Supporting EU access to Australian research programmes

Deliverable title	**D.4.5.1 – Reports (collated Activity Reports, Management Reports, Plan for Using and Disseminating the Knowledge: both periodic and final whole-of-project versions for all participants)**
Deliverable lead	DLR
Related WP	WP4: Coordination and Management
Related task	Task 4.1: Project implementation management Task 4.2: Financial management of the project
Author(s)	Hans-Jörg Stähle (DLR) with input from WP and task leaders
Dissemination level	**RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (incl. Com.)
Due submission date	Month 27 December 2011
Actual submission date	Month 29 February 2012
Project number	FP7-244485
Instrument	Coordination Action (CA)
Start date of project	01/10/2009
Duration	27 months

Abstract	This final report lists the status quo of the implementation of the four AUS-ACCESS4EU work packages.

Project funded by the European Commission under the International cooperation activity of the Capacities Programme of the 7th European Framework Programme for RTD.

Versioning and contribution history

Version	Date	Modification reason	Modified by
v00	20.01.2012		Hans-Jörg Stähle
v01	20.02.2012		Kerrie Glennie
v02	22.02.2012		Claire McNulty
V03			
V04			

PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 244485

Project acronym: AUS-ACCESS4EU

Project title: Supporting EU access to Australian research programmes

Funding Scheme: Coordination and Support Action

Period covered: from 01. Oct. 2009 to 31. Dec. 2011

Name of the scientific representative of the project's co-ordinator[1], Title and Organisation:

Dr. Hans-Jörg Stähle and Dr. Gerd Rücker, International Bureau of the BMBF at DLR

Tel: +49-228-3821 1403 and +49-228-3821 1180

Fax: +49-228-3821 1444

E-mail: hans.staehle@dlr.de and gerd.ruecker@dlr.de

Project website address: www.aus-access4.eu

[1] Usually the contact person of the coordinator as specified in Art. 8.1. of the Grant Agreement.

INDEX

Final publishable summary report

This section must be of suitable quality to enable direct publication by the Commission and should preferably not exceed 40 pages. This report should address a wide audience, including the general public.

*The publishable summary has to include **5 distinct parts** described below:*

- *An executive summary (not exceeding 1 page).*
- *A summary description of project context and objectives (not exceeding 4 pages).*
- *A description of the main S&T results/foregrounds (not exceeding 25 pages),*
- *The potential impact (including the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far) and the main dissemination activities and exploitation of results (not exceeding 10 pages).*
- *The address of the project public website, if applicable as well as relevant contact details.*

Furthermore, project logo, diagrams or photographs illustrating and promoting the work of the project (including videos, etc…), as well as the list of all beneficiaries with the corresponding contact names can be submitted without any restriction.

4.1.1 Executive Summary

Supporting EU access to Australian research programmes

The objectives of the AUS-ACCESS4EU-Project were to enhance the information collection on programmes open for EU researchers as well as the rules for and any obstacles to their participation. The close and continuous dialogue with Australian programme owners and the wide outreach of the project results to European stakeholders and policy makers and European scientists were two of the major success factors of the project.

The project has succeeded in promoting relevant Australian programs in Europe, and also in raising awareness among Australian program owners about issues of international collaboration and openness.

International collaboration in research and innovation happens at a number of different levels, including individual researchers, collaborative teams, research institutions and national policy-makers. Each have their own objectives and information needs for effective decision-making, particularly in the context of a dynamic international system. The project has helped to gather information in a way not done before in Australia about international participation in Australian programs – in doing so, it has also highlighted inconsistencies and gaps across agencies in the information gathered. We suggest that this will be an increasingly significant issue into the future, as institutions and governments seek to make decisions about responding to ongoing internationalization. Within Australia, there was a benefit in better connecting international relations staff with program owners, in effect supporting the implementation of recent policy decisions in Australia designed to internationalize key funding programs.

There is a strong trend within the EU to improve coordination among and across international collaboration projects, for example across all the 11 ACCESS4EU projects, INCO-Nets, ERA-Nets, etc. This has implications for partner countries such as Australia – effective engagement with Europe in the future may benefit from a strategic approach that can tap into this European coordination. For example, there were opportunities to reach a much larger European audience through coordinated information dissemination.

The project has also pioneered new work on ways to measure comparative research strength and "reciprocity" as aspects of policy decision-making for research and innovation. It has also emphasized the importance of clarity of intent in structuring international collaboration to effectively balance risk and reward across different levels.

4.1.2 Summary description of project context and objectives

Australia has always been keen to intensify its cooperation in science and technology (S&T) with the European Research Area (ERA), not only with European Member States through bilateral cooperation agreements but also within the EU Framework Programmes. Australia signed an S&T cooperation agreement with the EU in 1994. Cooperation is currently facilitated by a Joint Science and Technology Cooperation Committee (JSTCC) which meets every second year. The last meeting took place in October 2008 in Brussels and, reflecting the strong emphasis on engagement with Europe put into place by the new Australian Government, comprised the most senior Australian JSTCC delegation to date. The October meeting defined the basic guiding principles for continued and intensified research cooperation between the European Union and Australia. In line with their strong and active support for increased reciprocity in EU-Australian research cooperation the Australian Government has provided a letter of support for this proposal (attached as Annex 1).
Australia was the first so called 'Third Country' to set up a national contact point (FEAST) which originated from an initiative of one of the European embassies in Australia and the Australian government. FEAST served as an exemplar for subsequent BILAT projects. FEAST has been serving as a promoter of the Framework Programmes of the EU in Australia since the initial project (FEAST I) was launched in 2000. The current project, FEAST phase III (FEED), commenced on the 1st May 2008.
The key aim of the 7th Framework Programme is to strengthen the European Research Area. According to the Green Paper of the European Commission the ERA comprises "an adequate flow of competent researchers (…) involving notably the absence of financial or administrative obstacles to trans-national mobility. There should be full opening of academic research positions and national research programmes across Europe."[2]
In order to ensure the coherence of national and regional research programmes and priorities on issues of European interest the Commission therefore proposes "the reciprocal opening of corresponding national and regional programmes to participants from other Member States"[3] to increase the efficiency and impact of public funding.
The 7th Framework Programme not only promotes the opening of programmes within Member States, but in third countries as well. Many European research programmes are already open to third country participants. AUS-ACCESS4EU takes one step further by promoting EU access to Third Country programmes, and by doing so developing the reciprocity aspects of the respective S&T agreements. The S&T agreement between the EU and Australia records the "participation of Australian entities in Community projects, in the areas of cooperative activities, and a reciprocal participation of entities established in the Community in Australian projects in those areas."

The overall objective of the proposed project was to increase S&T cooperation between the EU and Australia by identifying access opportunities for European researchers in Australian research capabilities and programmes.

This ambitious goal was to be achieved by pursuing the following specific objectives:

- Raising awareness of access opportunities for European researchers and research organisations in national research and/or innovation programmes managed by the Australian Federal Government and by state and territory governments and NGOs.

  This objective was to be achieved by organising a conference with representatives of Australian programme owners to present the objectives of their programmes and providing

[2] European Commission: Green Paper. The European Research Area: New Perspectives – COM (2007), P. 8.
[3] P.18.

further information, contacts and materials e.g. a handbook on Australian research programs, leaflets, setting up web resources such as a website and database of Australian and European research programs.

