



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

D2.1 Report on implementation approaches

**Due date of deliverable: 1 April 2008
Actual submission date: 13th May 2008**

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 2: 02.05.08]

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

Table of contents

Management summary	3
1. Introduction	3
2. Summary	5
I. Position and status of the partners in complexity research funding	5
II. Funding Approaches and Legal and administrative considerations	5
III. Role of industry	5
IV. Networking activities	5
V. Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users	6
Table: Summary of issues for consideration for supporting joint activities	7
 3. Issues for consideration for supporting investigator driven research	 11
I. Position and status of the partners in complexity research funding	11
II. Funding Approaches and Legal and administrative considerations	12
III. Role of industry	26
 4. Issues for consideration for supporting challenge driven research	 26
IV. Networking activities	27
V. Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users	28
 5. Conclusions	 29
 Comparative tables:	 30
1. Networking activities	30
2. Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users	31
 Annexes*:	
 Questionnaire responses relating to Network support and supporting research from other disciplines and complexity users. It should be noted that detailed information relating to funding approaches by partners can be found in D1.1.	
I – Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC)	32
II – Fonds National de la Recherche Scientifique (FNRS)	37
III – Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MSTI)	40
IV – Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia (EAS)	44
V – General Secretariat for Research and Technology (GSRT)	47
VI – National Office for Research and Technology (NKTH)	51
VII – Irish Research Council for Science, Engineering and Technology (IRCSET)	54
VIII – Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR)	57
IX – Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek (NWO)	61
X – Fundacao para Ciencia e Tecnologia (FCT)	65
XI – Ministerio de Educacin y Ciencia (MEC)	68

*restricted to programme participants, including the Commission Services

Management Summary

In November 2007, partners in Complexity-NET, together with scientists in the Complexity field convened in Budapest. During the meeting the European Complexity Landscape was discussed. The final result of this meeting has been described in deliverable D2.2 of Complexity-NET. This deliverable reported the conclusion that the partners could best develop networking activities first, to build links between complexity researchers in different disciplines and to involve industry and business in research activities. This would then be followed by funding and training for research projects and PhD Schools. The investigator driven research should be: (a) focussed to specific themes, (b) multidisciplinary and (c) guided by user needs and real world challenges. In this document we have investigated possible limitations for the implementation of these activities. The key conclusions of this report are:

- (1) All partners can support some types of networking activities, but many activities cannot be funded by all of the partners. Workshops were identified as a mechanism for networking which all partners could support.
- (2) There are many similarities in the funding approaches for all partners but there are also some differences, resulting in a number of potential limitations to be overcome before any Complexity-NET activity is implemented. However, many of the issues should be easy to overcome through further discussion by the partners.
- (3) A key challenge for implementation of joint activities is that not all partners can provide funding.

1. Introduction

This report provides an overview of the possible practical limitations and possible solutions for joint Complexity-NET activities. It is based on the information provided by the partners in Deliverable D1.1 – 1.2 and the information provided in an additional questionnaire for Work package 2.1.

The additional questionnaire has been designed based on the suggested joint activities in Deliverable D2.2 and the description of work for Task 2.1 (Strategies and implementation options) of Work package 2 for Complexity-NET. The task description is as follows:

Based on the information on programme content, evaluation processes, tools for reporting and dissemination, the management approaches and the administrative procedures collected in WP1, the practical limitations and possible solutions for co-ordinated networking of national research activities (incl. mutual opening of national programmes) are analysed and described. The questionnaires completed in WP1 should aid discussions at this stage, and might need to be further developed to ensure a full understanding of Partner Country's requirements is achieved. A full analysis of comparisons between implementation processes, peer review and timescales for programme decisions will be made to enable an understanding of potential joint programme options. An overall view of IPR will also be discussed and considered.

The conclusions in D2.2 were:

1. Complexity Science research is of high relevance for industry and society and also has an important role to play in policy making.
2. However, the impact complexity science currently has on society is limited and therefore must be substantially improved.
3. Improving impact requires more research and training across traditional scientific disciplines and more contact with industry and the public service sector is also needed.

There were two basic directions suggested: (1) The challenge driven approach which is about improving the impact of complexity through the formation of stronger networks involving complexity scientists from a variety of discipline backgrounds and representatives from industry, business, the public service sector and other users of complexity science. (2) The investigator driven approach which is about providing a strong complexity science research base across Europe by encouraging scientists from different disciplines to work together and to teach complexity science to the next generation of researchers.

The consensus of the partners was that it would be most appropriate to first support the "challenge driven" approach, through networking activities, to help the complexity science community to become sufficiently networked and shaped to then successfully implement the "investigator driven" approach. The partners stipulated that investigator driven activities should be focussed around themes and be specifically for complexity research. In order to add value to existing mechanisms, the research should be truly multidisciplinary and have the involvement of industry and other users.

Comparative tables focusing on key issues are presented in D1.1 – 1.2 and in this document. They indicate essential differences and similarities. The additional information in this document has been collected in a set of tables and relates to:

- Networking activities, and
- Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users.

In consultation with the partners it was decided not to spend much time and effort on the mutual opening up of programmes at this point. The results of a workshop in Budapest, which are described in D2.2, do not suggest that the mutual opening up of programmes should be a high-priority activity.

The purpose of the present exercise is to prepare the partners for the work as described in Task 3.1. The objective of that Task is to formulate a joint action plan with the purpose to advance European cooperation between national complexity research and research-training activities and the dissemination and exploitation of their results.

2. Summary

There are 5 key areas where practical limitations may affect the Complexity-NET activities that the partners wish to pursue. In the table below, areas where differences between partners occur have been highlighted, solutions identified along with an assessment as to how easy the limitations will be to overcome. In sections 3 and 4, the limitations and potential solutions are explored in more detail.

I. Position and status of the partners in complexity research funding

The main limitations are that possibly not all partners can financially support the Complexity-NET activities and that some partners cannot make an independent decision about their participation in Complexity-NET activities.

In those cases funding will have to be sought elsewhere, possibly from other parties in their countries, the participants themselves or the other Complexity-NET partners.

Partners need to agree budgets for any joint activities.

II. Funding approaches, including administrative and legal considerations

It seems unlikely at this point that the differences between the partners regarding funding modes will pose serious limitations for joint Complexity-NET activities.

There are many differences between the partners regarding the way the applications are processed, and in the evaluation and decision-making processes. The main possible limitations are expected to lie in the evaluation and decision-making processes; however the limitations do not appear to be insurmountable.

