



## Deliverable 4.2 - Review of Synergies among Policies & Programmes

<b>Project</b>	STI International Cooperation Network for Eastern Partnership Countries – PLUS
<b>Project Acronym</b>	EaP PLUS
<b>Project Number</b>	692471
<b>Deliverable Number:</b>	D4.2
<b>Submission Date</b>	24.04.2018
<b>Responsible author(s):</b>	IPPT-PAN, ICBSS

<b>Abstract</b>	A review conducted by the EaP Plus project of the JPI, COST and EU MS programme participation by the EaP countries indicated high interest of those countries in international R&D projects, while the analysis of the national priorities and STI policy planning in the EaP countries showed many common themes for potential synergies. The deliverable also discusses benefits and obstacles related to such cooperation.
-----------------	---



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 692471.

## Document Control Sheet

<b>Work package Number</b>	WP4
<b>Work package Title</b>	Optimal framework conditions and increasing coordination in policies and programmes
<b>Task Number</b>	T4.2
<b>Task Title</b>	Increase coordination and synergies between policies and programmes of EU/MS and EaP
<b>Deliverable Number</b>	D4.2
<b>Deliverable Title</b>	Review of Synergies among Policies & Programmes
<b>File Name</b>	D4.2
<b>Number of pages</b>	30
<b>Dissemination level</b>	Public
<b>Main author</b>	IPPT-PAN, ICBSS
<b>Contributors</b>	BellISA, CPI, NAS-RA, SRNSF, SDF-AZE, MESU
<b>Quality Assurance (if applicable)</b>	Piotr Swiatek, German National Contact Point for Energy in H2020 PTJ/FZJ

## Versioning and Contribution History

Version	Date	Author/Editor	Contributors	Description/Comments
_v01	22.02.2018	IPPT-PAN, ICBSS	BellISA, CPI, NAS-RA, SRNSF, SDF-AZE, MESU	1st version of the deliverable disseminated to the partners for review
_v02	20.04.2018	IPPT-PAN	Piotr Swiatek	2 <sup>nd</sup> version of the deliverable is prepared according to the comments of Quality Control Reviewer
_final	22.04.2018	IPPT-PAN		Final version submitted

**Content**

- Content..... 3
  - List of Abbreviations ..... 5
- Executive Summary ..... 6
- 1 Introduction ..... 7
- 2 Methodology..... 7
- 3 Joint Programming Initiatives and possibilities for EaP involvement..... 8
  - 3.1 Ongoing JPis and current EaP participation ..... 8
  - 3.2 Conditions for participation of EaP countries in JPis ..... 9
  - 3.3 Joint Calls of the JPis ..... 10
- 4 National priorities and STI policy planning in the EaP countries ..... 11
  - 4.1 Armenia ..... 11
  - 4.2 Azerbaijan..... 11
  - 4.3 Belarus..... 12
  - 4.4 Georgia ..... 12
  - 4.5 Moldova..... 13
  - 4.6 Ukraine ..... 14
- 5 Case studies of current JPI participation ..... 15
  - 5.1 Moldova..... 15
  - 5.2 Belarus..... 16
  - 5.3 Poland..... 17
- 6 Future of JPis in the new Work Programme 2018-2020 and FP9..... 19
- 7 Cooperation with COST ..... 20
  - 7.1 Potential for participation of EaP countries ..... 20
  - 7.2 Review of ongoing COST actions ..... 21
- 8 Exploring the participation of EaP countries in the EU MS joint programmes ..... 22
  - 8.1 Background information ..... 22
  - 8.2 Active cooperation schemes ..... 22
    - 8.2.1 ERA-NETs Cofund..... 23
    - 8.2.2 Article 185 Initiatives..... 25
  - 8.3 Challenges and future perspectives ..... 26

9 Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 27

10 Sources of information..... 28

11 Annexes ..... 29

***List of Abbreviations***

AC	Associated Countries
COST	European Cooperation in Science and Technology
CSA	Coordination and Support Action
EaP	Eastern Partnership
EaP PLUS	STI International Cooperation Network for Eastern Partnership Countries – PLUS
ERA	European Research Area
EU	European Union
FOS	'Field of Science' (FOS) classification (Frascati classification)
GPC	High Level Group for Joint Programming
IncoNet EaP	STI International Cooperation Network for Eastern Partnership Countries
JPI	Joint Programming Initiative
JPICH	Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage
JPND	Joint Programming in Neurodegenerative Diseases
JPP	Joint Programming Process
MB	Management Board
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	Member State
NASB	National Academy of Sciences of Belarus
NCBR	National Centre for Research and Development of Poland
NCN	National Science Centre of Poland
NCPs	National Contact Points
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
R&D	Research and Development
R&I	Research and Innovation
SRA	Strategic Research Agenda
SRNSF	Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia
S&T	Science and Technology
STI	Science, Technology and Innovation
WP	Work Programme

## Executive Summary

The objective of this deliverable was to explore cooperation with JPIs, COST Actions and national programmes in view of an increased coordination and synergies between policies and programmes of the EU/MS and EaP countries.

A review of ongoing JPIs and a potential for third country cooperation with them was undertaken. The work also included review of the national priorities and STI policy planning in the EaP countries to identify common themes for potential synergies with Joint Programming Process. Although national research agendas in each EaP country are quite different, the analysis identified many research priorities, which are common for these countries and also intersecting with questions tackled by the Joint Programming Process.

Already in previous studies conducted within the IncoNet EaP and Black Sea Horizon projects, the EaP representatives expressed interest in participating in the Joint Programming Process, but currently, only Moldova and Belarus participate in JPIs with Moldova being a member of JPI Cultural Heritage and Water JPI and Belarus of Cultural Heritage JPI. Among the obstacles highlighted by the countries were availability of funding, staff capabilities and knowledge of the processes, as well as specifics of national funding rules and legislature. In order to improve understanding of JPI participation process by some of the EaP countries, the partners of the EaP Plus project developed 3 case studies illustrating JPI participation in Moldova, Belarus and Poland, while further training and exchange of experiences being recommended in the future.

The second part of the analysis focused on cooperation of EaP countries with COST. The review of the COST Actions showed that in 2017 among the 252 running COST Actions there were 74 COST Actions with participants from the EaP countries. Some COST Actions had participants from 2-4 EaP institutions of the same or different EaP country. Among the 35 new actions approved in June 2017, there were 7 Actions with participants from EaP countries. Further promoting of COST participation would be beneficial.

The review of participation of EaP countries in the EU MS programmes indicated that EaP countries highly value cooperation with international partners in the field of science research and technology and cooperation with EU countries is increasing.