- Providing information on distinctive areas of competitiveness in Australian research in order to raise awareness amongst those European researchers who are not aware of Australian strengths.
- Mapping and matching areas of joint interest and identifying relevant national S&T programmes. For this purpose we will implement an audit of cases of EU participation in Australian scientific programs, including: bilateral cooperation under Australian scientific programmes and the national programmes of EU countries; coordinated calls; participation of regional researchers in Australian programmes jointly with European partners; ad-hoc research cooperation supported by diverse sources and institutional players. A comparative analysis of the level of involvement of European scientists in Australian programmes and the participation rate of Australian teams in both European and national programmes, including studies of best practices was planned
- Identifying the major obstacles to the participation of European researchers in Australian RTD programmes. An audit of bilateral cooperation agreements, analysing in particular their reciprocity conditions and rules of participation and funding of European researchers, as well as investigating the potential obstacles to their participation and formulating recommendations was intended to help avoid these obstacles. Barriers may include personal and domestic concerns as well as cultural differences and perceptions.
- Setting up a basis for joint "project-generating" actions that will open new cooperative opportunities and develop improved tools for long-term collaboration. We will jointly develop integrated models for providing long-term coordinated actions aimed at the highest interaction (synergy) between European and Australian scientists by setting up a dialogue and collaboration with the major stakeholders in Australia and the EU who are responsible for setting the framework for S&T cooperation.
- Contribute to the intensification of the ongoing EU-Australia policy dialogue via identifying research priorities of joint interest or identifying a common research agenda. This goal was to be achieved by providing feedback to the Commission and the Australian Government for use in the JSTCC process, and by making appropriate recommendations to encourage matching reciprocity from Australia.
- Promoting new cooperative opportunities and supporting sustainability of achieved outcomes by forwarding information to national contact points in EU Member States, developing interactive web pages, publishing information on existing web resources, arranging presentations held by Australian funding programme owners and agencies in EU countries, providing consulting services for European researchers on participation in Australian RTD programmes and further monitoring the participation of EU researchers and institutes in Australian programmes.

Moreover, the AUS-ACCESS4EU proposal contained a set of experimental tasks via which the project could lead ACCESS4EU-wide work on developing a suite of metrics covering *openness* and *reciprocity* in funding international research and innovation cooperation. The use of metrics of this type would be useful in supporting the move toward more internationalised research and innovation cooperation and in informing debates over the governance of such international cooperation. As such, they may also align with OECD-led work on the governance of international S&T cooperation.

The aim is to measure and map reciprocity in terms of the "openness" of different national funding and support systems to internationalised research and innovation activities. This would necessitate developing and applying measures of both:

- *relative openness* (the proportion of a nations' research funding and innovation support incentives, such as R&D tax concessions, openness to overseas entities, etc), and;
- *absolute openness* (the value, on a Purchasing Power Parity basis of these funding and incentives).

The suite of metrics, which should not be complex, would assess the openness of different funding and support regimes (as framed above) and, on that basis, go on to assess reciprocity in terms of the actual take-up of cooperative opportunities against the potential that exists for such cooperative opportunities to take place.
Applying this type of measure is a non-trivial exercise that would eventually benefit from collective work by all interested ACCESS4EU consortia. This collective work would need to address both the methodological challenges and the country-specific details required to execute such measures in a timely and accurate manner. AUS-ACCESS4EU will initiate this dialogue by providing a practical demonstration of what it is possible to measure and assess accurately and what is less robust as regards measuring reciprocity. It is anticipated that one of the major challenges will be in characterising the sometimes complex rules and eligibility criteria in each nation that impact upon openness.

4.1.3 Work progress and achievements

Overview of **AUS-ACCESS4EU work packages**:

- WP1: Inventory and monitoring
- WP2: Awareness raising and profile building
- WP3: Information dissemination and outreach
- WP4: Project coordination and management

For AUS-ACCESS4EU, a 'parallel work package approach' was adopted. This means that all four work packages ran through the whole 27 months duration of the project. The main advantages of this approach were that all AUS-ACCESS4EU partners were involved in the project implementation process from the very beginning to the end. This led to a higher interdependency of the results, the creation of synergies between work packages and the securing of the commitment of all partners throughout the whole duration of the project.

The following information on the current status of the implementation of each work package is structured as follows:

A) Introduction to/overview of the respective WP
B) Achievements from October 2009 – Dec. 2011

4.1.3.1 WP1: Inventory and monitoring

A) Overview

Work package leaders of WP1 were the Australian National University (ANU) and the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO). This WP aimed to map the opportunities for European researchers and research institutes to access Australian Federal

Government, State/Territory Government programmes and other significant programmes run by Academies/NGOs and philanthropic bodies etc. This included analysing the rules of participation and funding guidelines for European organisations and researchers as well as identifying the practical obstacles to their participation in Australian research.

WP1 consisted of 7 tasks as follows.

- Task 1.1 Mapping of access opportunities
- Task 1.2 Implementation of a database on Australian programmes open for EU researchers
- Task 1.3 Monitoring the participation of EU researchers and institutes in Australian programmes
- Task 1.4 Mapping Australia's research strengths from an international perspective
- Task 1.5 Define desirable attributes for metrics
- Task 1.6 Develop draft metrics specification
- Task 1.7 Experimental test of applying the metrics

B) Progress and achievements

Task 1.1 Mapping of access opportunities

The deliverable **D.1.1** on 'Analytical report on the reciprocity issues of bilateral cooperation agreements and existing bilateral/reciprocal cooperation' after circulation to the consortium members and the Advisory Panel was published on the AUS-ACCESS4EU website. This paper proposes a method via which specific international research cooperation agreements can be analysed in regards to the nature and extent of reciprocity involved. The proposed analytical framework is based upon the familiar risk-reward relationship. This is used to develop a taxonomy of five different stages in the development of international research cooperation agreements: from simple scientific and exchanges and visits (Stage 1) through to fully interoperable funding systems (Stage 5). The suggested framework is tested against EU-Australia S&T cooperation agreements and proves itself to be an effective means of categorising these agreements and of understanding the wider process of partnership-building that they facilitate.

The paper 'Enhancing reciprocity in international cooperation in research: issues and metrics' (**D1.2+D1.7**) (Annex 1) was completed and published on the website.

The paper highlights key policy trade-offs between competition and cooperation in international research cooperation. This is a tension of particular relevance to support for public interest-oriented scientific research (which is inherently international in its ethos) versus support for innovation - which has a strong national competitiveness dimension and is hence less amenable to international cooperation. Consequently, recent trends to closely couple science policy and innovation policy have complicated the policy agenda as regards support for international cooperation. Within this context, the paper draws attention to the growing importance of openness and reciprocity considerations in national policy frameworks and research funding arrangements. Finally, it proposes a methodology for calculating the proportion of a nation's domestic research funding portfolio that is open to applications from overseas researchers. This methodology was further explored and piloted on research grant programmes of two major Australian funding providers. See paper below.

When looking at the rules of participation for European researchers in available programmes, it became obvious that these vary from programme to programme. Each programmes' requirements have been comprehensively detailed in their online guidelines and described in each programme's

Eligibility section of the RTDI database. The database gives links to the relevant rules where the conditions are to be found.

The Special Note in the online AUS-ACCESS4EU – A Guide for European Researchers prepared by the project partners gives a list of important points to observe.

It is essential to read each programme's instructions very carefully. Comprehensive guidelines are available online for each programme. Some special things to look out for are:

- specifications for Principal and Chief Investigators;
- definitions of Eligible Organisations;
- visa or residency requirements;
- co-investment conditions;
- possible necessity for top up scholarships; and
- the existence of standard agreements.

Each programme has a contact person who is able to help with queries about application procedures and what will be expected of successful applicants. Most programmes also provide a sample application form with detailed instructions on their website. Very usefully, one series of programmes provides a case manager for successful candidates.

Task 1.2 Implementation of a database on Australian programmes open for EU researchers (ANU/CSIRO/BC/DLR)

Major funders and programmes have been identified:

Programme Owner	**Programme**
Australian Research Council (ARC)	Linkage Projects Linkage, Infrastructure, Equipment & Facilities Discovery Projects Discovery Early Career Researcher Award Future Fellowships Australian Laureate Fellowships
National Health & Medical Research Council (NHMRC)	Australia Project Grants
Commonwealth Scientific & Industrial Research Organisation (CSIRO)	Flagship Clusters Flagship Research Projects Flagship Visiting Fellowships Flagship Postgraduate Scholarships
Science & Industry Endowment Fund (SIEF)	Science & Industry Endowment Fund Research Grants
Department of Employment, Education & Workplace Relations (DEEWR)	Endeavour Postgraduate Awards Endeavour Research Fellowships Endeavour Executive Awards Endeavour Vocational Education & Training Award
Group of Eight (Go8) universities	Go8 European Fellowships

Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education(DIISRTE) administered by individual universities	Cooperative Research Centres Program International Postgraduate Research Scholarships
National Library of Australia (NLA)	Harold White Fellowships

Programmes in which European researchers are eligible to participate are described according to categories agreed by all ACCESS4EU projects. These agreed fields were:

- Country
- Call type
- Thematic area
- Keywords
- Programme title, acronym and unique id
- Publication date
- Deadline for proposal submissions
- Call owner
- Call abstract and full description
- Eligibility conditions
- How to apply
- Budget (in Euros)
- Maximum duration
- Call URL
- Contact details

The Research, Technology Development and Innovation (RTDI) database is available on the AUS-ACCESS4EU website. It can be searched by country, programme type and thematic area and retrieves a programme description and information on the closing date, eligibility requirements, how to apply, the budget and contact details and a programme web link.