The solutions to the limitations will probably depend on the type and subject of the Complexity-NET activity. For some of the issues a possible solution would be to have the councils follow their national rules in relation to their own funds (see specific issues). Many issues are considered likely to be solved relatively easily during further discussions between the partners.

The main possible limitations relating to legal and administrative considerations are expected to be related to regulations about conflicts of interests. However, these issues are likely to be overcome in further discussions between the partners.

III. Role of industry

From D2.2 it was concluded that it was crucial to involve industry, business, the public sector and other users of complexity science in any Complexity-NET activities. This is important to show how complexity science is relevant and useful for tackling real world challenges. In relation to this industrial and user involvement, limitations might be important; however it will depend on the type and subject of the Complexity-NET activity. The main limitation will be the participation of industry in some partner countries, having no experience or authority in this matter. Some partner countries cannot financially support industry involvement.

IV. Networking activities

In D2.2 it was concluded that networking could be an important activity to bring different disciplines and users together to add value to existing activity. The main concern in organising networking activities is the limited type of such activities which could be supported by all partners, simultaneously. The only network mechanism that all partners

can support is workshops. In WP3, partners will need to consider further whether this limitation prevents networks being a feasible activity for Complexity-NET to pursue.

V. Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users

In order to allow real world challenges to be addressed, multidisciplinary research groups need to work together, with users providing significant input to the research projects. This was a crucial conclusion of the European Landscape study. The main limitations in this section are the limited options different partners have to support the different groups (researchers from discipline backgrounds other than the physical sciences, representatives from industry, business, the public service sector and other users of complexity science) and their expected participation. Other important possible limitations are strict funding systems and peer review, which are often oriented towards traditional disciplines and can prevent interdisciplinary collaborations.

Table: Summary of issues for consideration for supporting joint activities

Issue	Importance	Possible Solutions identified	Ease of Resolution (E = easy to resolve/M = may require effort to resolve /H = hard to resolve)
I. Position/Status of Partners			
1 Not all partners have a budget	High	1. Obtain support from other sources within their country	H
2 Supporting Complexity-NET activities is not a priority for the partner	High	2. Researchers support themselves 3. Other partners provide support	H
3 Partners are not budget holders	Medium - High	1. Partners make the case to budget holders to support Complexity-NET activities	H
II. Funding approaches			
II.1 Application			
4 Partners have different funding modes, but all partners can fund via project and themes	Low	1. Joint activities should be project-based or thematic	E
5 Continuous application or Managed call	Low	1. Partners agree that Complexity-NET activities will be awarded through managed call(s)	E
6 Language of applications	Medium	1. All application forms will be in English and all applications submitted will be in English. If national rules, require it, applications can also be submitted in the national language	E
7 Guidance for applicants	Low-medium	1. Guidance and specific application forms for the specific Complexity-NET activities are used 2. Partners agree on what information is needed in the application – different partners can request different information if necessary	E
8 Method of application submission	Medium	1. Partners agree to an electronic submission system. Hard copies can be requested by	E

			countries who also require signatures	
--	--	--	---------------------------------------	--

II.2 Evaluation

9	Project Evaluation Criteria	Medium	1. Partners to agree on the criteria (and their relative importance) for evaluating specific Complexity-NET activities	M
10	Evaluation procedures for proposals	High	1. Partners agree to a comprehensive peer review process i.e. by postal peer review, response by applicant and ranking by an international panel. Partners agree to allow an independent panel to rank the proposals whilst funding bodies will have final decision as to whether to fund or not	E
11	Guidance for evaluators	Medium	1. Guidance for the specific Complexity-NET activities is used	E
12	Specific evaluation forms	Medium	1. An evaluation form for the specific Complexity-NET activities is used	E
13	Evaluator objectivity	Low	1. Partners agree on a definition of conflict of interest 2. Partners agree that evaluators are asked to declare any conflicts of interest beforehand	M
14	Number of Evaluations	Low	1. Partners agree on the number of evaluations required for a Complexity-NET activity 2. Partners agree on whether evaluators should be national or international	M
15	Identity of evaluators	Low-medium	1. Partners agree that all evaluators are anonymous	E
16	Evaluator payment	Low	1. Partners agree on suitable remuneration for evaluators	M
17	Interim evaluation procedures for funded projects	Medium-High	1. Partners agree whether mid-term reviews are required for all Complexity-NET activities and what should happen should those reviews be failed OR 2. Partners take the advice of an external body who evaluates the project	M
18	Final evaluation procedures for funded projects	Medium-High	1. Partners agree that scientific final reports will be expected to be submitted at the end of the	E

			project and will be assessed by peer review	
19	Guidance for final scientific report	Low-medium	1. Guidance for the specific Complexity-NET activities is used	E
20	Final reports	Medium	1. Partners to agree on the nature of the scientific and financial reports required for the projects	M
II.3 Funding/Budgets				
21	Funding decisions	Low-medium	1. The final funding decision will lie with the national decision-making bodies of the partners participating in the Complexity-NET activity	E
22	Publicising the funding decision	Low-Medium	1. Partners agree to publicise successful projects but not the rank ordered list	E
23	Cutting budgets requested	Medium	1. Allow budgets to be cut before awarding the grant OR 2. Ask applicants to fully justify the resources they are requesting and then take this into account when ranking the proposal. If the requested budget is not well justified, the proposal is ranked lower as a result	H
24	Follow on funding	Medium	1. Partners agree that the success of one Complexity-NET project will influence the funding of further Complexity-NET projects	M
25	Eligible costs	Low	1. Partners agree on what costs applicants can ask for OR 2. Different partners fund different costs 3. Partners agree on a minimal level of funding per grant	M
26	Eligibility for funding	Low	1. Partners agree that national rules for eligibility for applying for funding will apply to Complexity-NET activities	E
27	Flexible funding	Low	1. Partners agree that national rules apply as to whether funds can be used for other purposes than for those originally planned OR 2. Partners agree that funds are only used for their original intentions	M
28	Moving of funds	Low	1. Partners agree that researchers cannot take their funds with them if they move OR 2. Partners agree that a decision as to whether a	M

			researcher can take their funds with them when they move is made on a case by case basis	
29	Funding foreign institutes	Low	1. Partners fund researchers in their own country only, unless national rules allow funding of foreign institutes	E
30	Knowledge Transfer procedures	Low	1. Partners agree that valorisation of knowledge is the responsibility of the project owner and his/her university	M
31	IPR	Low-medium	1. Partners agree that IPR lies with the institution and/or researcher	E