## 1 Introduction

The project “STI International Cooperation Network for Eastern Partnership Countries – PLUS” (EaP Plus) aims at stimulating cooperation between researchers from the EaP countries and EU MS as well as enhancing the active participation of the Eastern Partnership countries in Horizon 2020 Framework Programme.

This document reviews possibilities for participation of EaP countries in JPIs and COST Actions, national R&D priorities and STI policy planning in the EaP countries and also explores the cooperation of the EaP countries with EU MS programmes.

Joint Programming Initiatives serve as a tool aligning national policies and strategies as well as coordinating research in many different fields related to societal challenges. Although, Joint Programming Process has been active for almost ten years, participation of EaP partners in the process started only couple of years ago and only two EaP countries are currently members of JPIs.

Previous reports developed under the IncoNet EaP and Black Sea Horizon projects and also discussions during the workshop in Baku<sup>1</sup> in 2016, identified various obstacles, which hinder more active participation of EaP countries in JPIs. Among them are insufficient understanding of JPI participation conditions, availability of funding for international activities, and also capabilities of staff within public bodies and funding agencies.

In order to stimulate JPI participation and to help EaP countries in understanding of Joint Programming Process, the Consortium of the EaP Plus project agreed during its 1st General Assembly meeting in Vienna in 2017 to prepare case studies analysing participation in JPIs of three countries Moldova, Belarus and Poland.

Participation in COST Actions is more developed. In 2017, there were more than 70 COST Actions, which had participants from the EaP countries. The information about COST Action participation has been presented during various events conducted in the EaP countries, but still there is a greater potential in engaging wider range of research organizations from EaP countries.

## 2 Methodology

The information for this report was collected from various sources, which included review of available reports on JPIs and COST, communication with project partners, review of national reports and national R&D legislature, interviewing national officials dealing with R&D, analysis of previous reports prepared within IncoNet EaP and Black Sea Horizon projects, as

---

<sup>1</sup> The “Workshop for the Participation of Non-EU Black Sea and Eastern Partnership Countries in Thematic COFUND ERANETs & JPIs” (October 13-14, 2016, Baku).

well as new Horizon 2020 Work Programmes 2018-2020 which were announced in October 2017.

Communication with partners from the EaP countries was implemented in two stages: first: being collection of information with regards to national research priorities and policies and the second: interviewing partners and national officials on current situation regarding JPI participation and also in more details about the conditions of participation of 3 countries used as an example for other countries which expressed interest in JPI participation. The 3 countries agreed by project partners included Belarus, Moldova and Poland.

The methodology developed for the elaboration of the chapter on cooperation of EaP countries with the EU MS programmes included online research of existing programmes and the desk analysis of a number of working documents by the EU and other stakeholders, as well as deliverables from similar projects like the FP7 IncoNet Eastern Partnership project (2013-2016), the Horizon 2020 Black Sea Horizon project (2015-2018). Detailed list of sources is included in the bibliography.

### **3 Joint Programming Initiatives and possibilities for EaP involvement**

#### ***3.1 Ongoing JPIs and current EaP participation***

The Joint Programming Process was launched by a Communication of the Commission in July 2008<sup>2</sup>.

Joint Programming Initiatives were set up to pool national research efforts in order to make better use of Europe's public R&D resources and to tackle common European challenges more effectively in a few key areas. They are designed to overcome the fragmentation of national research programmes to address global challenges.

Joint Programming is an intergovernmental process enabling European Member states and associated and third countries to participate in those joint research programming activities that are strategically important and offer synergies. While around 85% of overall European R&D effort is contributed by MSs, the objective is to better align research and innovation investments spent at national level. Member Countries participating in Joint Programming are expected to engage in concerted and joint planning, implementation and evaluation of national research and innovation programmes to define common strategy.

European Member States agree, on a voluntary basis and in a partnership approach, on a common Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) to address major societal challenges, which will be implemented jointly. JPIs are Member State-led, bringing together national research funding

---

<sup>2</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/background\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/background_en.html)

organisations, ministries and research councils. Example of JPI membership model based on JPI on Antimicrobial Resistance is presented in Annex I.

In the framework of the IncoNet EaP project, a feasibility study was conducted aiming to facilitate the participation of EaP countries in joint funding mechanisms, which included consultation with stakeholders to identify common grounds and readiness for commitment on which to build a joint structured cooperation activity. As the result of this study, the EaP countries expressed their interested for participating in JPIs, however it was indicated that participation in JPIs and equivalent multilateral programmes is meaningful when there is enough national budget to contribute and there is community in EaP countries large enough to assure proper participation.

Currently, 10 Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) have been launched and only 2 of them have participants from the EaP countries:

1. Alzheimer and other Neurodegenerative Diseases (JPND)
2. Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change (FACCE)
3. A Healthy Diet for a Healthy Life
4. Cultural Heritage and Global Change: A New Challenge for Europe – Among 20 members: [MOLDOVA](#) (Ministry of Culture), [BELARUS](#) (National Academy of Science of Belarus)
5. Urban Europe - Global Urban Challenges, Joint European Solutions
6. Connecting Climate Knowledge for Europe (CliK'EU)
7. More Years, Better Lives - The Potential and Challenges of Demographic Change
8. Antimicrobial Resistance- The Microbial Challenge - An Emerging Threat to Human Health
9. Water Challenges for a Changing World – Among 20 members: [MOLDOVA](#) (ASM - Academy of Sciences of Moldova; CIP – Center of International Projects)
10. Healthy and Productive Seas and Oceans

### ***3.2 Conditions for participation of EaP countries in JPIs***

In order to participate in the activities of a given JPI, a country can submit an expression of interest to become a member, observer or partner (Annex I) addressing it in writing to the Chair of the JPI Management Board (MB). The letter should mention all major programmes, research networks, centres of excellence or bi-lateral programmes related to the topic of JPI.

When discussing the application, the JPI Management Board will take into account added value of membership to the initiative as well as level of anticipated participation: e.g. scale, duration of cooperation, potential areas of mutual collaboration, etc.

Finally, application needs to be approved by the JPI Management Board unanimously and the Chair will inform the applicant of the decision. If accepted, the new member country will

be invited to the following JPI Management Board meetings. If rejected, the applicant country is informed why and what is necessary to do before applying again if they wish to.