The information has been updated continuously as calls open and close and this work went on through the whole project. ANU and CSIRO were mapping the calls and implemented them to the central RTDI database and BC acted as the RTDI Country Administrator to review, activate/deactivate and delete calls (**D1.6**).

The RTDI online database only includes information on currently open programmes. To allow potential researchers plenty of time to develop their proposals and collaborations, we prepared, and regularly updated, a calendar of Australian awards available to European researchers. The calendar was produced as a hardcopy for Information Days and other promotional events and also as an online resource with programme links available on the website.

Task 1.3 Monitoring the participation of EU researchers and institutes in Australian programmes (ANU/CSIRO)

The information on a range of key Australian programmes and institutions has been analysed (**D 1.3**) before concluding with an identification of issues relevant to making future improvements to data collection and analysis.

Despite and because of the constraints of the data available, a number of conclusions can nevertheless be drawn:

- Overall, there is consistency across different metrics and programmes that collaboration with EU researchers and institutions accounts for approximately 45% of total Australian international collaboration (and this shows signs of rising over recent years).
- To be able to track these trends or interrogate the data in any detailed way will require changes to the way data about international collaboration is gathered and reported.
- This has implications for programme owners and programme design, particularly given the increasing importance being placed on international collaboration by governments in Europe and Australia, and in particular if Australian agencies are required to report against the National Innovation Priorities.
- Specific data on the amounts of funding from Australian programmes received by researchers and institutions in the EU is not currently able to be gathered and aggregated in a way that would enable regular tracking or trend analysis.
- Minimal changes to funding application forms to include the current country of residence, as opposed to citizenship, of individual applicants and the amount of funding to go to international institutions and researchers would allow for more detailed analysis of participation and funding flows in international collaborations.

Preliminary findings were used to inform the November Information Days and further discussions with Australian programme owners. This work, including feedback from Australian and European partners, was captured in the "Monitoring report on the participation of EU researchers and institutes in Australian programmes", produced in July 2011 **(D1.3).** The exercise led to useful ongoing dialogue with Australian programme owners and policy-makers about the work we were undertaking in the project more broadly. Specifically, the Australian Research Council (ARC) now asks for Country of Residence in four of its major competitive grant programmes – the Australian Laureates, Future Fellowships, Linkage Projects and Discovery Early Career Researchers Awards – as recommended in the "Monitoring" report.

Given the lack of time series data available from programme owners, it is not possible to provide substantial and broad-based information on trends in participation of, and funding for, European researchers and institutes. However, we can point to some positive developments: as well as the additional information requested on ARC application forms mentioned above, the Group of Eight (Go8) universities have received a significant increase in applications for their 2012 Go8 European Fellowships, showing a growing interest from Eastern European researchers in working in Australia.

Task 1.4 Mapping Australia's research strengths from an international perspective (ANU)

The 'Australian Research and Innovation System' presentation prepared by CSIRO for the kick-off meeting is available on the AUS-ACCESS4EU website. This presentation covers key research

indicators, the structure of the innovation system, new developments, the basic characterisation of the research and the challenges for research policies (**Annex 2**).

A paper (**D1.4**) on 'Mapping Australia's research strengths from an international perspective' has been completed. The paper develops and tests a methodology for mapping a nation's research strengths from an international perspective based on ratios of Relative Citation Impact (RCI). Thomson-Reuters *National Science Indicators* (NSI) data are used to map Australia's standing vis-à-vis EU Member States and other selected nations. These ratios are expressed in a matrix that indicates whether Australia has a higher, comparable, or lower RCI performance than a given nation for a specific research field. The results indicate that this method provides a feasible means of assessing relative research strengths in a clear and easily grasped manner.

One of the Australian programme owners, the Group of Eight (Go8) universities, has developed a searchable database to allow industry, government, and potential collaborators and research students to find experts in their fields of interest. Australia's Knowledge Gateway uses keywords to search for individuals and institutions with strength in specified research disciplines. The Go8 is currently exploring the possibility of broadening the scope of the Gateway beyond the 70 percent of Australian research conducted at Go8 universities.
gateway.go8.edu.au

In addition, profiles of major Australian programme owners were prepared for the Information Days and made available on the website.

FEAST has cooperated with Roxby Media Australia Pty Ltd to produce a 152 page glossy publication highlighting the nature and extent of Australian-European cooperation in research and technology development and examining options for the future evolution of this cooperation. The volume will be widely circulated in both Europe and Australia. As such, the publication will provide a useful mechanism for highlighting salient issues and ideas for enhanced international cooperation in research in general, and Australian-European cooperation in particular.
http://www.feast.org/publications/FEAST_Roxby_2010.pdf

Task 1.5 Define desirable attributes for metrics (ANU/CSIRO) & Task 1.6 Develop draft metrics specification

The paper (**D1.2 & D1.7**), noted in Task 1.1, on 'Enhancing reciprocity in international cooperation in research: issues and metrics' has been published on the website, following valuable input from partners and revision. It addresses both Tasks 1.5 and 1.6. This paper proposes a methodology for calculating the proportion of a nation's domestic research funding portfolio that is open to applications from overseas researchers (referred to as the 'Three C's method'). This comprises: *capacity*: the quantum of funding available (converted to!); *commitment*: the extent to which a funding mechanism allows for international access (measured on the scale C1 $0 < x < 1.0$), and; *clarity*: the extent to which guidelines are easily grasped by an international researcher in a timely manner (measured on the scale C2 $0 < x < 1.0$). Capacity (€ AVAILABLE), commitment (C1) and clarity (C2) are related in the following simple equation: €OPEN = € AVAILABLE x C1 x C2. This method has the potential to provide an evidence-base that would allow the relative openness of different nations' policy stances and funding arrangements to be assessed.

The Australian programme owners form a small group with whom ANU/CSIRO are in regular contact including through the consultation process (with our Advisory group) for the paper for

deliverables 1.2 + 1.7 where we sought and incorporated useful comments from Australian programme owners and the Workshop, Deliverable 2.1, where these issues were also discussed.

Therefore the "Design Workshop" **D.1.5 wa**s not required to elicit their views and suggestions in a structured way. A second Workshop, satisfying **D2.6**, with a clear and detailed agenda (**D2.3**) was organised after the first Infotour in December 2010 and provided a suitable means to obtain their input. In addition, desk research has provided extensive coverage of current policies, opportunities and guidelines across all major funding programmes.

Task 1.7 Experimental test of applying the metrics

The development of a metric of openness and reciprocity (**D 1.2 & 1.7**), was able to be applied to two Australian research funding systems (i.e. the Australian Research Councils National Competitive Grants Programme and the Flagship Collaboration Fund of CSIRO) in such a way that it highlighted their profiles in relation to these matters, and identified areas of implementation where these two quite open funds could improve their game. At the same time it clearly demonstrates the degree to which both funds have moved in the direction of openness and reciprocity (**D 1.8**) (Annex 3).

A recommendation derived from this work is to investigate other national research funding systems using the tools developed here in order to work towards a standard set of descriptors that could be applied internationally. It would be expected that more descriptors would be identified, or the ones listed here further refined, to remove those elements that may be peculiar to the Australian system.

The respective document (**D1.2. & D 1.7**) has been shared with all other ACCESS4EU projects to inform them and to encourage the application on existing programmes open to international cooperation.