III - V Dissemination, Industry Participation and Multidisciplinary collaboration

32	Utilisation and dissemination of final report information	Low	1. Partners should use scientific reports to assess the success of Complexity-NET 2. Partners will disseminate information through the Complexity-NET and other websites 3. The researchers will be encouraged to disseminate their work widely	E
33	Industry participation	Medium	1. Partners agree on nature of industrial participation, depending on specific activities	M
34	Network support	High	1. All partners can support workshops 2. Users (industry and business) should fund their own involvement 3. Partners must find a way to support researchers from other disciplines	M

3. Issues for Consideration for Supporting Investigator Driven Research

The following section is an overview of the possible limitations that need to be considered before undertaking any activity by Complexity-NET. The information was derived from the individual questionnaires that the partners responded to in WP1, as well as additional information requested by the Task Leaders. Solutions to the issues are also recommended.

I. Position and status of the partners in complexity research funding

1. Not all partners have an own budget. They cannot support any Complexity-NET activities¹ financially.

[importance: high]

- EAS: is not a funding body, i.e. has no budget for directly funding research
- NKTH: does not have an own budget
- CNR: ISC budget is for the institute only, but financial support to Complexity-NET activities can in principle be discussed

Possible solution(s):

1. *these partners will try to convince other parties in their countries to act as a source of funding*
2. *researchers from their countries pay for their own participation in any activity*
3. *perhaps the other partners can pay (for part of) the participation of researchers from their countries*

2. For the majority of partners there is no priority for complexity research in their organisations. Therefore, they might not be able to support any Complexity-NET activities financially. Additionally, depending on the activity, they might not be able to provide sufficient funding.

[importance: high]

- FNRS, MSTI, EAS, GSRT, NKTH, IRCSET, FCT: no priorities for complexity research

Possible solution(s):

1. *these partners will try to convince other parties in their country to act as a source of funding*
2. *researchers from their countries pay for their own participation in any activity*
3. *perhaps the other partners can pay (for part of) the participation of researchers from their countries*

3. Not all partners are budget holders that make their own decisions. Therefore, they might not be able to decide on their participation in any Complexity-NET activity. The decision on items funded through any Complexity-NET activity might (also) be out of their hands.

[importance: medium – high]

- MSTI: independent councils decide
- EAS: the Ministry decides
- NKTH: RTIC decides
- CNR: the Ministry and the President of CNR decide (the institute also decides, but on a budget that is for the institute only)

¹ Activities funded under Complexity-NET, outside the scope of the Description of Work, i.e. outside the scope of the contribution by the European Commission.

Possible solution(s):

1. *the partners do their best to convince their decision making bodies of the need to participate in the activity*
2. *regarding the items funded through any Complexity-NET activity, the partners might be able to convince their decision making bodies to agree that the decision on the national level will follow a recommendation by a separate body. This body is created to make a recommendation for funding to the national partners.*

II. Funding approaches and Legal and Administrative considerations

Application Procedure

4. Not each partner currently offers all the funding modes (project-based, laboratory-based, person-based, thematic, non-thematic and core strategic). [importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, pages 20 – 21

Similarities:

- For all partners project-based and thematic funding are possible

5. There are small differences regarding whether partners have special calls or funds can be applied for continuously, the number of calls per year, the deadlines for the call, the time it takes on average from application to decision, and whether there are any standards for the length of the application to award process.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 26

Similarities:

- All partners have special calls.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to have (a) special call(s). They could also agree on the deadline for the call and a standard for the length of the application to award process. Depending on the type of call, it is likely to take longer than national calls of the same type. If it is agreed to have more than one call, the partners could agree on the frequency of the calls.*

6. There are differences in the language in which the application forms are available and in which the applications are required.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 27
- For GSRT and MEC the application forms are not available in English

Similarities:

- Except FNRS all partners (sometimes) require applications to be in English

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners provide any application forms in English. If their national rules require it, the partners also provide the application form in their national language.*

7.i. There are differences in the instructions given to the applicants to prepare the proposal.

[importance: low – medium]

- FNRS and FCT have not specified the instructions they give to the applicants to prepare the proposal.

Similarities:

- All partners have a special application form.

Possible solution(s):

1. *When the partners have agreed on all the details of the Complexity-NET activity the appropriate instructions (including a special application form) will be given to the applicants.*

7.ii. There are differences in the items that are required in the applications for each partner.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 27

Similarities:

- All partners require a project description and a research plan
- Except IRCSET all partners require a budget plan

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree which items they want to require in a Complexity-NET activity. Should any partner require an item, which the other partners do not want to require, then the partners can follow the national rules, i.e. different partners can require different additional items.*

8. There are great differences between partners regarding the way in which proposals can be submitted (electronically through an internet form, by email or on paper).

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 28
- GSRT requires the signature of the applicant to be on the application

Similarities:

- Except NKTH none of the partners ask applicants to submit proposals electronically by e-mail

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to require applicants to submit their proposals electronically through an internet form. One of the application submission systems, that are in place for some partners, could be (adapted and) used. The proposals could then be accessed by all partners in for example a Microsoft Sharepoint environment. Partners that require a signature on the application can require of their national applicants to send in a signed copy of the application also.*

Evaluation Procedure

9.i. There are differences in the (emphasis on the) proposal and project evaluation criteria used.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 35

Similarities:

To assess proposals:

- For all partners the following criteria are important: the feasibility of the research plan, the scientific quality of the research team, the competence of the applicant
- The scientific method is important for all partners except NKTH
- The potential impact of the research is important for all partners except NWO
- Gender factors are not important except for FNRS

To evaluate completed projects:

- For all partners the following criteria are important: success in generating new information, scientific impacts, knowledge generated by the project
- The criterion 'objectives of the project were achieved' is important for all partners except EAS
- The criterion 'other results like patents, proto-types, etc.' is important for all partners except CNR

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on the proposal and project evaluation criteria, these will depend on the type and subject of the Complexity-NET activity.*

9.ii. There are differences between the partners regarding other issues and criteria besides scientific quality which are considered in the decision-making process.