Participation in the JPI actions is based on the principle of variable geometry, which allows the JPI member countries to decide how they wish to participate and how much to contribute, according to the relevance for their national priorities. The countries which have chosen to be involved could contribute using different instruments available:

- national research programme funds, institutionalised investments, in-kind capacities and contributions (human resources, infrastructure);
- structural funds;
- grants and projects;
- fostering networking and research alliances (across the innovation chain);
- mechanisms to foster open access to knowledge, data and information.

Participation of Member States in each initiative is based on voluntary commitments leading to partnerships composed of variable groups of countries. For each initiative, participating countries will be:

- Developing a shared vision for the area;
- Defining a Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) and SMART objectives (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-Bound); and
- Preparing for implementation of the SRA by analysing the options, assessing expected impacts and defining the best mix of instruments to be used.

The Commission facilitates the Joint Programming Process and, if they so wish, support Member States for Joint Programming by:

- Financing support actions to their management
- Launching possible complementary measures to actions undertaken jointly by participating countries as identified in each JPI Strategic Research Agenda
- Linking the JPIs to international actions and bodies where the Commission represents the EU
- Reporting on the JPI progress to the Council and informing the European Parliament.

### **3.3 Joint Calls of the JPIs**

JPIs organize joint calls to support research on selected topics. Joint calls present one of the instruments for implementing aspects of the strategic research agenda. They are competitive procedures where proposed projects are selected and cooperatively funded by partners within JPI.

Joint calls require the participation of a minimum of two countries represented in JPI. The countries agree to jointly fund a call for proposals and act as funding partners. There is no

upper limit to the number of countries which can act as funding partners of a joint call. Usually a virtual common pot is applied and each beneficiary is financed by its corresponding funding organisation.

## **4 National priorities and STI policy planning in the EaP countries**

### **4.1 Armenia**

The Armenian Development Strategy for 2014-2025<sup>3</sup> envisages national development into a “knowledge-based economy, which is competitive in the European scientific and technical community in terms of its fundamental and applied scientific research and development”.

Science and Technology Development Priorities for 2015-2019<sup>4</sup> in Armenia include wide range of topics covering the areas of life sciences, Armenology, secure and efficient energy, information and communication technologies, space, earth sciences, sustainable use of natural resources, as well as social and economic issues.

Although science and technology development priorities of Armenia in many ways intersect with the themes covered by JPIs and a general interest of national stakeholders in JPI participation being shown, lack of funds appears as the main obstacle for participation. Better comprehension of conditions for JPI participation and possible future benefits could facilitate country’s involvement into the Joint Programming Process.

### **4.2 Azerbaijan**

The “Development Concept. Azerbaijan – 2020: Outlook for the future”<sup>5</sup> approved by the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan in 2012 foresees strengthening of scientific and technological potential and expansion of education opportunities as important factors for the development of industry. Along with the state funding, it is envisaged to stimulate the financing of science from other sources. The Development Concept lists issues like migration and demography being of special importance in Azerbaijan. Other leading topics which intersect with the JPI themes include ecological problems related to oil extraction carried out for decades with imperfect methods in the Absheron Peninsula and Caspian Sea, the access of the country’s population to enhanced water supply services, the development of the agrarian sector, strengthening of food security, as well as preservation of cultural heritage and its effective management. Therefore, participation in JPIs could in many ways be beneficial for the development of scientific and research potential in Azerbaijan.

---

<sup>3</sup> Armenia Development Strategy for 2014-2025. Annex to RA Government Decree # 442 - N on 27th of March, 2014

<sup>4</sup> Science and Technology Development Priorities for 2015-2019 (25.12.2014, N 54)

<sup>5</sup> “Azerbaijan 2020: Look into the future” Concept of Development ([http://www.president.az/files/future\\_en.pdf](http://www.president.az/files/future_en.pdf))

### **4.3 Belarus**

In Belarus, financing of fundamental and applied research is implemented according to State research programmes<sup>6</sup>. Twelve separate State research programmes for the years 2016-2020 were approved by the government in 2015. Each programme covers a different topic, such as energy, chemical technologies, biotechnology, medicine, informatics, space and security, material sciences, environment and ecology, agrarian sector, or social sciences. At the moment, Belarus participates in one JPI, but at the same time many research topics listed within the State research programmes of Belarus are being similar to goals of other existing JPIs, with the potential for cooperation in these areas. The Belarussian programme on “Fundamental and applied sciences in medicine” is being one of such examples. One of its goals is to research scientific bases of new technologies related to increased life expectancy and quality of life, while the Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) “More Years, Better Lives – The Potential and Challenges of Demographic Change” seeks to enhance coordination and collaboration between European and national research programmes related to demographic change. Another example is the Belarussian State research programme on “Quality and efficiency of agrarian sector” devoted to questions such as sustainable food security, soil production under climate change, new methods in livestock breeding and crop production leading to higher efficiency in agriculture, which in many ways coincide with the 5 core research themes identified by the Joint Programming Initiative on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change (FACCE-JPI).

### **4.4 Georgia**

The support for the development of Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) system in Georgia is provided by the Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSF)<sup>7</sup>, which is a Legal Entity of Public Law under the aegis of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. The strategic vision of the foundation is to promote integration of Georgia into international system of Science, Technology and Innovation, significantly contributing to rapid socio-economic development and welfare of the country. Mission of the foundation is to support development of a new generation of scientists, to increase the research potential of Georgian research and scientific institutions and communities and to integrate of Georgian scientists into international research area by provisioning improvement of the quality, importance and competitiveness of innovative scientific research.

The vision and strategy of the foundation is in line with Georgia’s socio-economic development strategy - «Georgia 2020», (the four point reform plan for the development of

---

<sup>6</sup> State Research Programmes of the Republic of Belarus (<http://research.bsu.by/research-activity/research-areas-programs/gpni/>)

<sup>7</sup> Rustaveli National Science Foundation (SRNSF) <http://www.rustaveli.org.ge/en/Mission,-Goals,-Objectives>

the country) and the EU-Georgia Association Agreement requirements regarding the development of STI system. The foundation organizes calls for proposals, defines targeted programmes and projects, and is involved in international scientific networks and joint projects. SRNSF administers more than 20 programmes, out of which, there are 15 national, about 10 are international bilateral, and 2 are multilateral projects (Black Sea Horizon, EaP PLUS) within the scope of the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation “Horizon 2020”.

SRNSF Priority Directions are four fold: Supporting Excellence in Research; Supporting Young Researchers’ Development (Postdocs, PhD and MA students); Internationalization of research (bi and multilateral schemes); Diversification of Research Funding of STI and Enhancing Georgian Researchers’ participation in international programmes; SRNSF also promotes popularization and communication of science and STI achievements in wider society, modernization of scientific infrastructure, update of research equipment and provision of access to international databases.