4.1.3.2 WP2: Awareness raising and profile building

A) Overview

The objectives of this work package are to raise the awareness of Australian institutions and programme owners of this project, to analyse aspects of the reciprocity of research programmes and to give recommendations to the EC based on the results of this analysis.

WP2 consists of 3 Tasks as follows.

- Task 2.1. Kick-off conference with representation by Australian programme owners
- Task 2.2. Dialogue with Australian programme owners
- Task 2.3. Workshops on enhancing opportunities for EU participation in Australian programmes with relevant policy decision makers and programme owners

B) Achievements

Task 2.1 Kick-off conference with representation by Australian programme owners

A meeting (**D2.1**) with key Australian programme owners was held in Canberra in March 2010. Representatives attended from the DLR, FEAST, CSIRO, the Australian Research Council (ARC), the National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), the Australian Academy of Science, the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and the Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering, the Australian Group of 8 Universities and the Delegation of the European Union to Australia and New Zealand.

The meeting discussed the merits of producing a metric of reciprocity in international research collaboration that could give a combined measure of the capacity, commitment and clarity of programmes. It was suggested that a metric of capacity and commitment would be of interest to policy makers; whereas the question of accessibility or clarity may mean more to individual researchers, who have limited time and energy to devote to funding applications and who would therefore value a user-friendly public face of programmes to achieve their goals The discussion

included issues of implementation, e.g. what bodies would make the assessments and by what mechanisms could the metric be updated.

There was also some further discussion of qualities of accessibility, or transparency, of programmes for international collaborators – not only the quality of visibility on websites, but also the language used, and whether or not that language was user-friendly for people unfamiliar with Australian institutional contexts and vocabulary. It was a general view that few funding websites were written and designed with that purpose in mind. It was further suggested, to ensure continued updating of information on third country programmes for a European audience beyond the life of the ACESSS4EU projects that control of the content and research might eventually be handed over to an existing service such as ERAWATCH, to include this information on individual country's ERAWATCH pages.

Task 2.2 Dialogue with Australian programme owners

Representatives from the key Australian programme owners are members of the AUS-ACCESS4EU Advisory Board. We are in regular conversation on the activities, outputs and aims of the project.

An Op Ed piece on International research collaborations: overcoming the impediments was published in the *Australian R&D Review* of March 2010 (**Annex 4**). Institutions, agencies and non-government organisations that offer research and innovation support programmes accessible by overseas nationals were encouraged to contact FEAST to discuss their engagement with this new AUS-ACCESS4EU initiative.

The work of the project was also presented at the Australasian Research Management Society annual conference in Fremantle in September 2010. Paul Harris presented two papers – one by Mark Matthews and one by himself – both highlighting issues of international research cooperation and mentioning the Aus-ACCESS4EU project (**Annex 5**).

Task 2.3 Workshops on enhancing opportunities for EU participation in Australian programmes with relevant policy decision makers and programme owners

A second meeting/workshop with Australian programme owners has taken place on December 7, 2010. The Consortium members reported on progress being made by the project. Of particular interest was the feedback from the successful Info Day tour to Europe in November 2010. The level of interest and knowledge of the audiences will influence programme owners, along with the project as a whole, in their awareness raising efforts.

Second meeting with Australian programme owners on Dec. 7, 2010 in Canberra

Two exercises in which programme owners have been actively assisting the project officers, the mapping of European participation in Australian programmes and the preliminary work on applying a system of metrics of openness and reciprocity, were discussed more fully. It was recognised that inconsistencies and inadequacies in data collection on international collaboration adversely affect the evaluation and design of relevant funding programmes and is an issue that needs to be addressed. Creating a measure of relative openness was agreed to be a useful, if difficult task that is worth pursuing if targeted carefully (**D 2.5 & D 2.6**).

4.1.3.3 WP3: Information dissemination and outreach

A) Overview

WP3 leader was BC. The main aim was to increase the European research community's awareness of opportunities to access Australian support and capability in order to stimulate, encourage and facilitate the participation of European organisations in the programmes managed by Australian programme owners.

WP3 consisted of 6 tasks as follows:

- Task 3.1. Information dissemination about the project through established and accepted networks
- Task 3.2. Preparation of information for dissemination to EU researchers
- Task 3.3. Dissemination to relevant stakeholders and policy makers
- Task 3.4. Information and awareness activities by Australian funding programme owners in the EU
- Task 3.5 Development of an interactive website
- Task 3.6 Links with other projects

There was a slight delay in the initiation of some of the tasks within this work package, due to staffing issues and restrictions on promotional activities by UK Government, as a response to the financial crisis. However, after these issues were solved the activity commenced in earnest and delivery was on track by the end of the first reporting period.

The dissemination strategy was produced in May 2010, following an approach that focuses on 'multipliers' rather than on individual researchers. These 'multipliers' were to be encouraged to promote the project through their networks. Comprehensive contact lists were produced and full implementation of this strategy started in November 2010 with the first "Aus-Access4EU Info day tour".

The production of the newsletters and other promotional material has not been as straightforward in the first reporting period as it should have been because of the need to address interdependencies with other Access4EU projects and the desire of the project coordinators for common approaches, formats, designs and URLs. Although this has obvious benefits in terms of brand recognition, it resulted in a delay in the production of the newsletters; the main issues being cross-communication and unmet deadlines, as well as technical and procedural issues. Despite these challenges we produced the first Aus-Access newsletter (**D3.3.1**), an Aus-Access promotional flyer (**D3.2**), and the common Newsletter No 2 (**D3.3.2**) in the first reporting period. Furthermore, we have been able to produce three more AUS-ACCESS4EU-Newsletters in the second reporting period.

Up to 17 information days, each for 45-50 participants, were initially envisaged which can be allocated to the three different levels according to the common dissemination strategy for all ACCESS4EU projects as suggested by DLR. Under level three Aus-access4EU specific dissemination events were focused on Australia and took place in priority target countries in Europe: The preparatory work for the first 'Info Day' tour was completed in Year One, although delivery of the events took place in November 2010 (**D3.2**).

There were three info day tours planned, each visiting three different European capitals, for months 14, 17 and 19. Speakers included scientific administrators of the main Australian funding schemes and 'local' researchers working on collaboration projects with Australia, to provide case study presentations. The target audience was intended to be made up of 'multipliers' such as national research managers, administrators and policymakers. Where possible events were planned to be organised in the British Council offices, or premises of our European partners in the Euraxess initiative, in order to reduce costs and facilitate efficient organisation. The linking with Euraxess partners also gave us the opportunity to tap into their networks of researchers and multipliers; there are more than 200 organisations which support researchers involved in the Euraxess project all across Europe.

Kommentar [C1]: Mark, did we use BC premises much?

B) Achievements

Task 3.1. Information dissemination about the project through established and accepted networks

A dissemination strategy was developed (**D3.2**). UK and EU contact lists of target audience were collated. In total four AUS-ACCESS4EU newsletters were prepared and distributed.
The project has contributed to the Common ACCESS4EU newsletters, in particular to the Common ACCESS4EU newsletter no. 2 with a focus on Australia. An AUS-ACCESS4 EU flyer (D3.2.1) was prepared and 4000 copies were printed and distributed

Task 3.2. Preparation of information for dissemination to EU researchers

"Guidelines for EU researchers" (D3.2) were prepared and 2000 copies were printed prior to the first infotour in November 2010. In addition, the guidelines were uploaded to the AUS-ACCESS4EU website and updated regularly.

Task 3.3. Dissemination to relevant stakeholders and policy makers

Invitations to the Information Days across Europe were sent to relevant stakeholders and policy makers as well as multipliers (month 13 onwards). Where appropriate, extra information sessions, or visits, were organised alongside the Information days specifically for stakeholders and policy makers *Research at* to disuss the policy aspects of measuring reciprocity of openness. The information was also disseminated to stakeholders and policy makers in countries where no Information Days could be organized.
We have looked for more synergy with other FP7 projects, in particluar with other ACCESS4EU projects. VINNOVA (Sweden), APRE (Italy), the Latin American Institute, LAI (Austria), and the Austrian Research Promotion Agency FFG, and also with the EURAXESS project, in which BC is a partner. For example, whenever BC gave a presentation in the UK on the Euraxess project, several slides were also included on the AUS-ACCESS4EU project. This lead to an increased number of researchers and research funders and administrators being aware of the project, and the opportunities offered by Australian research programmes.