[importance: low – medium]

- A part of MSTI also considers the scientific relevance and the scientific impact
- EAS also considers the critical mass and the relevance
- NKTH also considers the equal regional distribution of funded research projects, the potential contributions of project outputs to boost competitiveness of the Hungarian economy and innovation system, and economic and social utilization of the planned outputs
- IRCSET also considers the research potential of the applicant, the host lab suitability, the potential success of the project, the mobility of the applicant and the impact
- At CNR arguments of general strategy can play a role

Similarities:

- Most partners also consider the amount of funds and the evaluation criteria (see above and Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2)

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on the project evaluation criteria, these will depend on the type and subject of the Complexity-NET activity. Naturally, the amount of funds could also be considered in the decision-making process.*

10.i. There are fairly large differences in the evaluation procedure (peer review, panel review, international evaluators, etc.).

[importance: high]

- In FCT the ranking of the proposals is done by an international panel, the panel can ask for reviews from outside experts if their expertise does not cover all the received applications
- At FNRS, GSRT and IRCSET (postgraduate call) the applications go directly to the (international) scientific committees that will make the final recommendation to the decision-making body.
- EAS (Centres of Excellence programme) has a two-stage, international evaluation procedure
- At MSTI, if the requested budget is below a certain limit, the applications are evaluated by members of the research council (otherwise peer review is used)
- At IRCSET (postdoctoral call) the international evaluation panel consists of postal assessors.
- At CNR project are submitted to the institute's director and then to the Governing Board, there is typically an internal evaluation
- At NKTH an application is only sent to the evaluation body if the reviewers have assessed the quality of the application to lie above a certain threshold

Similarities:

- The most frequently used evaluation procedure consists of peer review followed by the ranking of the proposals by a panel / committee.

Possible solution(s):

1. *Depending on the type of activity, the partners could agree to use peer review followed by a rebuttal by the applicant, and the ranking of all applications by an international panel. The international panel could consist of the peer reviewers or of other independent, international experts.*

10.ii. There are differences between the partners regarding who does the ranking of the proposals.

[importance: high]

- At MSTI and EAS the ranking is done by the decision body

Similarities:

- For most partners the ranking is done by a review panel, the decision body has the right to modify the ranking

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that the ranking will be done by a review panel. If the option of a 'Complexity-NET activity Board' (see above) is chosen, this body could have the right to modify the ranking.*

10.iii. There are differences in the way the applications are processed after they are received.

[importance: medium – high]

- CNR situation: in most cases researchers apply for a budget related to a project and the CNR management (with possible intermediate committees) decides. For ISC the director has the authority to certain assignments.

Similarities:

- In general the proposals are sent to external referees (after registration and an administrative check on formal criteria). Subsequently, an (international) evaluation body ranks the applications based on the referee reports. The ranking is the final recommendation to the decision-making body.

10.iv. There are minor differences between the partners whether the applicants receive the evaluations or not, and whether they then receive the full evaluations or only summaries of the evaluations.

[importance: medium – high]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 31
- For NWO it is a requirement to send the applicants the full evaluations

Similarities:

- Except for FNRS and GSRT all partners send the evaluations to the applicants. For FNRS there are no legal or national rules which do not permit the evaluations to be sent to the applicants.
- Most partners send the applicants the full evaluations.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to send the applicants the full evaluations.*

10.v. There are differences between the partners regarding whether or not the applicants are allowed to improve their proposal before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation (or comment on the evaluation).

[importance: medium – high]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 32
- EPSRC and NWO allow the applicants to comment on the evaluation before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation

Similarities:

- None of the partners allow the applicants to improve their proposal before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation, except in some cases at CNR

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that they will not allow applicants to improve their proposal before decision-making on the basis of the evaluation, but that they will allow them to comment on the evaluation by means of a written rebuttal.*

11. There are differences in the kind of instructions the reviewers are given.

[importance: medium]

- There was no response from FNRS
- MSTI, CNR, FCT and MEC have not really specified the instructions given to the reviewers
- EPSRC has very extensive instructions for the reviewers

Similarities:

- The instructions typically cover: a short description of the different steps of the procedure after receiving the applications, an explanation of the rating scale of the criteria / categories, an explanation of what to do in case of a possible conflict of interest, the standard evaluation form

Possible solution(s):

1. *When the partners have agreed on all the details of the Complexity-NET activity the appropriate instructions (including a special evaluation form) will be given to the reviewers.*

12. There are differences in the specific evaluation forms used.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 29
- MSTI, FNRS, CNR, FCT and MEC have not sent in their specific evaluation form
- EAS has two (mostly similar) forms, one for the reviewers and one for the committee
- NKTH (Ányos Jedlik Programme) gives the reviewers the opportunity to ask the applicants questions in duly defined cases, when clarification might enhance the chances of the project to get funding. The evaluation criteria are not listed in their evaluation form.
- GSRT and IRCSET apply weights to the different main criteria

Similarities:

- All partners have a standard evaluation form.
- In almost all evaluation forms the evaluation criteria are listed
- In most evaluation forms the reviewer is asked to inform the partner if he / she feels he / she has a conflict of interest with the applicant / application

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to use a standard evaluation form which includes the proposal evaluation criteria and their weights and an explanation of what to do in case the reviewer has a conflict of interest with the applicant / application.*

13.i. There are differences in the way in which the objectivity of the proposal evaluators is ensured (explicit declaration of no conflict of interest or clarification of linkage before appointment).

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 28

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to aim for clarification of linkage before appointment and to require an explicit declaration of no conflict of interest after appointment.*

13.ii. There are differences between the partners regarding the kinds of administrative regulations they have concerning conflict of interest.

[importance: medium – high]

- FNRS has regulations applied by the universities

Similarities:

- Most partners have regulations to determine any conflicts of interest, often the evaluators are asked to sign a statement stating that he / she has no conflict of interest regarding the proposal

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to make regulations for the Complexity-NET activity concerning conflict of interest, based on the national regulations of the partners.*

13.iii. There are differences between the partners regarding their definitions of 'conflict of interest' and how it is ensured that the reviewer / decision maker / administrator does not have a conflict of interest with the applicant.

[importance: medium – high]

- No answer was received from FNRS
- GSRT and IRCSET seem to have the least restrictive regulations. GSRT only requires that the evaluator has not submitted a proposal in the same programme and the same scientific area as the applicant. IRCSET only considers it a conflict of interest if the evaluator has worked with the applicant or his / her supervisor or within the same institution as the applicant.