Based on bottom – up approach, projects in all scientific fields are funded,. The Foundation does not have any field priorities, it operates by using the OECD Frascati classification of science and technology (FOS) / EUROSTAT classification, which include 6 directions: Exact and Natural sciences; Engineering and Technologies; Medical and health sciences; Agrarian sciences; Social sciences; as well as Humanities. One of strategically important direction of foundation is to promote excellent research in Georgian Studies Programmes both in Georgia and in international dimension.

In regard to JPI topics, the areas of activity of the Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change JPI; Cultural Heritage JPI and Antimicrobial Resistance JPI would be of the most importance for Georgia, while topics of JPI Climate, More Years, Better Lives JPI, Water JPI, Urban Europe JPI, and JPI Oceans also being of interest.

#### **4.5 Moldova**

Currently Moldova participates in 2 Joint Programming Initiatives: JPI on Cultural Heritage and Global Change as well as JPI on Water Challenges for a Changing World. There are also plans to join several other JPIs including JPI More Years, Better Lives, JPI Urban Europe and JPI Climate.

Other Societal Challenges are also addressed in the various official documents of Moldova and could serve as a basis for future cooperation between Moldovan parties and JPIs. The Action programme of the Government of Republic of Moldova for 2016-2018<sup>8</sup>, among other

---

<sup>8</sup> Action programme of the Government of Republic of Moldova for 2016-2018 [http://www.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/government\\_of\\_republic\\_of\\_moldova\\_-\\_action\\_programme\\_of\\_the\\_government\\_of\\_republic\\_of\\_moldova\\_for\\_2016-2018.pdf](http://www.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/government_of_republic_of_moldova_-_action_programme_of_the_government_of_republic_of_moldova_for_2016-2018.pdf)

topics, includes such topics as healthy diet for children and pupils; adaptation and mitigation of climate change effects on agricultural products; ensuring food safety of Moldova; as well as various issues related to human health.

The Code of the Republic of Moldova on science and innovations<sup>9</sup> (the last edition from 20.10.2017) envisages alignment of national R&I priorities and goals with framework programmes of the EU and also sees support of the government for international cooperation in the field of science and innovation.

Food security, sustainable agriculture, marine, maritime and bioeconomic research; disease prevention and effective disease diagnosis; and climate change are also among the priorities listed within the Research and Development Strategy for the Republic of Moldova by 2020.

#### **4.6 Ukraine**

In 2017, the Ukrainian government adopted the “Medium-term Government Priority Action Plan to 2020<sup>10</sup>” which includes the paragraph on “Creating a new science management and financing system” discussing the major problems of the scientific sphere of Ukraine and possible ways of reforming it. Integration of Ukrainian science into the European Research Area is seen as ultimate goal, with Horizon 2020 and Euratom being an additional chance for modernizing the Ukrainian science and raising additional funds into the scientific sphere.

The Law of Ukraine “About the priority directions of development of science and technology<sup>11</sup>” (the last edition from 16.01.2016)<sup>11</sup> determines legal and organizational basis of complete system of forming and realization of the priority directions of development of science and technology in Ukraine. Among the priorities defined for the years 2017-2018 there are multiple topics intersecting with study interests of JPIs, such as topics dealing with environmental protection, sustainable use of fertilizers, food security, organic farming, sea geology research, as well as neurodegenerative diseases.

Climate change, ocean and sea research, diagnostics and forecasting of the conditions in sea environment, protection and improvement of environmental conditions in seas, historical and cultural heritage of different regions of Ukraine are among multiple priorities identified within the „Main scientific priorities and crucial problems of fundamental research in the

---

<sup>9</sup> Code of the Republic of Moldova on science and innovations No 259-XV dated 15.07.2004 (Last edition from 20.10.2017)

<sup>10</sup> Medium-Term Government Priority Action Plan to 2020 (Approved by the Ordinance of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine of 2017 No. 275-p (<https://www.kmu.gov.ua/storage/app/media/.../cerednostrokoviy-plan-2020.doc>))

<sup>11</sup> Law of Ukraine of July 11, 2001 No. 2623-III “About the priority directions of development of science and technology” (<http://cis-legislation.com/document.fwx?rgn=18116>)

areas of natural, technical and human sciences of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine for 2014-2018<sup>12</sup>”.

A support of the state is envisaged for the international cooperation including joint research activities, cooperation in technical development and international research and technical programmes.

## 5 Case studies of current JPI participation

### 5.1 Moldova

Moldova is an official member of 2 JPIs<sup>13</sup>:

- Water JPI (responsible agency - the Academy of Sciences of Moldova; active participation started from 2014)
- Cultural heritage JPI (responsible agency - the Ministry of Culture, participation started from 2014, no actions were performed till now)

Participation of Moldova in the calls launched by ERA-NETs and multilateral programmes is the following:

- FP7/Black-Sea-ERA.NET – Pilot Joint Call – 1 project completed;
- FP7/SEERA-EI – Pilot Joint Call – 2 projects completed;
- FP7/ERA.NET-RUS-PLUS - Single Joint Calls, 2015 - 2 ongoing projects, Joint Call 2017 - 1 project selected in 2017;
- H2020/Water JPI, ERA.NET-COFUND, within two Calls WaterWorks2014 and WaterWorks2015 – 2 ongoing projects;
- H2020/Water JPI-CSA, IC4Water – project submitted for Joint Call announced in 2017/ASM;
- H2020/Climate JPI, ERA.NET-COFUND, Axis – project prepared for 2018 call;
- H2020/Climate JPI-CSA, SINCERE, – ongoing project/Institute of Ecology and Geography, ASM;
- BMBF Danube Regional Call, 2015 – 2 ongoing projects;
- Black Sea Horizon Regional Call, 2018 – project in preparation for 2018 call.

---

<sup>12</sup> Main scientific priorities and crucial problems of fundamental research in the areas of natural, technical and human sciences of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine for 2014-2018 ([http://www1.nas.gov.ua/infrastructures/Legaltexts/nas/2013/regulations/OpenDocs/Naukovi\\_napryamy\\_2014\\_2018.pdf](http://www1.nas.gov.ua/infrastructures/Legaltexts/nas/2013/regulations/OpenDocs/Naukovi_napryamy_2014_2018.pdf))

<sup>13</sup> The information on Moldovan participation in JPIs is provided by the EaP Plus project partner from Moldova.