Task 3.4. Information and awareness activities by Australian funding programme owners in the EU

There were three info day tours planned, each visiting three different European capitals, for months 14, 17 and 19. Speakers to be included were scientific administrators of the main Australian funding schemes and 'local' researchers working on collaboration projects with Australia, to provide case study presentations. The target audience was intended to be made up of 'multipliers' such as national research managers, administrators and policymakers.

The first info day tour took place between November 8 and 11, 2010. European cities included were London, UK (Nov. 8), Paris, France (Nov. 9) and Bonn, Germany (Nov. 11). The events were well received and the audience, although varying in number, consisted mainly of the envisaged target group, i.e. research managers, administrators and policy makers. Where ever possible room was also provided for meetings with policy makers and research managers. For example, in Bonn the Australian experts met with the so-called AUS/NZL coordination group consisting of representatives of funding and research organisations in charge of bilateral cooperation activities with Australia.

Audience of the Bonn info day, Nov. 11, 2010

Against the background of the lessons learnt during the first info day tour, at the second physical meeting of the consortium in Bonn on Nov. 12, 2010, the decision was taken to merge info day tours 2 & 3 to a longer tour to avoid too much time consuming travel between Australia and Europe and thus making it easier for the Australian speakers. A side benefit was the reduction of travel costs for the Australian experts.

The second expanded info day tour started on May 16, 2011 (ending on May 26) and comprised information sessions in Stockholm (Sweden), Brussels (Belgium), Vienna (Austria), Rome (Italy) and Madrid (Spain). Originally, a sixth event in Amsterdam (Netherlands) had been planned but was cancelled due to very low response. On the other hand, the registration for the Rome event had to be closed early due to a very strong response.

Speakers of the info day in Madrid, May 25, 2011

The events in Stockholm and Brussels were co-organized with the South Africa ACCESS4EU project. The information event in Brussels was exclusively organized for the members of the so-called IGLO (International Group of Liaison Offices) group.

In addition, the project was presented, and the Australian funding programmes and the Australian research capabilities in the respective areas were promoted at the ICT event in Brussels (November 2010), at the EU Health days (June 2011) in Brussels, at the EU Environmental-Biotech conference in Gdansk (September 2011) and at the EURASIAPAC final workshop in Brussels (Nov. 2011).

Task 3.5. Development of an interactive website

The official project website (**D3.1**) was launched in February 2010 (www.aus-access4.eu). The site contains information on the project and the project partners, descriptions of the individual work packages, references to planned activities (e.g. dissemination events, conferences, workshops, etc.), analytical reports, studies and the RTDI database that have been produced within the framework of the project, information on the ACCESS4EU instrument, links to other relevant websites and projects, news on R&D cooperation with Australia and the option to subscribe to the project's newsletter. Finally, the calendar function as well as the intranet was implemented in October 2010. There was a marked increase in the number of hits to the website during our first Info Day tour from 8th to the 12th November 2010

ANU and CSIRO staff have participated actively in this task in support of BC and DLR colleagues, including the preparation of content for newsletters, websites and brochures, and the planning for, and presenting at, the info days in Europe. This work continued through the second half of the project. Since the project finished by the end of 2011 information has been provided that no further updates will be made on the website and a link to the FEAST website has been placed which will be operative at least until the end of the FEAST project in mid 2012.

4.1.3.4 WP4: Project Coordination and Management

The WP 4 leader was DLR. The objectives of this work package was to organise and coordinate project activities, to provide a smooth interface between the individual work packages and to ensure the proper implementation of the work packages and corresponding tasks, to ensure a continuous quality assurance of the deliverables, to execute the overall legal, financial and administrative management, to provide the optimum implementation of the contract and to assure an effective information flow.

Consortium management tasks and achievements

The project coordination of the ACCESS4EU project by DLR concentrated on the one hand on ensuring the contractual obligations towards the European Commission and on the other hand on the internal project management. The contractual obligations were mainly the finalisation of the GPF and the transfer of the budget shares to the different partners. The internal management of the project consortium was threefold:

- ***Coordination among AUS-ACCESS4EU partners (within WP's and tasks)***
  To ensure the coordination and the exchange between the different project partners various tools are used. These ranged from the usual **telephone/e-mail exchange** to regular physical and virtual meetings. The intranet section of the AUS-ACCESS4EU website has been used for storing useful information, meeting minutes, other documents, photos, etc. so that they can be accessed and downloaded at all times by the consortium partners.

- ***Information by the project coordinator to the participants***
  DLR prepared regular internal Management infos via mail or in the form of telephone-conferences (see below) in order to provide information and news on the overall project organisation, project meetings, financial and administrative issues and news from the European Commission. Each consortium partner was encouraged to contribute to the Management Info by sending the information that should be circulated among all partners to DLR. Thus, a constant information flow among all project partners and full transparency of what was happening in the project was ensured.

- ***Reviewing, monitoring, reporting within the project***
  The reviewing, monitoring and reporting within the project has been shared between the project partners, the WP leaders and DLR as the coordinator. As laid down in the Consortium Agreement, all AUS-ACCESS4EU consortium partners were responsible for providing information on their tasks to their Task and WP leaders and the coordinator. The WP leaders played an important role in managing the timely and successful implementation of the project tasks. They were responsible for checking the progress within each WP against the planned schedule and for indicating any changes to the project coordinator. Based on regular WP reports the coordinator was able to get a concise overview on the implementation of the project, especially whether the official deliverables to the European Commission are finalised and the milestones are met.
  The consortium set up a broadly based and representative "Advisory Board" to ensure high quality reviews (**Annex 6**) and created a detailed project manual (**D4.3**). This document describes the guidelines for the structure and format of deliverables (reports, databases, etc.) and the process of peer reviewing these deliverables, this providing a quality check. It defines the roles and a responsibility of the partners involved, describes the methodology and

working steps to be followed and presents the relevant templates which will have to be used during the peer review process.

There was a continuous information exchange between the coordinator and the WP leaders and the European Commission project officer to ensure that the EC expectations towards the project are being met.

For the success of AUS-ACCESS4EU the interlocking of the two main working areas of mapping and dissemination activities were essential. To ensure the direct contact between the mapping- and the dissemination-activities DLR enforced direct and regular contact between BC and the Australian partners (ANU/CSIRO). Regular monthly teleconference meetings have taken place since May 2010 to encourage better and more frequent communication between the Consortium members which have been very valuable in facilitating the delivery of tasks, resolving issues, and offering a forum for discussing tasks and developing the project and its implementation.

Despite the great distances between Australia and Europe we have been able to organize five physical meetings of the consortium: the **kick-off meeting** which took place in November 2009 (month 2 of the project) in Bonn (**D 4.2**) and four additional physical meetings: in Canberra in July 2010, in Bonn after the info day in Nov. 2010, and July 2011 again in Canberra. Against the background of the extension of the project till the end of 2011 an additional consortium meeting was held in London in September 2011 (**D 4.4.1 – 4.4.3**).

Apart from the internal communication the project partners and the project coordination established cooperation and coordination with other projects and programmes. These have been most notably:

- **ACCESS2CANADA** This project was initiated when it became clear that European researchers are not well enough informed about available funding opportunities in Canadian research and innovation programmes. The aim of the project is to increase the participation of European researchers in these funding programmes.

- **APORTA** "Supporting EU Access to Brazilian National research programmes - Acesso por Ciência e Technologia no Brasil - is the A4EU project specifically targeted at Brazil.

- **KORRIDOR** is also anACCESS4EU project that aims to stimulate and facilitate the participation of European researchers in Korean R&D programmes.

- **ACCESS4EU:NZ** seeks to establish a platform to increase the awareness and dissemination within the Member States and Associated Countries of opportunities for European researchers and research organisations to participate in New Zealand's (NZ's) publicly-funded research and innovation programmes.