Similarities:

- Most partners consider it a conflict of interest when the evaluator has (recently had) a personal or scientific relationship with the applicant / research group or if the evaluator has a personal or financial interest in the outcome of the matter

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on a common definition of 'conflict of interest', based on the national definitions of the partners. Evaluators could be required to sign a statement stating that he / she has no conflict of interest regarding the proposal / applicant.*

14. There are fairly large differences in the number of evaluators per application. There are only small differences on whether the evaluators are national or international, and whether foreign evaluators are allowed or not.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 29

Similarities:

- Except IRCSET, all partners (sometimes) allow national evaluators.
- For all partners the evaluators are (sometimes) international.
- Foreign evaluators are allowed by all partners.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on the number of evaluators. The required number will likely depend on the type of Complexity-NET activity and the evaluation process. The partners could also agree on using evaluators from both partner and non-partner countries.*

15. There are differences in whether the evaluators are anonymous or not.

[importance: low – medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 29

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that the individual reviewers of proposals remain anonymous, as this is the case for all partners except FNRS and MSTI. The partners can agree whether they want the panel members to remain anonymous or not (if applicable).*

16. There are great differences in the payment of the evaluators.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 28

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on appropriate payment for the evaluators. Perhaps this payment could be made out of the EC budget for Complexity-NET.*

17.i. There are differences between the partners regarding what happens if the funded project does not progress in the planned or desired way.

[importance: medium – high]

- At MSTI negotiations will take place, at IRCSET they may take place
- At EAS the project is suspended
- GSRT may ask for some funds to be returned
- At CNR and NWO it has (almost) never led to the ending of the project
- At MEC the funds are reduced

Similarities:

- Most partners either end the funding or alter the project plans (according to recommendation of the body that evaluates the progress and / or President)

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on what should happen in case a project does not progress in the planned or desired way. An option would be to follow the national rules on this point.*
2. *Another option would be to follow the recommendation of the body that evaluates the progress.*

17.ii. There are differences in who carries out the intermediate and final project evaluation.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 34

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on who carries out each of the project evaluations.*
2. *For one or both types of project evaluation the national rules can be applied to the national parts of the proposals.*

17.iii. There are minor differences in the frequency of the intermediate project evaluation and the form of the evaluation.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 33

Similarities:

- All partners (sometimes) conduct intermediate project evaluations, for all partners this is (sometimes) done in the form of progress reports.
- Except IRCSET none of the partners use questionnaires for this purpose.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on the frequency of conducting intermediate project evaluation and to use progress reports. If some partners require progress reports more frequently, then they can require these of their national applicants.*

18.i. There are large differences between partners in the way the scientific final reports (or the outcomes of the research) are processed and evaluated.

[importance: medium – high]

- EAS has not specified the way scientific final reports are evaluated (on this point they have no experience yet in the Centers of Excellence programme)

- CNR and NWO have no real evaluation of the scientific final reports

Similarities:

- Most often the scientific final reports are evaluated by peer review or by a panel / advisory committee

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to have the scientific final reports evaluated by peer review and / or a panel.*

18.ii. There are small differences between the partners in the way scientific progress and financial matters of the projects are followed up.

[importance: low]

- For a part of MSTI the follow-up of projects consists of midterm scientific seminars
- From CNR the situation is fluid and major changes may be introduced in the near future
- For FCT the follow-up of projects consists of site-visits in addition to reports
- For FNRS, NKTH and NWO (for larger projects) the reports are sent to evaluators or an 'evaluation body'

Similarities:

- All partners request final scientific and financial reports, periodical intermediate scientific and financial reports are also often requested.

Possible solution(s):

- *The partners could agree to request intermediate and final scientific and financial reports.*

18.iii. There are minor differences in the material used for the final project evaluation and whether self-assessment is used as a tool to evaluate project performance.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 34

Similarities:

- All partners use scientific and financial reports.
- Except IRCSET none of the partners use questionnaires as part of the final project evaluation.

Possible solution(s):

The partners could agree to use scientific and financial reports and not to use self-assessment.

19. There are differences between the partners regarding what kinds of instructions the researchers are given for preparing the scientific report.

[importance: low – medium]

- There was no response from FNRS, whilst FCT and MEC have not specified their instructions
- At CNR, researchers are asked to explain the general results, to list the relevant publications as well as other products (such as prototypes, software etc.), and to mention the possible collaborations.
- EAS does not use a standard report form
- GSRT requires researchers to describe in detail how much of the proposed work was accomplished, to provide a list of all the papers resulting from the project and to give an account of the dissemination of the results through international meeting, and the education of younger researchers trained
- NKTH requires researchers to summarize the results of former reporting periods, to list the tasks, their status and their results, to list the publications and patents, and to fill in time sheets

- IRCSET requires researchers to describe the progress to date and the workplan for the next 12 months, and to list the conference presentations and publications
- NWO requires researchers to send in copies of the thesis (for a PhD project), a financial report and to give a laymen's summary of the project. This final report must be submitted through their electronic grant application system

Similarities:

- Most partners give the researchers a standard report form

Possible solution(s):

1. *Depending on the final scientific and financial reports required the partners could give the researchers the appropriate instructions.*

20. There are small differences between the partners regarding what kinds of final scientific and financial reports are required for the project.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 35
- NKTH requires a monitoring report with the standard and project specific indicators in addition to the final scientific and financial report
- At EAS the final scientific report should include a list of publications
- At IRCSET the final report should contain some information on the career plans of the student if possible
- At NWO the final report should include an overview of the deliverables and products, etc.

Similarities:

- All partners require a final scientific and financial report

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on the kinds of final scientific and financial reports are required for the projects. Partners may have national rules that require additional information, these partners could request the necessary additional information from their national project participants.*

Funding and Budgets

21.i. There are small differences between the partners regarding how the decision-making is prepared.

[importance: high]

- The question in the questionnaire was interpreted differently by different partners

Similarities:

- For most partners the decision-making process is prepared by the evalution body (ranking) and someone from within the agency that takes the ranking and the available budget into consideration

Possible solution(s):

1. *One option could be that the partners could decide to make a special body (a 'Complexity-NET activity Board') which prepares a funding proposal for the national decision-bodies based on the ranking of the evaluation body and the available national budgets.*

21.ii. There are fairly large differences between the partners regarding who decides on funding.