Besides the Water JPI and the Cultural Heritage JPI, involvement in other JPIs is under discussion, including Climate JPI, Urban JPI and MYBL JPI (such as involvement in the new joint calls ERA.Nets and CSA).

As a full member in 2 JPIs, Moldova does not pay any financial contribution. Its participation includes involvement in joint calls and several joint actions. Other possibilities of involvement include program management, data mapping, shared research infrastructure, knowledge hub, etc.

The joint calls foresee national co-funding guarantee. The process is very similar to one already existing in EaP countries in the case of bilateral cooperation: signing a bilateral agreement on S&T cooperation with a partner country to organize a bilateral joint call, where the conditions of a call are agreed, and funding amount, schedule, priorities, number of the joint projects supported, etc are defined. During the implementation stage, Moldova covers expenses of the Moldovan research team from its national budget, while other countries cover expenses of national research teams from their state budget.

Within JPIs, activities are organized similarly at the multilateral level. The conditions of Joint Calls (which are usually organized within ERA-NET COFUND scheme, CSA, etc, supported by JPI) are discussed within a consortium which includes several countries agreeing to participate in such action. The financing of projects supported within the Joint Calls is organized similar to the bilateral framework specified above - each country supports financially its participants.

To confirm the willingness of participation and to guarantee a funding contribution to support the joint projects which would be recommended for funding, it is necessary to provide a guarantee letter from the national funding agency (or any other institution which agreed to allocate funding for the projects). This is done upon request, at the beginning negotiations of joint actions.

Among the benefits from JPI participation, Moldovan representative mentions development of vital consortiums for further participation in H2020 as well as opportunity to benefit from independent evaluation process organized outside the country.

## **5.2 Belarus**

The National Academy of Sciences of Belarus (NASB) became a partner of the JPI on Cultural Heritage (JPI CH) in 2016. At the moment NASB have participated in 2 calls for proposals within JPI CH with one application for each of the two calls. In the first call, the application that included the Belarusian partner failed to get support. In the second call, evaluation has

not been finalized so far<sup>14</sup>. Currently, participation in the JPI CH calls for proposals is the only coordination mechanism NASB is involved. At the same time, NASB stays open to consider any proposals from the EU MS/AC side to join other JPIs.

For the JPI CH, research activities of the Belarusian partners in possibly selected projects will be funded from the national sources, e.g. from the so-called 'State programs of scientific research' (or other types of national programs) which are approved for 5-year periods. It would, however in the future, be beneficial for the Belarusian side to top them up by the EC contribution and in particular via ERANET COFUND CH.

Although Belarus only recently became a partner of the JPI CH, there are already significant benefits such as creation of new partnerships and networking. Thanks to the involvement in the JPI, contacts have been established with organizations which together with the Belarusian side were applying to the two JPI calls. Also, the Center for Belarusian Culture, Language and Literature Studies as a partner of JPI has significantly increased its visibility and has started to be approached by EU MS/AC organizations with different cooperation proposals. Most of them are on bi-lateral level.

For the Belarusian partners of the JPI CH, also the EU MS/AC experience in bringing the cultural heritage R&D to the market as well as legislation in this area present a special interest. Participation in JPI CH via concrete research projects and coordination mechanisms other than the calls for proposals could be helpful to increase the EU MS/AC experience in the mentioned area and adopting it in Belarus. At the same time, participation in JPIs affects the national programs and it is expected that this effect will be stronger with the time.

Belarusian participation in JPIs could also benefit from improved management skills (trainings on these topics would be appreciated) and more regular involvement in the Management Board meetings. Due to the lack of funds, the representative from Belarus could not attend all of them.

### **5.3 Poland**

Poland participates as a member in 9 Joint Programming Initiatives (excluding Climate JPI). Polish research organizations which participate in JPI calls implement both basic and applied research, which is financed through the National Centre for Research and Development

---

<sup>14</sup> The information is based on the personal interview conducted by the Belorussian project partner on February 9, 2018 with Dr. Sergey Vitiaz, Deputy Director, Center for Belarusian Culture, Language and Literature Studies, NAS Belarus (<http://cbcll.basnet.by/>) and Dr. Natalia Yankevich, Head of the Department on Cooperation with EU Programmes, Center for System Analysis and Strategic Research of the NASB. Dr. Vitiaz coordinates participation of the NASB in JPI Cultural Heritage, while Dr. Yankevich is a manager of the two ERANET COFUNDs where the NASB is a partner.

(NCBR) and National Science Centre (NCN)<sup>15</sup>. These agencies determine participation in specific JPI calls establishing the national criteria of participation and amount of national funding. The funding is based on the virtual common pot system in which countries fund their national research teams. Under this system, evaluation of proposals is undertaken by an international expert committee, whereas funding decisions and funding are undertaken by individual national organisations, in accordance with their own standard rules and procedures.

Polish JPI Management Board members regularly participate in MB meetings (on average occurring quarterly), where decisions on activities undertaken within JPI are agreed. The Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education is a member of most of the JPIs. It covers costs of participation of Ministry representatives in JPI Management and Advisory Board meetings. Once the joint call is prepared under a specific JPI, on the national level the call is managed by such agency as the National Centre for Research and Development (NCBR). The role of NCBR could be divided into two main stages – international and national.

During the international stage, the NCBR is responsible for agreeing respective financial contribution to a call, from which research projects of Polish participants will be financed. The submission of proposals is a 2-step procedure. The first step involves submission of pre-proposal which is evaluated by the international experts. It results in a list of selected 30-40 pre-proposals, which are later developed into full proposals which are again evaluated and are ranked as projects selected for financing. Usually it includes 8-15 proposals.

The NCBR is responsible for providing financing for Polish research groups which are selected. Therefore during the national 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, Polish applicants are requested to provide additional national applications where detailed project costs are presented. These applications are evaluated by a panel of experts, which mostly evaluate the financial side of applications. The results of evaluation allow establishing the concrete amount for project financing and the agreement is then signed with the organization implementing the project. During the implementation stage, the NCBR monitors the activities done within the project through reports including the final report of all implemented activities.

So far, the NCBR participated in more than 15 calls organized by various JPIs. Among the benefits from JPI participation, Polish representatives name transfer of knowledge and experiences, as well as unique platform for contacts with the best European research organizations.

---

<sup>15</sup> The information on Polish participation in JPIs is provided by the representatives of the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Karolina Zaborowicz – Department of Innovation and Development) and the National Centre for Research and Development (Marcin Chmielewski – Department of International Programmes).

