

SECOND SOCIOLOGICAL SURVEY OF PARTICIPATION OF ESTONIAN ORGANIZATIONS IN THE 5th FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

TABLE OF CONTENT

<u>1. OVERVIEW OF THE SURVEY AND THE PARTICIPANTS</u>	2
<u>2. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AND THE RESPONDENTS</u>	3
<u>2.1 General information about the respondents</u>	3
<u>2.2 Role of Estonian organisation in a project</u>	5
<u>3. PARTICIPATION IN CALLS FOR PROPOSALS AND PARTNERS IN CONSORTIUM</u>	8
<u>3.1 Proposal writing</u>	8
<u>3.2 Initiators of proposals</u>	8
<u>3.3 Partners</u>	11
<u>3.4 Problems in proposal writing</u>	12
<u>3.5 Need for information and consultation</u>	13
<u>4. PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATION IN FP5</u>	15
<u>4.1 Objectives of participation</u>	16
<u>4.2 Importance of the projects</u>	18
<u>4.3 Strengths and weaknesses of projects</u>	19
<u>4.4 Importance of EU financial contribution</u>	20
<u>5. PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION EXPERIENCE</u>	22
<u>5.1 Previous R&D cooperation experience</u>	22
<u>5.2 Previous framework programme experience</u>	23
<u>6. USE OF ESTONIAN NATIONAL CONTACT PERSON FOR FP5</u>	24
<u>7. CONCLUSIONS</u>	25

1. OVERVIEW OF THE SURVEY AND THE PARTICIPANTS

This analysis represents the results of the second survey conducted among the Estonian organisations that participated in FP5 calls for proposals. First survey was conducted at the end of 1999 and it included the proposals submitted to the first calls for proposals in FP5. In total 106 organisations participated in the first survey. The aim of first survey was to find out the general background information, broader objectives and problems related to preparation of proposals presented to the FP5 calls from Estonia. The results of the first survey are summarised in the publication called “Participation of Estonia in the Fifth Framework Programme. January 1999 – January 2001.”¹

Preparations for carrying out the second survey started in spring 2002. In addition to the questions of the first survey the aim of the second survey was to identify the problems related to the preparation as well as participation of Estonian organisations in FP5 projects. The aim was to interview successful Estonian applicants. In total 134 organisations participated in the second survey.

The questionnaire consisted of 142 questions divided into five thematic blocks:

- 1) General information about the proposal submitted and the applicant.
- 2) Participation in the calls for proposals of FP5 and partners in consortium.
- 3) Purpose for participation in the project proposals of FP5.
- 4) Previous cooperation experience in research and development.
- 5) Use of the Estonian support structure of FP5.

The survey was conducted between 16 June and 25 September 2002. The interviewers were NCPs of FP5 in Estonia: Maria Habicht (31 proposals), Kristina Kallas (10), Meelis Sirendi (30), Tarmo Pihl (23), Hillar Toomiste (11), Terje Tuisk (2), Ülle Must (2) and Silver Toomla (25) respectively.

¹ *Participation of Estonia in Fifth Framework Programme. January 1999 – January 2001.* Ministry of Education and Archimedes Foundation, Tartu 2001.

2. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED AND THE RESPONDENTS

2.1 General information about the respondents

In total 134 organisations participated in the survey. Out of those 12 were not successful and 4 respondents did not know the Commission's decision yet. Among the respondents of successful proposals bit less than half (49%) had signed the contract with European Commission. 27% said they are still negotiating and 10% percent could not answer. Differently from the first survey, where all applicants where interviewed, the aim of the survey was to interview successful Estonian applicants. However, several applicants were not available for interviews due to the lack of time.

Table 1. Number of respondents by programme

Programme	Number of proposals	Respondents of first survey	Respondents of second survey	Total first and second survey
Quality of Life	256	33	36	69
Information Society Technologies	126	2	23	25
Growth	27	8	1	9
Environment	215	34	46	80
International Cooperation	18	8	2	10
SME & Innovation	51	10	11	21
Human Potential and socio-economic research	115	11	15	26
Total	808	106	134	240

Among respondents most numerous were organisations participating in Quality of Life and Environment programmes (together 52% of respondents). The least represented is Growth programme with only one respondent and INCO programme with 2 respondents.