[importance: low – medium]

- At EPSRC the Head of Programme decide
- At GSRT the General Secretary decides
- At NKTH the President decides
- IRCSET and CNR seem to have misinterpreted the question in the questionnaire

- At FCT the Board of FCT and the Minister decide
- At MEC the (evaluation) panel decides
- At all other partners the (Board of the) Council decides

Possible solution(s):

1. *The final funding decision will most likely have to lie with the national decision-bodies of the partners participating in the Complexity-NET activity. The decision-making process before the final funding decision will likely depend on the type of Complexity-NET activity. One option could be that the partners could decide to make a special body (a 'Complexity-NET activity Board') which prepares a funding proposal for the national decision-bodies based on the ranking of the evaluation body and the available national budgets.*

22. There are small differences between the partners regarding the sense in which the evaluation and decision are confidential.

[importance: low – medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 32
- Some partners (e.g. EPSRC and MSTI) have national legal rules allowing anyone to request the information

Similarities:

- All partners make the funding decision public.
- Except for EPSRC and GSRT none of the partners make the ranking public.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree not to make the ranking public, but to make the funding decision public. The partners could agree to make the results of the evaluation public or not.*

23. There are differences between the partners regarding whether the applicants are allocated as much funds as applied for or whether the budgets are cut. There are also differences between the percentages by which the budgets are cut and whether when cutting the budget there is any negotiation with the applicant.

[importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, pages 32 and 33

Similarities:

- Except EPSRC and NWO all partners *may* cut the budgets.
- Except EAS and IRCSET all partners *may* allocate the applicants as much funds as they have applied for.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to allocate the applicants as much funds as applied for or not. If they agree to allow cuts in the requested budgets, the partners could agree to ask for an advise on an appropriate budget in the evaluation process, and to follow this advise.*
2. *The partners could agree that instead of cutting the requested budget, a proposal is ranked lower in the ranking resulting from the evaluation process if the requested budget is not well motivated.*

24. There are differences between partners regarding how the success of the project influences the further funding of the applicant.

[importance: medium]

- EPSRC does not consider research proposals from an applicant who was the Principal Investigator on a grant where there is an overdue final report
- At FNRS and MEC the success of the project influences the further funding of the applicant, at FNRS the final report of the first two year period is used to determine the funds granted for the second two year period

Similarities:

- For most partners the success of the project does not have a (large) influence on the further funding of the applicant, it only has an indirect influence as it influences the reputation of the researcher (group)

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to decide on how the success of the project should influence the further funding of the applicant after the first Complexity-NET activity.*

25.i. There are differences in the costs / expenses that are eligible for funding for each partner.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 23

Similarities:

- For all partners scientific instrumentation and travel and subsistence are costs / expenses that are eligible for funding
- Except for IRCSET for all partners temporary scientific personnel and administrative / technical personnel are costs / expenses that can be eligible for funding

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that for each applicant in the Complexity-NET activity, the rules of their national funding agency for the eligibility of costs apply, i.e., within the Complexity-NET activity different partners may fund different costs.*

25.ii. Some partners might require a minimum amount of funding per grant.

[importance: low]

- MSTI, NKTH, IRCSET and NWO have minimum amounts of funding (for specific programmes)

26.i. There are differences in the types of researchers that can apply for funding / be funded for each partner.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 24

Similarities:

- All partners can fund researchers at public (state) universities and foreign researchers
- Except CNR all partners can fund researchers from other public research institutions

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that for each applicant in the Complexity-NET activity, the rules of their national funding agency for the eligibility of types of researchers apply, i.e., within the Complexity-NET activity different partners may grant funding to different types of researchers.*

26.ii. There are minor differences in who is formally the applicant.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 25

Similarities:

- For all partners the researcher is / researcher groups are (sometimes) formally the applicant.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that for any Complexity-NET activity the researcher is / researcher groups are formally the applicant.*

26.iii. There are large differences between the partners regarding whether they have gender requirements in relation to scientists involved with research proposals or not.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 31

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to have or not to have any gender requirements for scientists in the Complexity-NET activity.*

27.i. Not all partners have fixed amounts of funding, e.g., fixed salary categories for persons.

[importance: low]

- NKTH does not have any fixed amounts of funding

Possible solution(s):

1. *For any Complexity-NET activity fixed amounts of funding could be agreed.*
2. *The partners could agree to follow the national rules on fixed amounts of funding. In that case NKTH could decide on its fixed amounts of funding for their national applicants in the Complexity-NET activity.*

27.ii. There are great differences regarding whether the funds can be used for other purposes than for those originally planned.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 24

Similarities:

- In case the funds may be used for other purposes than for those originally planned, all partners require negotiations with their organisations.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to follow the national rules on this point.*
2. *The partners could agree not to allow the funds to be used for other purposes than those originally planned, or to allow it, but require negotiations with the corresponding partners.*

28. There are some differences between the partners regarding whether a researcher can take his / her funding with him / her if he / she moves to another university / institute / country.

[importance: low]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 26

Similarities:

- Except EAS all partners allow a researcher to take his / her funding with him / her if he / she moves to another university / institute / country in some specific cases.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree that they do not allow researchers to take their funding with them when they move.*
2. *The partners could agree that they allow researchers to take their funding with them when they move to another national institution (on a case by case basis).*

29.i. There are small differences between the partners regarding the kinds of national legislation and regulations they have concerning granting research funding to foreign institutes / foreign persons.

[importance: low]

- No answer was received from FNRS
- MSTI has possibilities for delegating the decision making and granting to foreign institutes

- At CNR it can usually be done within specific agreements, such as participation to CERN, ESFR and large facilities
- At NWO there is a mutual understanding with other councils for joint evaluation

Similarities:

- Most partners can grant funding to foreign persons as long as they are working / will work at an eligible institute in the country of the partner during the term of the grant. They cannot grant funding to foreign research institutes or foreign persons working at those institutes.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners only fund foreign persons who work in the country of the partner*

29.ii. There are small differences between the partners regarding the administrative regulations they have concerning granting funding to foreign institutes / foreign persons.

[importance: low]

- At MSTI it has to be approved one a case by case basis by the minister
- GSRT has no administrative regulations concerning this point
- IRCSET increments the value of the expenses portion of the scholarship by the difference between the cost of non EU and EU fees
- At CNR it depends on the specific situation and agreements

Similarities:

- Most partners have administrative regulations stating who is eligible for funding. There are other regulations but these are national regulations or regulations of the host institution.