## **6 Future of JPIs in the new Work Programme 2018-2020 and FP9**

In the context of mid-term review of Horizon 2020 and the preparation of the 9<sup>th</sup> EU Framework Programme for Research and innovation, the High Level Group for Joint Programming (GPC) prepared the opinion on the “Future of Joint Programming to address societal challenges”. In this document, the GPC underlines a highly valuable contribution of JPIs and the overall Joint Programming Process (JPP) to the advancement of the ERA.

The potential of P2Ps to make a valuable contribution to the achievement of Framework Programme objectives was also emphasized in the “Lamy Report” (Report of the independent High Level Group on maximising the impact of EU Research & Innovation Programmes).

The new Horizon 2020 Work Programme for years 2018-2020 provides new opportunities supporting JPI activities. They include such calls as ERA-NET Cofund supporting the Joint Programming in Neurodegenerative Diseases strategic plan (JPND). Horizon WP on Health also announces the CSA for ‘Establishment of an International Network of Social Sciences Research Centres to help address governance and other challenges in the preparedness for and the response to infectious threats’ which is expected to collaborate with GloPID-R members and JPI AMR and their various initiatives in this domain. Another CSA is planned for ‘Coordinating European brain research and developing global initiatives’, which also supports the work done by the Joint Programming on Neurodegenerative Diseases.

The WP on Climate also underlines the importance of creating synergies with other relevant ongoing initiatives such as the JPIs, such as the JPI Water, JPI Climate, and JPI Cultural Heritage. While the WP for the Societal Challenge 6 ‘Europe in a changing world’ includes the CSA on ‘Innovative solutions for inclusive and sustainable urban environments’ which is supposed to base its recommendations on the results of projects funded under the JPI Urban Europe.

With the consultations on the 9<sup>th</sup> research framework programme currently ongoing, in the next FP, the GPC sees the role of P2Ps as gateways between MS/AC policy-makers and the EC in the definition of future R&I programmes. It also indicates that P2Ps and JPIs in particular are of considerable importance for structuring national and European R&I systems and deserve a central role in the governance and organization of SC-related research and innovation in Europe.

## 7 Cooperation with COST

European Cooperation in Science and Technology (COST) framework founded in 1971 provides funding for science and technology networks offering scientists the opportunity to embark upon bottom-up, multidisciplinary cooperation across all science and technology domains.

COST enables researchers to set up their interdisciplinary research networks in Europe and beyond and is funding organisation of conferences, meetings, training schools, short scientific exchanges or other networking activities in a wide range of scientific topics.

All COST Actions have four-year duration and require a minimum participation of seven COST Member States. The 36 COST Member States are: Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

These countries govern COST via their representatives in the COST Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) - the General Assembly of the COST Association.

Israel is a Cooperating State which has non-voting rights in the COST CSO, however researchers from COST's Cooperating State enjoy member rights in COST Action participation.

### **7.1 Potential for participation of EaP countries**

COST Actions are open to international cooperation, by allowing the participation of researchers from Near Neighbour Countries and International Partner Countries on the basis of mutual benefit.

The 6 Eastern Partnership countries covered by the EaP Plus project (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine) are on the list of the **Near Neighbour Countries**.

Researchers affiliated to institutions in Near Neighbour Countries can participate in COST Actions on the basis of ascertained mutual benefit regulated by the COST rules for participation. Their participation has to be approved on a case by case basis by the Executive Board on behalf of the CSO, the COST Governance body.

Once their participation is approved, researchers from Near Neighbour Countries' institutions can participate in the COST Action on the same basis as the COST Countries that

have signed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) – with the exception of the right to vote in the Management Committees or Working Groups of the Action.

Additionally, Near Neighbour Countries' institutions can be represented by a total maximum of two members in the Management Committee of a COST Action.

Up to two researchers from Near Neighbour Countries, one per institution, can be eligible for reimbursement to the Management Committee meetings of the particular COST Action.

## 7.2 Review of ongoing COST actions

Based on the statistics received from the COST Association, as of May 2017 there were in total 252 running COST Actions. Institutions from the EaP countries participated in 74 COST Actions, among them were 20 COST Actions with participants from 2-4 EaP institutions of the same or different EaP country.

COST Action participants were coming from 68 EaP institutions with some of them participating in several COST Actions. The largest number of institutions participating in COST were from Ukraine (33), followed by Armenia (13), Moldova (8), Georgia (7), Belarus (6), and Azerbaijan (1).

On 23 June 2017, new Actions were approved by the COST Committee of Senior Officials. Out of 454 eligible proposals, 35 actions were approved. Participants from EaP countries in the approved Actions reached a number of 7 (Table 7.1).

Out of 35 approved COST Actions for 2017, 5 had participants from Ukraine (CA16209, CA16213, CA16214, CA16226, CA16234) and 2 from Georgia and Armenia (CA16206, CA16235) (Table).

Table 7.1. New actions selected in June 2017 with participants from EaP countries.

<b>COST Action number</b>	<b>COST Action name</b>	<b>Near Neighbour Country</b>
CA16209	NATURAL FLOOD RETENTION ON PRIVATE LAND	Belarus, Ukraine
CA16213	NEW EXPLORATORY PHASE IN RESEARCH ON EAST EUROPEAN CULTURES OF DISSENT	Ukraine
CA16214	THE MULTI-MESSENGER PHYSICS AND ASTROPHYSICS OF NEUTRON STARS	Ukraine
CA16226	INDOOR LIVING SPACE IMPROVEMENT: SMART HABITAT FOR THE ELDERLY	Ukraine
CA16234	EUROPEAN CLEFT AND CRANIOFACIAL INITIATIVE FOR EQUALITY IN CARE	Ukraine
CA16206	EMPOWERING THE NEXT GENERATION OF SOCIAL ENTERPRISE SCHOLARS	Armenia, Georgia
CA16235	PERFORMANCE AND RELIABILITY OF PHOTOVOLTAIC	Armenia, Georgia

	SYSTEMS: EVALUATIONS OF LARGE-SCALE MONITORING DATA	
--	---	--

Participation in COST Actions constitutes an extremely important way for networking and for ultimately preparing H2020 proposals. Associated countries like Israel, Serbia and Turkey actively promote the participation of their researchers in COST Actions.

Despite the importance of COST, the participation of the EaP Countries in COST Actions has not been yet proportional to the national efforts to become Associated Countries of H2020. The EaP Plus project puts emphasis on promoting the participation in COST Actions and supports further dissemination of information on COST Actions by partners, NCPs and relevant stakeholders, underlining the possibility of joining the already running COST Actions.