Besides the synergies between these five ACCESS4EU projects where the International Bureau of the BMBF is involved the coordinator was heavily involved in the development of the common ACCESS4EU web portal and the RTDI database for all 11 ACCESS4EU projects. To design and implement this central A4EU tool the coordinator actively participated in all common web-conferences supported by DLR .

As mentioned previously, owing to BC's involvement in the EURAXESS initiative, there was also close interaction with Euraxess partners, especially during the dissemination of information about the

info-days. Euraxess is a Europe-wide initiative aiming to support the mobility of researchers, and there are more than 200 Euraxess partner organisations across Europe.

Furthermore at the first physical coordinators meeting in Athens (Greece) the coordinator suggested the so called “three-step dissemination strategy”, which was the starting point for the subsequently established “task force dissemination events” .

4.1.4 Potential Impact

The project has succeeded in promoting relevant Australian programs in Europe, and also in raising awareness among Australian program owners about issues of international collaboration and openness.
International collaboration in research and innovation happens at a number of different levels, including individual researchers, collaborative teams, research institutions and national policy-makers. Each will have their own objectives and information needs for effective decision-making, particularly in the context of a dynamic international system.
The project has helped gather information in a way not done before in Australia about international participation in Australian programs – in doing so, it has also highlighted inconsistencies and gaps across agencies in the information gathered. We suggest that this will be an increasingly significant issue into the future, as institutions and governments seek to make decisions about responding to ongoing internationalization.
International collaboration is inherently a two-way process and success therefore requires an understanding of the context/objectives of your partner.
The project has also pioneered new work on ways to measure comparative research strength and "reciprocity" as aspects of policy decision-making for research and innovation. It has also emphasized the importance of clarity of intent in structuring international collaboration to effectively balance risk and reward across different levels.
There is a strong trend within the EU to improve coordination among and across international collaboration projects, for example across all the 11 ACCESS4EU projects, INCO-Nets, ERA-Nets, etc. This has implications for partner countries such as Australia – effective engagement with Europe in the future may benefit from a strategic approach that can tap into this European coordination.
For example, there are opportunities to reach a much larger European audience through coordinated information dissemination, but this requires engagement with the right agencies/networks.
Within Australia, there was a benefit in better connecting international relations staff with program owners, in effect supporting the implementation of recent policy decisions in Australia designed to internationalize key funding programs. There has been a further benefit in exposing program staff to policy makers and researchers in Europe to better understand the requirements and perceptions of their programs' audience.
A selection of quotes:

Merrilyn Fitzpatrick 'It was extremely valuable to be able to meet European researchers and research managers, and to acquire a deeper understanding of their needs and interests in considering collaboration through the Australian research funding system.

It was particularly striking to observe how an FP7 call which designates Australia as a partner had a galvanizing effect on the interest of European researchers in understanding the Australian system and finding out more about possible Australian partners. In each event of the May Info tour there were at least one and usually two or three research institutions in attendance specifically because of the upcoming call on stem cell therapies and regenerative medicine. Their attendance also was an indication that notice of the event had reached widely into the research community so that those with a specific current interest were alerted to it.'

Kathy Dunn 'The opportunity to present in person to such a broad range of potential collaborators was extremely worthwhile for the CSIRO and its Flagship Collaboration Fund. I was encouraged by the enthusiasm of European researchers who are extremely keen to learn how to link with Australian scientific expertise. The discussions from the Information Days reinforced that Australia and its

European partners are more than willing to work together to solve our common national challenges.'

Simon Sedgley 'The information days were a wonderful opportunity to spread the word about how we are opening up opportunities for European collaboration in Australian research. It was very encouraging to learn first-hand of the keen interest among European researchers to take up those opportunities'

This "operational" aspect of the project has – at least in Australia – been significant, as barriers to international participation and collaboration may exist at any of the levels outlined above, and a truly open program needs to reflect this openness in policy and implementation and communication. (See also the "Three C's" model outlined by the project.)
European partners see continuity in engagement with Australia through FEAST and Aus-ACCESS4EU, and consideration needs to be given to how this can be taken forward.

4.1.5. Consortium and Contact details

Consortium partners

The AUS-ACCESS4EU consortium committee responsible for the implementation of the four work packages consisted of the following partners:

	Name	Acronym	Country
1	International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research at the Project Management Agency of the German Aerospace Center	DLR	Germany
2	Australian National University	ANU	Australia
3	British Council	BC	United Kingdom
4	Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation	CSIRO	Australia

4.1.5.1. Contact information

Coordinator
Dr. Hans-Jörg Stähle
International Bureau of the German
Federal Ministry of Education and Research
at the German Aerospace Center
Heinrich-Konen-Strasse 1
53227 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: +49/(0)228/3821-1403
Fax.: +49/(0)228/3821-1444
E-Mail: hans.staehle@dlr.de

Managing coordinator
Dr. Gerd Rücker
International Bureau of the German
Federal Ministry of Education and Research
at the German Aerospace Center
Heinrich-Konen-Strasse 1
53227 Bonn, Germany
Tel.: +49/(0)228/3821-1180
Fax.: +49/(0)228/3821-1444
E-Mail: gerd.ruecker@dlr.de

4.2 Use and dissemination of foreground

A plan for use and dissemination of foreground (including socio-economic impact and target groups for the results of the research) shall be established at the end of the project. It should, where appropriate, be an update of the initial plan in Annex I for use and dissemination of foreground and be consistent with the report on societal implications on the use and dissemination of foreground (section 4.3 – H).

The plan should consist of:

- *Section A*

This section should describe the dissemination measures, including any scientific publications relating to foreground. ***Its content will be made available in the public domain*** *thus demonstrating the added-value and positive impact of the project on the European Union.*

- *Section B*

This section should specify the exploitable foreground and provide the plans for exploitation. All these data can be public or confidential; the report must clearly mark non-publishable (confidential) parts that will be treated as such by the Commission. Information under Section B that is not marked as confidential ***will be made available in the public domain*** *thus demonstrating the added-value and positive impact of the project on the European Union.*
Section B is not applicable to this project !!!

Section A (public)

Due to the character of the project no scientific publications have been made in peer reviewed journals, whereas the principal findings have been made public via discussion papers published on the FEAST website.

- Template A1: List of all publications relating to the foreground of the project.
- Template A2: List of all dissemination activities (publications, conferences, workshops, web sites/applications, press releases, flyers, articles published in the popular press, videos, media briefings, presentations, exhibitions, thesis, interviews, films, TV clips, posters).

These tables are cumulative, which means that they should always show all publications and activities from the beginning until after the end of the project. Updates are possible at any time.

TEMPLATE A1: LIST OF PUBLICATIONS, STARTING WITH THE MOST IMPORTANT ONES

NO.	Title	Main author	Title of the periodical or the series	Number, date or frequency	Publisher	Place of publication	Year of publication	Relevant pages	Permanent identifiers[4] (if available)	Is/Will open access[5] provided to this publication?
1	*Enhancing reciprocity in international cooperation un research: issues and metrics;*	*Mark Matthews & Paul Harris*	*AUS-ACCESS4EU Discussion Paper*	*July 2010*	*FEAST*	*FEAST Website*	*2010*			yes
2	*A framework for analysing bilateral research cooperation agreements relating to reciprocity*	*Mark Matthews & Merrilyn Fitzpatrick*	*AUS-ACCESS4EU Discussion Paper*	*Nov 2010*	*FEAST*	*FEAST Website*	*2010*			*yes*
3	*Reciprocity in international cooperation in science and*	*Mark Matthews*	*OpEd piece*	*March 2010*	*Australian R&D Review*		*2010*			*yes*

[4] A permanent identifier should be a persistent link to the published version full text if open access or abstract if article is pay per view) or to the final manuscript accepted for publication (link to article in repository).