Table 2. Number of respondents by the type of organisation

Type	Number	Percent
Research organisation	82	61
Private company	15	11
State institution	22	17
Local government	1	0,7
Other	14	11
Total	134	100

Majority of respondents were research organisations (universities and research institutes), however, the number of companies was also significant. Compared to the first survey the number of state institutions among project partners has increased.

Table 3. Number of respondents by project type

Type of project	Number	Percent
Research project	73	55
Accompanying measure	32	24
Thematic network	13	10
Concerted action	7	5
Combined research and demo project	4	3
Demonstration project	2	1
Exploratory award (EA)	2	1
Cooperative research (CRAFT)	1	0,7
Total	134	100

Slightly more than half of respondents (55%) participated in research projects. However, compared to the first survey the number of respondents who participated in other type of projects has increased from 30% to 45%. Second most popular type of projects were accompanying measures.

Table 4. Number of respondents by gender

Gender	Number	Percent
Male	98	73
Female	36	27
Total	134	100

Gender balance of the contact persons for the projects has changed compared to the first survey. Among all respondents there was 73% men and 27% women. In the first survey the men represented 90% of the respondents.

Table 5. Number of respondents by geographical region

Region	Number	Percent
Tallinn	54	40
Tartu	73	55
Jõgeva	1	0,7
Kärdla	1	0,7
Saku	1	0,7
Valga	1	0,7
Pärnu	1	0,7
Tõravere	1	0,7
Rakvere	1	0,7
Total	134	100

Main Estonian research centres Tartu and Tallinn represented 95% of respondents (Tartu 55% and Tallinn 40%). Compared to the first survey the role of these two centres has increased (from 92% to 95%). The participation of other centres has remained modest.

2.2 Role of Estonian organisation in a project

Table 6. Role of Estonian organisation in the project

Role	Number	Percent
Coordinator	15	11
Partner	109	81
Associated partner	6	5
Subcontractor	2	1,5
Other	2	1,5
Total	134	100

Majority of respondents participated in a project as partner. Only 11% of respondents were the coordinators of projects. However, the number of Estonian coordinators has increased between the surveys from 9% to 11%.

Table 7. Type of coordinator organisation

Type	Number	Percent
Research organisation	84	63
Private company	25	19
State institution	10	7
Local government	4	3
Other	11	8
Total	134	100

Projects with Estonian partner were mostly coordinated by research organisation (63%), followed by companies (19%). Compared to the first survey the share of research organisations among coordinators has decreased (from 74% to 63%) and the number of coordinators from companies (from 16% to 19%), state institutions (from 2% to 7%) and other organisations (from 4% to 8%) has increased.

Table 8. Role of Estonian organisation in the project by programmes (in numbers)

Programme	Coordinator	Partner	Associated partner	Subcontractor	Other
Quality of Life	6	25	5	0	0
Information Society Technologies	4	17	0	2	0
Growth	0	1	0	0	0
Environment	0	31	1	0	2
Energy	0	12	0	0	0
International Cooperation	1	1	0	0	0
SME & Innovation	3	8	0	0	0
Human Potential and socio-economic research	1	14	0	0	0
Total	15	109	6	2	2

Out of 15 Estonian coordinators 6 were in Quality of Life programme and 4 in IST programme. There was no Estonian coordinator among the respondents in Energy and Environment and Growth programmes. In SME & Innovation programme 3 coordinators were interviewed who all participated in innovation support structures and networks development projects. Compared to first survey the number of coordinators in thematic programmes has increased, but continuously Estonian organisations coordinated innovation promotion projects.

Table 9. Estonian coordinators by the type of organisation

Type	Number
Research organisation	3
Private company	7
State institution	2
Local government	1
Other	2
Total	15

Around half of the coordinators were private companies (7 out of 15). Among these 7 coordinators there were 2 companies who were participating in Exploratory Award projects. It is surprising that companies coordinated also research projects. Research organisations and state institutions, including local governments, each coordinated 3 projects. Other organisations such as foundations and NGOs coordinated 2 projects.