## **8 Exploring the participation of EaP countries in the EU MS joint programmes**

### ***8.1 Background information***

According to the barometer developed under the IncoNet EaP project<sup>16</sup>, the Eastern partnership countries evaluated highly the science research and technology cooperation with international partners. In particular, concerning the EU, the most important countries identified were Germany, Romania (mostly for Moldova), France, Italy and Poland.

The most important international research, science and technology cooperation activities are bilateral and international multilateral project collaboration with the EU countries and exchange of STI information on strategic level.

Although, cooperation with single European countries (bilateral cooperation) showed high increase in the last three years; nonetheless, multilateral schemes are desired as well.

### ***8.2 Active cooperation schemes***

Research and Innovation are significantly supported by EU programmes and initiatives, such as the JPIs, ERA-NETs, and Art.185 initiatives.

---

<sup>16</sup> IncoNet EaP project D2.2.b - Analytical evidence of S&T cooperation between EU and EaP countries - STI cooperation barometer between EU and EaP countries (29.7.2016)

### 8.2.1 ERA-NETs Cofund

The ERA-NET scheme under Horizon 2020 merges the former ERA-NET and ERA-NET Plus into a single instrument ERA-NET Cofund with the central and compulsory element which is implementation of one substantial call with top-up funding from the Commission. The focus of ERA-NETs is therefore shifting from the funding of networks to the facilitation of calls for transnational research and innovation in selected areas with high European added value and relevance for Horizon 2020.

In addition to the co-funded call, the consortia implement further joint activities including other joint calls without EU co-funding. The duration of an ERA-NET Cofund is five years. During this time the consortium has to prepare and implement the calls, select and negotiate the projects, finalise the projects including final payment to their beneficiaries.

Instruments and initiatives fostering productive synergies and the alignment of R&I national strategies and programmes have been developed over the past years to tackle common challenges and strengthen European competitiveness. Among these initiatives, Public to Public Partnerships (P2Ps) aim at promoting coordinated cooperation both at national and regional levels. In particular, with regards to the EaP countries, the following networks are currently active.

#### a) Armenia

Armenia does not participate in any networks at the moment.

#### b) Azerbaijan

EUPHRESCO (self-sustained) European Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

Targeted research fields: Environment, Food, agriculture and fisheries.

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

#### c) Belarus

MarTERA (Maritime and Marine Technologies for a New ERA)

Targeted research fields: Environment, Food, agriculture and fisheries, Materials

Coordinator: Project Management Juelich / Research Centre Juelich (PTJ/FZJ), Germany

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

EMEurope (ERA-NET Cofund Electric Mobility Europe)

Targeted research fields: Transport

Coordinator: TÜV Rheinland Consulting GmbH (TUEV), Germany

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

**d) Georgia**

EUPHRESKO (self-sustained) European Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

Targeted research fields: Environment, Food, agriculture and fisheries.

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

**e) Moldova**

AXIS (Assessment of Cross(X)-sectoral climate Impacts and pathways for Sustainable transformation)

Targeted research fields: Environment

Coordinator: German Aerospace Center (DLR), Germany

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

WaterWorks2017 (Water Works 2018-2022 in Support of the Water JPI (WaterWorks2017) and of the EC Call SC5-33-2017: Closing the water cycle gap)

Targeted research fields: Environment

Coordinator: National Research Agency (ANR), France

Open Call: WaterWorks 2017 - Water Challenges for a Changing World. Deadline: 27/06/2018. Eligible EaP countries: Moldova. Researchers from other countries can also participate at their own costs (commitment needed for being associated to a consortium applying to the Water JPI 2017 Joint Call).

EUPHRESKO (self-sustained) European Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

Targeted research fields: Environment, Food, agriculture and fisheries.

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

ERA.Net RUS plus (Further linking Russia to the ERA: Coordination of MS/ AC S&T programmes towards and with Russia)

Targeted research fields: Environment, Health, Industrial production, Materials, Nanosciences and nanotechnologies, Socio-economics sciences and humanities, Innovation

Coordinator: German Aerospace Center (DLR), Germany

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

#### **f) Ukraine**

GeoERA (Establishing the European Geological Surveys Research Area to deliver a Geological Service for Europe)

Targeted research fields: Energy

Coordinator: Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), Netherlands

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

ERA-PLANET (The European network for observing our changing planet)

Targeted fields: Environment, Space

Coordinator: Italian National Research Council (CNR), Italy

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

EUPHRESKO (self-sustained) European Phytosanitary Research Coordination.

Targeted research fields: Environment, Food, agriculture and fisheries.

Currently there is not any open Call within this network.

#### **8.2.2 Article 185 Initiatives**

Article 185 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) enables the EU to participate in research programmes undertaken jointly by several Member States.

Open Calls:

- a) Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL) Call Challenge 2018 “Smart Solutions for Ageing well”. EaP countries are not eligible to participate<sup>17</sup>.

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.era-learn.eu/network-information/networks/aal-2>

- b) Eurostars 2<sup>18</sup>. The Eurostars programme is supported by 36 Eurostars Participating States and Partner Countries. EaP countries are not included.

Difference between ERA-NET Cofund and Art. 185 initiatives is that the latter involves long term contractual arrangements between MS and EU. Advantage is that EU contribution is potentially higher than that in ERA-NET Cofund and is up to 50% of joint calls.

### **8.3 Challenges and future perspectives**

The Eastern partnership countries are becoming more and more active in joint initiatives. It is clear however that either bilateral cooperation or under the EU funding mechanisms, works as a safety net for the countries that result in closer cooperation in R&I.

According to the barometer results, researchers underlined the importance of communication between partners, and more importantly the clear and comprehensively defined conditions for participation to the Calls.

To this end, a very important role should be assumed by the NCPs in the EaP countries in order to promote the available funding opportunities efficiently and assist with the establishment of cooperation schemes.

Therefore, as abovementioned a follow-up study exercise is recommended that will include direct communication with the national agencies in the EU MS and the beneficiaries in the EaP countries in order to define the key priorities for mutual cooperation; the benefits from and the obstacles for, the involvement of the EaP countries to EU funded schemes and the means to address them efficiently.

New European Joint Programme (EJP) Cofund Actions may be interesting for EaP participants. EJP allows mixed participation of funding organisations and research institutions. Cofund is up to 70% and can be also granted for institutional funding which can be attractive in EaP with low R&D budget. EJP is proposed in 2018-20 WP Energy for cooperation with Africa.