[5] Open Access is defined as free of charge access for anyone via Internet. Please answer "yes" if the open access to the publication is already established and also if the embargo period for open access is not yet over but you intend to establish open access afterwards.

	innovation									

TEMPLATE A2: LIST OF DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES								
NO.	Type of activities[6]	Main leader	Title	Date	Place	Type of audience[7]	Size of audience	Countries addressed
1	*Web*	*DLR*	*Launch of AUS-ACCESS4EU website*	*26 February 2010*	*Internet*			EU
	Newsletter	*BC*	*AUS-Access Newsletter1*					
	Newsletter	*BC*	*AUS-Access Newsletter2*	*January 2011*	*Nuremberg*	Scientific Community, Policy Makers	*20 - 50*	Germany
	Newsletter	*BC*	*AUS-Access Newsletter3*	*June 2011*	*Torino*	Scientific Community	*50*	EU
	Newsletter	*BC*	*AUS-Access Newsletter4*	*August 2011*	Brussels	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	*50*	Europe
	conference	*BC*	*Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA), 2010 Annual conference*	*8-9 June 2010*	*Manchester, UK*	Research managers and administrators at all levels of experience	*Approx 350*	UK
	conference	*BC*	*Vitae researcher Development conference 2010*	*6-7 Sept 2010*	*Manchester UK*	Researchers, research managers, HR staff, researcher development managers,	*Approx 450*	UK

[6] A drop down list allows choosing the dissemination activity: publications, conferences, workshops, web, press releases, flyers, articles published in the popular press, videos, media briefings, presentations, exhibitions, thesis, interviews, films, TV clips, posters, Other.

[7] A drop down list allows choosing the type of public: Scientific Community (higher education, Research), Industry, Civil Society, Policy makers, Medias ('multiple choices' is possible.

	Exhibition	*BC*	*Nature Jobs Career Expo*	*23 Sept 2010*	*London*	Researchers and postgraduates	*Approx 2000*	UK and Germany
	conference	*BC*	*ARMA Annual conference, 2011*	*7-8th June, 2011*	*Glasgow*	Research managers and administrators at all levels of experience	*Approx 400*	UK
	conference	*BC*	*Vitae researcher Development conference 2011*	*5-6 September 2011*	*Manchester, UK*	Researchers, research managers, HR staff, researcher development managers	*Approx 450*	UK and some international participants
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 1	08.11.2010	London	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	30	
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 1	10.11.2010	Paris	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	20	
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 1	11.11.2010	Bonn	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	60	
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 2	19.05.2011	Brussels	Policy Makers, Multipliers	25	Belgium, Europe
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 2	20.05.2011	Vienna	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	20	Austria, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 2	23.05.2011	Rome	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	85	Italy
	Presentations	BC	Infotour 2	25 May, 2011	Madrid	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	60	Spain, Portugal
	Presentation	DLR	EU Health Day	June, 2011	Brussels	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers		EU
	Presentation	DLR	Environmental Biotech Conference	5.-6. Sept. 2011	Gdansk	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	60	EU
	Presentation	DLR	EUASIAPAC Workshop	30. Nov. 2011	Brussels	Scientific Community, Policy Makers, Multipliers	70	EU

Section B (Confidential[8] or public: confidential information to be marked clearly)
Part B1

The applications for patents, trademarks, registered designs, etc. shall be listed according to the template B1 provided hereafter.

The list should, specify at least one unique identifier e.g. European Patent application reference. For patent applications, only if applicable, contributions to standards should be specified. This table is cumulative, which means that it should always show all applications from the beginning until after the end of the project.

TEMPLATE B1: LIST OF APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, REGISTERED DESIGNS, ETC.					
Type of IP Rights[9]:	Confidential Click on YES/NO	Foreseen embargo date dd/mm/yyyy	Application reference(s) (e.g. EP123456)	Subject or title of application	Applicant (s) (as on the application)

[8] Note to be confused with the "EU CONFIDENTIAL" classification for some security research projects.

[9] A drop down list allows choosing the type of IP rights: Patents, Trademarks, Registered designs, Utility models, Others.

Part B2
Please complete the table hereafter:

Type of Exploitable Foreground[10]	**Description of exploitable foreground**	Confidential Click on YES/NO	Foreseen embargo date dd/mm/yyyy	**Exploitable product(s) or measure(s)**	**Sector(s) of application**[11]	**Timetable, commercial or any other use**	**Patents or other IPR exploitation (licences)**	**Owner & Other Beneficiary(s) involved**

In addition to the table, please provide a text to explain the exploitable foreground, in particular:

- Its purpose
- How the foreground might be exploited, when and by whom
- IPR exploitable measures taken or intended
- Further research necessary, if any
- Potential/expected impact (quantify where possible)

[19] A drop down list allows choosing the type of foreground: General advancement of knowledge, Commercial exploitation of R&D results, Exploitation of R&D results via standards, exploitation of results through EU policies, exploitation of results through (social) innovation.
[11] A drop down list allows choosing the type sector (NACE nomenclature) : http://ec.europa.eu/competition/mergers/cases/index/nace_all.html

4.3 Report on societal implications

Replies to the following questions will assist the Commission to obtain statistics and indicators on societal and socio-economic issues addressed by projects. The questions are arranged in a number of key themes. As well as producing certain statistics, the replies will also help identify those projects that have shown a real engagement with wider societal issues, and thereby identify interesting approaches to these issues and best practices. The replies for individual projects will not be made public.

A General Information *(completed automatically when **Grant Agreement number** is entered.*	
Grant Agreement Number:	244485
Title of Project:	**Supporting EU access to Australian research programmes**
Name and Title of Coordinator:	Dr. Hans-Jörg Stähle, Senior Scientific Officer

B Ethics	
1. Did your project undergo an Ethics Review (and/or Screening)? • If Yes: have you described the progress of compliance with the relevant Ethics Review/Screening Requirements in the frame of the periodic/final project reports? Special Reminder: the progress of compliance with the Ethics Review/Screening Requirements should be described in the Period/Final Project Reports under the Section 3.2.2 *'Work Progress and Achievements'*	***No***
2. Please indicate whether your project involved any of the following issues (tick box) :	***YES***
RESEARCH ON HUMANS	
• Did the project involve children?	
• Did the project involve patients?	
• Did the project involve persons not able to give consent?	
• Did the project involve adult healthy volunteers?	
• Did the project involve Human genetic material?	
• Did the project involve Human biological samples?	
• Did the project involve Human data collection?	
RESEARCH ON HUMAN EMBRYO/FOETUS	
• Did the project involve Human Embryos?	
• Did the project involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells?	
• Did the project involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?	
• Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?	
• Did the project on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos?	
PRIVACY	
• Did the project involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?	
• Did the project involve tracking the location or observation of people?	
RESEARCH ON ANIMALS	
• Did the project involve research on animals?	
• Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?	
• Were those animals transgenic farm animals?	

• Were those animals cloned farm animals?	
• Were those animals non-human primates?	
RESEARCH INVOLVING DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	
• Did the project involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)?	
• Was the project of benefit to local community (capacity building, access to healthcare, education etc)?	
DUAL USE	
• Research having direct military use	No
• Research having the potential for terrorist abuse	No

C Workforce Statistics

3. Workforce statistics for the project: Please indicate in the table below the number of people who worked on the project (on a headcount basis).

Type of Position	Number of Women	Number of Men
Scientific Coordinator	0	1
Work package leaders	1	3
Experienced researchers (i.e. PhD holders)	2	4
PhD Students	0	0
Other	2	2

4. How many additional researchers (in companies and universities) were recruited specifically for this project?	**0**
Of which, indicate the number of men:	

D Gender Aspects

5. Did you carry out specific Gender Equality Actions under the project?

○	Yes
x	No

6. Which of the following actions did you carry out and how effective were they?

		Not at all effective				Very effective
❑	Design and implement an equal opportunity policy	○	○	○	○	○
❑	Set targets to achieve a gender balance in the workforce	○	○	○	○	○
❑	Organise conferences and workshops on gender	○	○	○	○	○
❑	Actions to improve work-life balance	○	○	○	○	○
○	Other:					

7. Was there a gender dimension associated with the research content – i.e. wherever people were the focus of the research as, for example, consumers, users, patients or in trials, was the issue of gender considered and addressed?

○ Yes- please specify

x No

E Synergies with Science Education

8. Did your project involve working with students and/or school pupils (e.g. open days, participation in science festivals and events, prizes/competitions or joint projects)?