Table 10. Projects coordinated by Estonian organisation by project type

Type of project	Number	Percent
Research project	7	47
Research Training Network	1	7
Accompanying measures	5	33
Exploratory Award	2	13
Total	15	100

Among Estonian coordinators most popular were research and accompanying measures projects. Compared to the first survey, where 64% of Estonian coordinators lead accompanying measures projects, the number of those coordinating research projects has increased.

Table 11. Previous experience in FP participation among respondents by role in the project (in numbers)

Role	Have participated	Have not	Don't know	Total
Coordinator	9	4	2	15
Partner	56	50	3	109
Associated partner	3	3	0	6
Subcontractor	0	2	0	2
Other	1	0	1	2

Majority of Estonian coordinators have had previous experience in participating in framework programmes. However, there were 4 organisations who became the coordinators of project without previous experience. Among partners the number of respondents with previous experience was almost equal to those who have not participated in any framework programme before.

3. PARTICIPATION IN CALLS FOR PROPOSALS AND PARTNERS IN CONSORTIUM

3.1 Proposal writing

Size of the teams who were preparing proposals varied a lot. Predominantly smaller research teams were involved in preparation of project proposal (41%). Almost one fifth (24%) of project proposals were prepared by one person alone. The whole department or institution was involved in 19% of cases. Similar situation appeared also during the first survey. In average 2 persons were involved in project proposal preparation. As a minimum one person and as a maximum 10 persons were involved in writing a proposal.

Table 12. Involvement of respondent in the proposal writing

	Number	Percent
Did not participate in proposal writing, only signed A form	31	23
Participated in project writing in some degree	30	22
Participated in project writing in medium degree	44	33
Prepared a project independently	22	16
Other	5	4
Answer is missing	2	1.5
Total	134	100

Estonian organisations had a relatively modest role in writing proposals. This is related to the role of the Estonian organisations as a partners and not coordinators in projects. However, compared to the first survey the number of respondents who had prepared project proposal independently has raised from 10% to 16% and number of those who participated to some degree as fallen from 38% to 22%. At the same time the number of those respondents who did not participate in project proposal writing has also raised from 10% to 23%. Among other answers there were some single-partner projects or the proposal was submitted second time.

3.2 Initiators of proposals

Table 13. Initiators of proposals by the type of organisation (in numbers)

	Research organisation	Company	State institution	Local government	Other
Did not participate in proposal writing, only signed A form	13	3	11	0	4
Participated in project writing in some degree	24	2	2	0	2
Participated in project writing in medium degree	37	2	3	0	2
Prepared a project independently	5	7	5	1	4
Other	3	0	0	0	2
Total	82	14	21	1	14

From the respondents who did not participate in the proposal writing and only signed administrative forms were 42% research organisations and 35.5% state institutions. State institutions were the group of respondents who participated less in the proposal writing among all the respondents. Majority of the companies prepared their proposals themselves as many of them participated in Exploratory Award and CRAFT proposals which had to be prepared by companies. Companies were also actively involved as coordinators which explains their higher than average involvement in project writing. Research organisation participated in the project writing in medium degree.

Table 14. Initiators of proposals by the role of respondent in project (percent)

	Coordinator	Partner	Associated partner
Did not participate in proposal writing, only signed A form	0	27	17
Participated in project writing in some degree	0	23	67
Participated in project writing in medium degree	0	38	16
Prepared a project independently	93	7	0
Other	7	5	0
Total	100	100	100

All coordinators except one prepared the project independently. Among partners majority participated in proposal writing in a medium degree, however, significant number of partners only signed administrative forms (27%).

Majority of the project were initiated by cooperation partner outside of Estonia. Eleven percent of the proposals were initiated by the respondents themselves and among them all except one were coordinators of projects.

Table 15. The initiators of proposals by type of organisation (percent)

	Research organisation	Company	State institution	Other
Our group	4	50	9	14
Estonian partner	1	0	0	14
Foreign partner	89	50	86	43
Other	6	0	5	29
Total	100	100	100	100

Among companies the half of respondents initiated proposals themselves and half were initiated by their foreign partners. This can be again explained by high number of coordinators among companies. Among research organisations 89% and among state institutions 86% of proposals were initiated by foreign partners.