---

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.era-learn.eu/network-information/networks/eurostars-2>

## 9 Conclusions and Recommendations

A review of JPI, COST and EU MS programme participation by EaP countries conducted by the EaP Plus project indicated high interest of those countries in international R&D projects, both bilateral and multilateral.

The review of national priorities and R&D planning showed that European challenges tackled by the Joint Programming Process are of common interest to many European countries, with EaP countries being among them. There are also numerous benefits from JPI participation. Moldova, as a current JPI participant, noted that through the Water JPI it was able to establish deep connection to key EU policy makers and performers in the Water RDI sector; it was possible to align national priorities with JPI agenda; JPI participation enhanced visibility for Moldovan researchers and research groups and also allowed better integration and cooperation.

Although EaP countries express their interest in JPI participation and some of them are undertaking steps for becoming JPI members, they also see various obstacles on the way, such as availability of funding, staff capabilities and knowledge of the processes, as well as specifics of national funding rules and legislature.

It is then recommended to provide more training activities for the representatives from EaP research funding agencies on working with various EU funding schemes. JPI participation of EaP countries could also be supported through travel grants with some of the countries being advised to initially engage as observers. Further projects could also consider organizing trainings for young specialists working in the field of international research cooperation helping them to further employ the acquired knowledge while serving with their national R&D agencies.

Participation in COST Actions also constitutes an extremely important way for networking and for ultimately preparing H2020 proposals. Despite the importance of COST, the participation of the EaP Countries in COST Actions has not been too high and there is a need for further promotion of participation of EaP countries in COST Actions that may take place during various events such as information days and also may be supported by national NCP networks.

A follow-up study exercise to the analysis of participation of EaP countries in the EU MS programmes is recommended that will include direct communication with programme owners in the EU MS and the EaP countries in order to define the key priorities for mutual cooperation; the benefits from and the obstacles for, the involvement of the EaP countries to EU funded schemes and the means to address them efficiently.

## 10 Sources of information

- IncoNet EaP D 1.4 Feasibility Study for structured joint funding mechanisms targeting EaP region in the 3 SCs
- Black Sea Horizon “Report on opportunities and barriers to include RTI programmes from Black Sea countries in COFUND ERA-NETs”
- European cooperation in science and technology COST web pages <http://www.cost.eu/>
- ERA-LEARN 2020 support action web pages and reports <https://www.era-learn.eu/>
- EC web pages on Joint Programming [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/background\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/background_en.html)
- Armenia Development Strategy for 2014-2025. Annex to RA Government Decree # 442 - N on 27th of March, 2014
- Science and Technology Development Priorities for 2015-2019 (25.12.2014, N 54)
- “Azerbaijan 2020: Look into the future” Concept of Development ([http://www.president.az/files/future\\_en.pdf](http://www.president.az/files/future_en.pdf))
- State Research Programmes of the Republic of Belarus (<http://research.bsu.by/research-activity/research-areas-programs/gpni/>)
- Rustaveli National Science Foundation (SRNSF) <http://www.rustaveli.org.ge/en/Mission,-Goals,-Objectives>
- Action programme of the Government of Republic of Moldova for 2016-2018 [http://www.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/government\\_of\\_republic\\_of\\_moldova\\_-\\_action\\_programme\\_of\\_the\\_government\\_of\\_republic\\_of\\_moldova\\_for\\_2016-2018.pdf](http://www.gov.md/sites/default/files/document/attachments/government_of_republic_of_moldova_-_action_programme_of_the_government_of_republic_of_moldova_for_2016-2018.pdf)
- Code of the Republic of Moldova on science and innovations No 259-XV dated 15.07.2004 (Last edition from 20.10.2017)
- Medium-Term Government Priority Action Plan to 2020 (Approved by the Ordinance of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine of 2017 No. 275-p (<https://www.kmu.gov.ua/storage/app/media/.../cerednostrokoviy-plan-2020.doc>))
- Law of Ukraine of July 11, 2001 No. 2623-III “About the priority directions of development of science and technology” (<http://cis-legislation.com/document.fwx?rgn=18116>)
- Main scientific priorities and crucial problems of fundamental research in the areas of natural, technical and human sciences of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine for 2014-2018 ([http://www1.nas.gov.ua/infrastructures/Legaltexts/nas/2013/regulations/OpenDocs/Naukovi\\_napryamy\\_2014\\_2018.pdf](http://www1.nas.gov.ua/infrastructures/Legaltexts/nas/2013/regulations/OpenDocs/Naukovi_napryamy_2014_2018.pdf))
- JPI membership model based on JPI on Antimicrobial Resistance [https://www.jpiamr.eu/download/JPIAMR-membership-policy\\_2014.pdf](https://www.jpiamr.eu/download/JPIAMR-membership-policy_2014.pdf)

## 11 Annexes

### Annex I – JPI membership example based on JPI on Antimicrobial Resistance<sup>19</sup>

#### Membership model:

- Members
- Observers
- Partners

#### Membership rights and responsibilities:

##### Members:

- The nominated Management Board member has a governmental mandate
- All Members are represented in the Management Board (with a maximum of 2 representatives)
- They have voting rights

#### Active contribution to the activities of JPIAMR is expected from countries represented by the Management Board member:

- Attend regularly Management Board meetings
- Be a member of at least 1 MB Working Group
- Participate in some of the Joint Actions
- Answer to the official JPIAMR surveys

#### Contribution to JPIAMR operations:

- Contribute in-kind for the time for participation in meetings, workshops and Working Groups events and travel costs of member's representatives
- Contribute in-kind with the organisation of some of the JPIAMR meetings or workshops
- If in the future financial fees are decided to be set by the MB its members would have to contribute

#### Observers:

- The Observers are represented in the Management Board (with a maximum of 1 representative)
- They do not have voting rights
- They cannot be a member of the Steering Committee

---

<sup>19</sup> [https://www.jpiamr.eu/download/JPIAMR-membership-policy\\_2014.pdf](https://www.jpiamr.eu/download/JPIAMR-membership-policy_2014.pdf)

Active contribution to the activities of JPIAMR is expected:

- Attend regularly Management Board meetings
- Be a member of at least 1 MB Working Group
- Participate in some of the Joint Actions
- Answer to the official JPIAMR surveys

Contribution to JPIAMR operations:

- Contribute in-kind for the time for participation in meetings, workshops and Working Groups events and travel costs of member's representatives

After 2 years its membership status should be evaluated.

Partners:

- Involvement in specific JPIAMR activities only
- Information on JPIAMR activities
- Participation does not imply a role in JPIAMR governance

In all cases, any participating country will have to respect the rules governing any JPIAMR joint actions/research activities.