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners agree on eligibility requirements for funding for any joint activities supported by Complexity-NET*

30. There are differences between the partners regarding the procedure of valorisation of the knowledge obtained in the research.

[importance: medium]

- No answer was received from FNRS
- Projects funded by some council(s) at MSTI are required to share / transfer knowledge to industry
- At NKTH larger projects must have a plan for valorisation and economic application of their results when applying for funding
- CNR has patent offices

Similarities:

- Most often the partners do not have a procedure of valorisation of the knowledge obtained in the research, it is often considered the responsibility of the applicant or his / her university

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to consider the procedure of valorisation of the knowledge obtained in the research to be the responsibility of the applicant or his / her university.*

31. There are fairly large differences between the partners regarding their IPR policies. [importance: low – medium]

- At NKTH universities must have a 'code of IPR' if they want to apply for funding and each consortium involving research partners should elaborate and sign its own IPR agreement
- IRCSET has national guidelines which were drawn up by the funding agencies in Ireland

- CNR has complex regulations which might change soon
- NWO undertakes the exploitation of patent right relating to their projects, possibly by mutual agreement with the host institution. Financial returns will normally be shared equally between the institution and the research team(s) for use in funding further research

Similarities:

- Most partners delegate the responsibility to the funded institution / researcher and make no claim on IPR

Possible solution(s):

1. *Partners agree that the responsibility for IPR for any joint activities lies with the funded institution/researcher.*

32.i. There are fairly large differences between the partners regarding the kind of information available to the general public.

[importance: low]

- NKTH sometimes holds conferences where researchers can present their results to the press and the general public
- IRCSET does not provide scientific results in PR
- At FCT the names of the applicants at the titles of the proposals are publicly available during the evaluation

Similarities:

- Most partners (are required to) provide information on their funding schemes, funded projects, evaluation panels, exciting discoveries and their events on their websites

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to make knowledge derived from Complexity-NET funded research available and accessible for public use. They could also agree on which other information they want to make available to the general public.*

32.ii. There are differences between the partners regarding how the information in scientific reports is utilised.

[importance: low]

- EPSRC uses the information also to assess their own research and training portfolio
- For FNRS, FCT and MEC further funding can depend on the information in the scientific reports
- EAS uses the information to estimate the capacity of the performing organisation
- IRCSET does not really use the information in the scientific reports

Similarities:

- Often the information in the scientific reports is used for (annual) reports on the activities of the partners, PR activities and dissemination

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to use the information for Complexity-NET and national reports, PR activities and dissemination. The information could also be used to assess the success of the Complexity-NET activity.*

32.iii. There are differences between the partners regarding how dissemination of the research results is organised.

[importance: low]

- No answer was received from FNRS
- GSRT and NWO provide information on their websites whenever possible, at MSTI a website for the dissemination of research results is under construction
- GSRT publishes annual reports on their programmes and their results

- At NKTH the dissemination of the research results is organised through publications and public and press conferences

Similarities:

- Most partners do not organise the dissemination of the research results themselves, but consider it the responsibility of the applicant or his / her university

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree to organise the dissemination of the research results by providing information on their website.*
2. *The partners could agree to consider the dissemination of the research results the responsibility of the applicant or his / her university.*

III. Role of industry

33.i. There are differences between the partners on whether industry participates in their programme design and on whether they have specific requirements in relation to industry participation. [importance: medium]

- See Deliverable 1.1 – 1.2, page 36

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on whether they would like industry to participate in the design of the Complexity-NET activity and, if so, on the specific requirements in relation to their participation. This will depend on the subject of the activity.*

33.ii. There are large differences between the partners on how industry is involved. [importance: medium]

- No answer was received from EAS
- EPSRC has several projects and programmes where industry is involved
- At FNRS, FCT and MEC there is no involvement of industry, at MEC the involvement of industries is with research groups in universities through the transfer of technology
- At IRCSET and NWO researchers can carry out their research in an industrial environment and industry can be involved in the supervision of these projects

Similarities:

- Most often if industries are involved they participate in funding (cash / in kind)

Possible solution(s):

1. *The partners could agree on how they would like industry to be involved, this will likely depend on the subject and type of Complexity-NET activity.*

4. Issues for Consideration for Supporting Challenge Driven Research

In D2.2 it is proposed to first develop the “challenge driven” approach:

The challenge driven approach: This approach is about improving the impact of complexity through the formation of stronger networks involving complexity scientists from a variety of discipline backgrounds and representatives from industry, business, the public service sector and other users of complexity science. A two way flow of communication is needed so that users can articulate “real world” challenges and complexity scientists can demonstrate how they can help solve them.

(...)

The "challenge driven" scenario can be implemented by funding networking activities involving complexity scientists across all disciplines, industry, business and the public service sector. This will encourage complexity researchers to cross barriers towards industrial collaborations. It is important not to immediately expect research projects to come out of the networking activities, but rather allow time to enable the partners to get to know and understand each other.

Complexity-NET should really be able to make an impact in Europe using this approach.

Networking activities will be crucial and can take many forms, for example: workshops, match making, "science dating", career visits, summer schools, news letters, project offices etc., all helping in building real collaborations and strengthen links. It will be important that the networks are as inclusive as possible, attracting academics from all relevant disciplines and users from all relevant industry sectors, both private and public. New complexity networks should be encouraged to make the most of the many initiatives already implemented by Complexity-NET as well as by others. Although the envisaged network activities do not include research projects or a full Ph.D. education, effective networks still require substantial funding.

Therefore the additional questionnaire focussed on networking activities and supporting researchers from other disciplines and complexity users. The responses from the partners to this questionnaire are included with this report.

IV. Networking activities

34.i. There are differences in the types of suggested networking activities that the partners would be able to support.

[importance: high]

- See page 30
- NKTH would not be able to support project offices because they cannot fund operating costs
- IRCSET cannot fund some suggested networking activities because of overhead concerns or because they expect a low level volume of companies initially participating
- MEC cannot fund some suggested networking activities because these activities are funded by the EU or project offices

Similarities:

- All partners would be able to support workshops
- Most partners would be able to support career visits

34.ii. There are differences in the experiences the partners have supporting networking activities.