Table 16. The initiators of proposals by role of respondent in the project (percent)

	Coordinator	Partner	Associated partner
Our group	93	2	0
Estonian partner	7	0	33
Foreign partner	0	89	67
Other	0	9	0
Total	100	100	100

As can be seen from the Table 16 fifteen Estonian coordinators were the initiators of the proposals. Only in one case the initiator of the proposals was another Estonian partner and not the later coordinator. There was no case where the project was initiated by foreign organisation and Estonian organisation acted as coordinator. Compared to the first survey the Estonian initiators of project proposals were more often later the coordinators of those proposals. Among the partners only 2 respondents said that they initiated the proposal, but did not became coordinators later. In previous survey in five cases Estonian organisation initiated the project but did not became the coordinator.

In average the proposal to participate in project was made half a year before the submission deadline. The shortest notice was in 2 weeks, the longest in 2 years.

3.3 Partners

Table 17. Ways of finding partners

	Number	Percent
Previous personal contacts	101	75
Through CORDIS	0	0
Through FP5 NCP	5	4
Other	22	16
Answer is missing	6	5
Total	134	100

Partners were found for a project primarily through earlier personal contacts (75%). The channels in finding partners have not changed between the two surveys. Still the most used way is through previous personal contacts. None of the respondents found their partners through CORDIS partner search facility. Partner search through FP5 national contact person's network was used more among the respondents of second survey (raised from 1 percent to 4 percent). During the first survey the NCP network was relatively new and not strongly established in Estonia.

One company entered the project through proposal made from headquarters' office. Among other options for finding partners most frequently conference participation was mentioned. Internet search, universities liaison office, professional unions, committees and third parties were also were mentioned.

Table 18. Knowing partners before the beginning of project

	Number	Percent
Knew all partners	12	9
Knew most partners	41	30
Knew few partners	39	28
Knew one partner	20	15
Didn't know any partner	17	13
Other answer	5	3
Answer is missing	4	2
Total	134	100

The survey revealed that when joining the consortium respondents had known most or some of the partners well (30% and 28% respectively). Only 12 respondents out of 130 knew well all partners in the consortium. Compared to the first survey the number of respondents who knew all partners before starting the project had fallen (from 20% to 9%). The number of respondents who did not know any of the partners has risen from

4% in the first survey to almost 13% in second survey. These differences stem from the higher activity of Estonian organisations in FP5 participation during the second and third years of the programme.

Table 19. Relationship between the success of the proposal and knowing partners (in numbers)

	Successful	Not successful	Cannot say	Total
Knew all partners	10	1	0	11
Knew most partners	32	4	4	40
Knew few partners	36	3	0	39
Knew one partner	19	1	0	20
Didn't know any partner	14	2	0	16
Other answer	0	1	0	1
Total	111	12	4	127

The survey revealed that knowing all partners well before submitting the proposal did not provide big advantages. Only 10 out of 111 successful respondents knew all partners before submitting proposal. At the same time 14 out of 111 successful respondents did not know any of the partners. Majority of respondents, successful or not successful knew most or few partners before submitting the proposal.

3.4 Problems in proposal writing

Table 20. Problems arising during the preparation of proposals (percent)

	Certainly	Rather	Certainly not	Cannot say
Preparation time was too short	13	29	54	3.
Lack of previous experience	16	37	45	1.5
Lack of understanding in whole FP5	4	25	65	4
Lack of information about whole FP5	4	14	77	4
Lack of advice	4	16	77	1.5
Bad information dissemination and communication with partners	0.7	14	81	2

There was no major problem arising during the preparation of projects. Lack of previous experience in preparing similar proposals were most often mentioned as a problem – 16% of respondents considered it to be certainly a problem and 37% mentioned that it was a problem to a certain degree. Lack of time was also often appearing in the list of

problems. Only one respondent mentioned bad communication between partners as a problem that occurred during the preparation of proposal. Twice the framework programme vocabulary and ambiguity of instructions were mentioned as a problem.

Problems appearing during writing of proposal were not significantly different for different type of organisations. However, enterprises mentioned more often lack of previous experience in writing similar proposals, lack of time and awareness about where to get information than other organisations.

There was some statistically significant difference between the problems of coordinators and partners. Coordinators mentioned more often lack of time and previous experience in writing similar proposals as problems compared to partners. Associated partners mentioned bad communication and information exchange between partners as problem.

