X	X		X	X	X	s	s			
Both		X	s	s	X			s			
<b>What material is used for final evaluation?</b>											
Scientific reports	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Financial reports	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Interviews			s			s					
Questionnaires							s				
<b>Is self-assessment by parties involved in the project or programme used as a tool to evaluate project performance?</b>											
Yes	X								s		X
No		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	
<b>Who is asked for self-assessment?</b>											
Researchers / project leaders	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	X (p.l.)	-	X
Others		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	s	-	

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>How is the process of self-assessment carried out?</b>											
<b>By interviews</b>		-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
<b>By questionnaires</b>	X	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	X
<b>What are the project evaluation criteria on a scale "No / Low / Medium / High?"</b>											
<b>Objectives of the project were achieved</b>	M	H	X	L	H	H	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Success in generating new information</b>	M	H	X	H	H	M	H	M – H	H	M	H
<b>Added value produced by the project</b>	M	H	X	M	H	H	M	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Programme worked as a process and was well-coordinated</b>	M	M	X	N	M	M	H	L	M	M	H
<b>Scientific impacts</b>	H	H	X	H	M	H	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Researcher training</b>	H	H	X	N	H	M	H	N – L	M	M	H
<b>National research cooperation</b>	M	M	X	L	H	L	H	N – L	M	M	M
<b>International research cooperation</b>	M	H	X	M	H	M	H	N – L	M	N	M
<b>Development of the research environment</b>	M	M	X	M	M	H	H	N – L	M	L	M

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>What are the project evaluation criteria on a scale "No / Low / Medium / High?"</b>											
<b>Knowledge generated by the project, e.g. publications</b>	H	H	X	H	H	M	H	M – H	H	H	H
<b>Other results like patents, proto-types, etc.</b>	M	M	X	H	H	H	H	L	H	H	M
<b>Social impacts</b>	H	M	X	L	M	H	H	L	L	L	M
<b>Is a final evaluation report written?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>		X		X	X	X		s	s	X	X
<b>No</b>	X		X				X				

<sup>1</sup> working at the organisations selected above

#### CHAPTER 4: LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONSIDERATIONS

All questions in chapter 4 are open questions.

#### CHAPTER 5: ROLE OF INDUSTRY

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
<b>Does industry participate in your programme design?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>	X		s			X	s	s	s		s
<b>No</b>		X		X	X					X	
<b>Do you have specific requirements in relation to industry participation?</b>											
<b>Yes</b>			s		s		X	s			
<b>No</b>	X	X		X		X			X	X	X