[importance: medium]

- See page 31
- EPSRC has a best practice guide for networks
- Part of MSTI supports types of (often regional) networks which are focussed on technology
- NKTH recently launched a National Technology Platform Programme

Similarities:

- Most partners have experience with various types of networking activities, such as workshops, symposia, conferences, seminars, scientific meetings, travelgrants, visitorgrants and bilateral collaborations

V. Supporting researchers from other disciplines & complexity users

As supporting multidisciplinary research projects was a key recommendation in D2.2 by the Complexity-NET partners, it is crucial to consider how academics from other disciplines can be supported in any Complexity-NET activity. There are fairly large differences between the partners regarding whether they can support researchers from other discipline backgrounds, representatives from industry, business or the public service sector and other users of complexity science, both for networking activities and research projects. The summary of responses by the partners given to the question relating to funding these people is given in the tables on pages 30 & 31.

However there are also similarities, for example most partners can support researchers from a variety of academic disciplines, even if they cannot support *all* academic disciplines. FNRS, MSTI, GSRT and MEC have no barriers to supporting interdisciplinary collaboration. For other countries, there may not be any *actual* barriers to supporting such collaborations, but existing peer review procedures, a lack of interdisciplinary expert reviewers and perceptions of interdisciplinary research tend to make it difficult *in practice* for interdisciplinary research to be competitive at assessment stage.

Some of the partners have barriers to collaborating with industry and business. For example, for EAS, IRCSET and NWO strict funding systems and intellectual property issues can prevent such collaborations. Most partners would expect industry and business representatives to support themselves financially when involved in networking or research activities. If all partners agree that this is the best way forward to involve business and industry, action needs to be taken by the partners to encourage user engagement with the Complexity-NET activities and to make the case as to why they should support themselves and what benefits they will gain from involvement. This is the aim of the proposed deliverable D2.3 – Engaging with Industry.

The experience of partners receiving direct or indirect expressions of interest from researchers from different discipline backgrounds or representatives from industry and business is quite varied. Seven partners had positive experiences and four had no such experience. It should be highlighted that MSTI already has a network of industries which is involved in the establishment of a Danish complexity network.

There are differences in the experiences the partners have regarding contacts within or collaboration with industry, business, the public service sector, or other users of complexity science. Two partners had no experience (FNRS and NKTH), six partners had positive experiences and three partners had neutral experience, but MSTI, EAS, GSRT and CNR seem to have relatively limited experience in collaborations with these groups. EPSRC has a lot of experience with collaborative research projects, although not necessarily specifically relating to complexity science.

If ‘non Complexity-NET’ countries wished to become involved in network activities, the general expectation from partners would be that the ‘non Complexity-NET’ countries would support their own researchers. EAS and NKTH can support them, but only through bilateral agreements.

None of the partners have barriers in their countries or organisations which prevent them supporting networking activities with researchers from other discipline backgrounds, representatives from industry, business, the public service sector and other users of complexity science, through Complexity-NET, except that EPSRC would not financially support the industry representatives in a network.

5. Conclusions

This report has highlighted the possible limitations and possible solutions for co-ordinated networking of national research activities. It is clear from the responses to the partners relating to how they deal with funding research and research-related activities in their own countries that there are many common practices between the partners. A number of differences in the procedures and approaches used by the partners have also been identified, but in general the differences do not appear to be insurmountable and should be relatively easy to overcome, following further discussion by the partners in WP3.

One of the main recommendations by the partners in D2.2 was that Complexity-NET should support networks in the first instance, to bring researchers from different disciplines and users together. However, this study shows that the only networking mechanism that all partners can support is workshops, and therefore the partners must decide in WP3 whether this is a feasible activity for Complexity-NET to undertake.

Another key recommendation by the partners was that any research activity implemented by Complexity-NET should be specifically for complexity science and based on research themes, potentially linked to real world challenges. The project supported through this activity should be multidisciplinary and where possible involve users (such as industry and business). The report has highlighted that most partners are able to support a range of research disciplines, if not all research disciplines, and therefore it should be possible to ensure that the recommendation for multidisciplinary research is implemented in any Complexity-NET activity. Some partners have experience of collaborating with industrial and business partners, which should prove helpful when developing the activities. However, most partners would not expect to financially support industrial or business representatives, and therefore the partners must consider a plan of action to help engage industries and businesses with the Complexity-NET activities and to highlight the advantage of being involved in such activities. The proposed deliverable D2.3 – Engaging with Industry is intended to address this issue.

A final conclusion of this report is that not all the partners can financially support any Complexity-NET activities, and this needs to be taken into account when developing the road map and plan of action in WP3.

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
NETWORKING ACTIVITIES											
Which suggested types of networking activities would your organisation be able to support?											
Workshops	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Match making events	X	m	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	-
'Science Dating' events	X	m	X	m	X	X		X	X	X	m
Career visits	m	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Summer schools	m	m	X	X	X	m	m	X	X	X	
News letters	m		X	m	X	X	m	m	X	X	
Project offices	m		X	X	X			m	m	X	X
Can your organisation support:											
Researchers from other discipline backgrounds	some	X	X		some	X	X	X	some	X	X
Industry representatives			X		X	X	X	X		X	
Business representatives			X		X	X	X	X		X	
Public service sector representatives		X	X		X	X		X		X	X
Other users of complexity science	m		X		X	X	X	X		X	
Have researchers from other discipline backgrounds or representatives from industry, or business, or the public service sector, or other users of complexity science in your country, directly or indirectly expressed their interest in complexity science?											
Yes	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		
No				X		X				X	X

	EPSRC	FNRS	MSTI	EAS	GSRT	NKTH	IRCSET	CNR	NWO	FCT	MEC
What experience does your organisation have regarding contacts within or collaboration with industry, business, the public service sector, or other users of complexity science?											
None		X				X					
Positive	X		X		X			X	X	X	
Neutral				X			X				X
Negative	X										
Are there any barriers in your country or organisation which prevent interdisciplinary collaboration?											
Yes				X		X	X	X	X	X	
No	X	X	X		X				X		X
Are there any barriers in your country or organisation which prevent collaboration with industry, business, the public service sector, or other users of complexity science?											
Yes				X			X		X		
No	X	X	X		X	X		X		X	X
Are there any barriers in your country or organisation which prevent supporting networking activities with researchers from other discipline backgrounds, representatives from industry, business, the public service sector and other users of complexity science, through Complexity-NET?											
Yes											
No	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Can your organisation support networking activity participants from 'non Complexity-NET countries'?											
Yes		X		X	X	X	X	X		X	
No	X		X						X		X

m: maybe