3.5 Need for information and consultation

To the question whether any additional information or consultation had been needed in the preparation of the proposal 32% gave affirmative answer, 55% negative and 12% could not say. Compared to the previous survey the number of those who needed additional information and consultation had fallen from 48% to 32%. Similarly as in first survey consultation and information was mostly needed about the cost models and preparation of budget (11 respondents). Among other issues were most often mentioned filling in administrative forms (5 respondents), calculation of personnel costs (3), writing so-called soft parts of the proposal (contribution to EU policies and added value) (2). Single respondents mentioned the questions of project management, using specific framework vocabulary, information about evaluation procedure and different types of projects. Two respondents from universities mentioned the need for information about the university's internal administrative rules.

Table 21. Need for information and consultation by organisation type (in numbers).

	Research organisation	Company	State institution	Municipal organisation	Other
Would have needed information	7	4	1	0	1
Would have needed	19	4	1	0	6

consultation					
No	46	4	17	1	5
Cannot say	10	3	2	0	1

Information and consultation need did not differ significantly between different type of organisations. More than half of the research organisations (56%) and around 80% of state institutions said they did not need any kind of information or consultation. However, 53% of enterprises mentioned that they would have needed information or consultation during writing a proposal. Need for consultation was high also among other type of organisations, mostly NGOs (46%).

Table 22. Need for information and consultation by the role of the organisation in project (in numbers).

	Coordinator	Partner	Associated partner
Would have needed information	2	9	2
Would have needed consultation	5	23	2
No	6	63	2
Cannot say	2	13	0

Respondents who were partners in the project needed information and consultation less often than coordinators. Half of the coordinators needed information and consultation and other have did not.

Similarly from the first survey the question of intellectual property rights has not been acknowledged by organisations participating in framework programmes. Three quarters (75%) of respondents did not discuss the issue of intellectual property rights in the course of the preparation of proposal. However, private companies are more aware of the issue of intellectual property rights - 60% of companies said that they did discuss the IPR issue before submitting the proposal. Only 20% of research organisations and 19% of state institutions said they did so.

Signing consortium agreement was not considered to be important during the preparation of proposal by 80% of respondents. Only 15% of respondents signed the agreement before the submission of proposal. Here again companies considered existence of consortium agreement prior to submitting the proposal slightly more important than research organisations and state institutions - 26% of companies and only

12% of research organisations and 20% of state institutions signed consortium agreement before the submission of proposal.

Those respondents who have signed an agreement with European Commission it took in average 5 month to negotiate a contract with EC. Minimum time mentioned was 2 weeks and maximum 1 year. The advance payment arrived in average within 3 month (minimum 2 weeks, maximum 7 month).

4. PURPOSE OF PARTICIPATION IN FP5

In average 5 persons from one partner organisation were involved with the implementation of the project. The minimum number was 1 and the maximum 30 persons.

Table 23. Time of planning the activities of research organisations

Years	Number	Percent
Up till 6 month	2	1.5
Up to 1 year	22	16
Up to 2 years	33	25
Up to 5 years	24	18
More than 5 years	13	10
No planning	0	0
Cannot say	4	3

Table 24. Time of planning the activities of companies and other institutions

Years	Number	Percent
Up till 6 month	5	4
Up to 1 year	10	7
Up to 2 years	7	5
Up to 5 years	14	10
More than 5 years	3	2
No planning	0	0
Cannot say	0	0

The average time of planning the activities was from 1 to 5 years. Majority of organisations planned their activities up to 2 years. There was no major difference in planning time span between research organisations and companies.