○ Yes- please specify

x No

9. Did the project generate any science education material (e.g. kits, websites, explanatory booklets, DVDs)?

○ Yes- please specify

x No

F Interdisciplinarity

10. Which disciplines (see list below) are involved in your project?

○ Main discipline[12]:

○ Associated discipline[12]:

○ Associated discipline[12]:

G Engaging with Civil society and policy makers

11a Did your project engage with societal actors beyond the research community? *(if 'No', go to Question 14)*

○	Yes
x	No

11b If yes, did you engage with citizens (citizens' panels / juries) or organised civil society (NGOs, patients' groups etc.)?

x No

○ Yes- in determining what research should be performed

○ Yes - in implementing the research

○ Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project

[12] Insert number from list below (Frascati Manual).

11c In doing so, did your project involve actors whose role is mainly to organise the dialogue with citizens and organised civil society (e.g. professional mediator; communication company, science museums)?	○ ○	Yes No

12. Did you engage with government / public bodies or policy makers (including international organisations)

x	No
○	Yes- in framing the research agenda
x	Yes - in implementing the research agenda
x	Yes, in communicating /disseminating / using the results of the project

13a Will the project generate outputs (expertise or scientific advice) which could be used by policy makers?

- ○ Yes – as a **primary** objective (please indicate areas below- multiple answers possible)
- x Yes – as a **secondary** objective (please indicate areas below - multiple answer possible)
- ○ No

13b If Yes, in which fields?

Agriculture		Energy		Human rights	
Audiovisual and Media		Enlargement		Information Society	
Budget		Enterprise		Institutional affairs	
Competition		Environment		Internal Market	
Consumers		External Relations		Justice, freedom and security	
Culture		External Trade		Public Health	
Customs		Fisheries and Maritime Affairs		Regional Policy	
Development Economic and		Food Safety		**Research and Innovation**	
Monetary Affairs		Foreign and Security Policy		Space	
Education, Training, Youth		Fraud		Taxation	
Employment and Social Affairs		Humanitarian aid		Transport	

13c If Yes, at which level?

- ○ Local / regional levels
- ○ National level
- ○ European level
- x International level

H Use and dissemination

14. How many Articles were published/accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals?	**0**
To how many of these is open access[13] provided?	
How many of these are published in open access journals?	
How many of these are published in open repositories?	
To how many of these is open access not provided?	
Please check all applicable reasons for not providing open access:	
❑ publisher's licensing agreement would not permit publishing in a repository ❑ no suitable repository available ❑ no suitable open access journal available ❑ no funds available to publish in an open access journal ❑ lack of time and resources ❑ lack of information on open access ❑ other[14]: ……	

15. How many new patent applications ('priority filings') have been made? *("Technologically unique": multiple applications for the same invention in different jurisdictions should be counted as just one application of grant).*		**0**
16. Indicate how many of the following Intellectual Property Rights were applied for (give number in each box).	Trademark	
	Registered design	
	Other	
17. How many spin-off companies were created / are planned as a direct result of the project?		**0**
Indicate the approximate number of additional jobs in these companies:		

18. Please indicate whether your project has a potential impact on employment, in comparison with the situation before your project:

❑	Increase in employment, or	❑	In small & medium-sized enterprises
❑	Safeguard employment, or	❑	In large companies
❑	Decrease in employment,	x	None of the above / not relevant to the project
❑	Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify		

19. For your project partnership please estimate the employment effect resulting directly from your participation in Full Time Equivalent (*FTE = one person working fulltime for a year*) jobs:	*Indicate figure:*

[13] Open Access is defined as free of charge access for anyone via Internet.
[14] For instance: classification for security project.

Difficult to estimate / not possible to quantify	x

I Media and Communication to the general public

20. As part of the project, were any of the beneficiaries professionals in communication or media relations?

○ Yes x No

21. As part of the project, have any beneficiaries received professional media / communication training / advice to improve communication with the general public?

○ Yes x No

22 Which of the following have been used to communicate information about your project to the general public, or have resulted from your project?

❑	Press Release	❑	Coverage in specialist press
❑	Media briefing	❑	Coverage in general (non-specialist) press
❑	TV coverage / report	❑	Coverage in national press
❑	Radio coverage / report	❑	Coverage in international press
x	Brochures /posters / flyers	x	Website for the general public / internet
❑	DVD /Film /Multimedia	❑	Event targeting general public (festival, conference, exhibition, science café)

23 In which languages are the information products for the general public produced?

❑	Language of the coordinator	x	English
❑	Other language(s)		

***Question F-10*:** Classification of Scientific Disciplines according to the Frascati Manual 2002 (Proposed Standard Practice for Surveys on Research and Experimental Development, OECD 2002):

FIELDS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

1. NATURAL SCIENCES

1.1 Mathematics and computer sciences [mathematics and other allied fields: computer sciences and other allied subjects (software development only; hardware development should be classified in the engineering fields)]

1.2 Physical sciences (astronomy and space sciences, physics and other allied subjects)

1.3 Chemical sciences (chemistry, other allied subjects)

1.4 Earth and related environmental sciences (geology, geophysics, mineralogy, physical geography and other geosciences, meteorology and other atmospheric sciences including climatic research, oceanography, vulcanology, palaeoecology, other allied sciences)

1.5 Biological sciences (biology, botany, bacteriology, microbiology, zoology, entomology, genetics, biochemistry, biophysics, other allied sciences, excluding clinical and veterinary sciences)

2 ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

2.1 Civil engineering (architecture engineering, building science and engineering, construction engineering, municipal and structural engineering and other allied subjects)

2.2 Electrical engineering, electronics [electrical engineering, electronics, communication engineering and systems, computer engineering (hardware only) and other allied subjects]

2.3. Other engineering sciences (such as chemical, aeronautical and space, mechanical, metallurgical and materials engineering, and their specialised subdivisions; forest products; applied sciences such as

geodesy, industrial chemistry, etc.; the science and technology of food production; specialised technologies of interdisciplinary fields, e.g. systems analysis, metallurgy, mining, textile technology and other applied subjects)

3. MEDICAL SCIENCES

3.1 Basic medicine (anatomy, cytology, physiology, genetics, pharmacy, pharmacology, toxicology, immunology and immunohaematology, clinical chemistry, clinical microbiology, pathology)

3.2 Clinical medicine (anaesthesiology, paediatrics, obstetrics and gynaecology, internal medicine, surgery, dentistry, neurology, psychiatry, radiology, therapeutics, otorhinolaryngology, ophthalmology)

3.3 Health sciences (public health services, social medicine, hygiene, nursing, epidemiology)

4. AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES

4.1 Agriculture, forestry, fisheries and allied sciences (agronomy, animal husbandry, fisheries, forestry, horticulture, other allied subjects)

4.2 Veterinary medicine

5. SOCIAL SCIENCES

5.1 Psychology

5.2 Economics

5.3 Educational sciences (education and training and other allied subjects)

5.4 Other social sciences [anthropology (social and cultural) and ethnology, demography, geography (human, economic and social), town and country planning, management, law, linguistics, political sciences, sociology, organisation and methods, miscellaneous social sciences and interdisciplinary , methodological and historical S1T activities relating to subjects in this group. Physical anthropology, physical geography and psychophysiology should normally be classified with the natural sciences].

6. HUMANITIES

6.1 History (history, prehistory and history, together with auxiliary historical disciplines such as archaeology, numismatics, palaeography, genealogy, etc.)

6.2 Languages and literature (ancient and modern)

6.3 Other humanities [philosophy (including the history of science and technology) arts, history of art, art criticism, painting, sculpture, musicology, dramatic art excluding artistic "research" of any kind, religion, theology, other fields and subjects pertaining to the humanities, methodological, historical and other S1T activities relating to the subjects in this group]

4.4 Annexes

Annex 1: 'Enhancing reciprocity in international cooperation in research: issues and metrics' (**D1.2+D1.7**)
Annex 2: Mapping Australia´s research strengths from an international perspective (**D 1.3**)
Annex 3: Testing metrics of openness and reciprocity to international collaboration against existing Australian programmes (**D1.8**)
Annex 4: Reciprocity in international cooperation in science and innovation
Annex 5: Why successful international engagement in research is so critical to effective policy making by governments policy making by
Annex 6: Advisory board contact details