4.1 Objectives of participation

Table 25. Objectives of participation in the project (percent)

	Very important	Rather important	Not important	Completely not important	Cannot say
Obtaining new knowledge	54	34	8	0.7	1.5
Solving scientific problems	38	21	19	18	2
Solving practical problem in local level	23	30	30	16	0.7
Observing R&D innovations in own field	32	34	20	10	2
Developing new research methods	31	25	21	17	4
Finding new partners	62	31	4	0.7	0.7
Enhancing prestige through participation in FP5	26	24	28	19	3
Publication of the results	37	20	22	16	3
Dissemination of the results in commercial purposes	7	12	26	42	4
Getting new patents	5	7	8	55	4
Training the personnel	28	34	18	7	4
Observing the activities of competitors	4	18	28	32	4
Products quality development	14	17	10	28	7
Developing new products	7	18	12	32	7
Improving the productivity	8	7	14	38	9
Creating new production processes/developing existing ones	8	16	8	34	9
Finding new markets	11	12	6	39	8
Providing additional financial resources	54	27	8	6	4

The largest number of respondents regarded finding new cooperation partners as important objective in participating in project (62%). Compared to the first survey the

importance of getting additional funding has fallen from first to second place. Around 55% of respondents considered getting additional financial resources and obtaining new knowledge equally important. The low importance of commercial objectives is clearly evident among respondents. This can be partly explained by the smaller number of companies among respondents.

Additionally the following objectives of participation were mentioned: raising the awareness of the topic in Estonia, participating in high level pan European cooperation and gaining new experience.

There were slight differences between the primary objectives of different types of organisations in participating in framework programme project. Solving interesting scientific problem was for obvious reasons more important objective for research organisations and to some extent companies than to state institutions. Research organisations were more interested in publishing the results in high level scientific journals. Companies were more interested in developing new methods or technology, disseminating the results in commercial purposes, getting new patents, widening the range of products and qualitative development of products and also in finding new markets. Providing additional financial resources was somewhat less important to state institutions than to research organisations and companies. Similar tendencies in different objectives were also evident in first survey.

There was no major difference between the objectives of coordinators, partners and associated partners for participation in the project except that associated partners regarded gaining new ideas, solving scientific problems and publication of the results somewhat more important than did partners and coordinators.

Table 26. Negative aspects of participation (percent)

	Certainly	Somewhat	Certainly not	Cannot say
Cooperation with non EU countries decreased	0	2	65	0.7
Estonian national priorities were ignored	1.5	1.5	65	0.7
Project did not correspond to our scientific interests	0	8	58	1.5
Some other negative aspects	4	3	31	19

Respondents did not mention any major problem that occurred because of their participation in framework programme project. Nor the decrease in the cooperation with non EU countries neither the fact that project did not correspond to the scientific interest of respondent were mentioned as problems.

Respondents mentioned the following problems they encountered during the implementation of project: lots of time went to the bureaucratic procedures in the management of project, difficulties with co-financing, delays in Commission's payments, heterogeneity of partners and also the obligation to reveal data to competitors.

There was no statistically significant difference between different type of organisations and different partners in mentioning the problems arising from the participation in FP5 projects.

4.2 Importance of the projects

Table 27. Importance of the project for the basic research theme (research organisation) or strategic development (company and other organisation) of the respondent (percent)

	Very important	Rather important	Rather unimportant	Not important	Cannot say
Research organisation	15	36	16	4	0
Enterprises and other organisations	8	13	8	3	0.7
Total	23	49	24	7	0.7

Table 28. Relation of the project to the central research subject of the research group or to the main field of activity of companies and other organisations (percent)

	Related very closely	Related rather closely	Related rather little	Is not related	Cannot say
Research organisation	27	34	8	1.5	0
Enterprises and other organisations	24	6	3	0	0.7
Total	51	40	11	1.5	0.7

Almost half of the respondents (49%) found the project to be rather important and 24 % very important to the basic research theme or strategic area of their group. However, almost quarter found the project to be rather unimportant to their basic research theme or strategic area of activity. There were few who participated in a project because of some other interest.

Strong majority of the respondents among research organisations (61%) as well as companies and other organisations (30%) found the project to be very closely or rather closely related to their main field of activity.

4.3 Strengths and weaknesses of projects

Table 29. Evaluation of their project by respondents (percent)

Problem	Strong	Rather strong	Rather weak	Weak	Cannot say
Scientific and technological excellence	30	41	15	2	7
Innovativeness and originality	28	45	16	0.7	4
Scientific and technological quality of partners	48	33	7	0.7	3
Transparency, well-planning and adequacy of the implementation and management of project	27	45	14	0	6
Optimal use of finances and resources	18	42	13	0.7	16
Adequate methodology and work plan for the achievement of objectives	24	49	12	0.7	7
Practical value and broader economic relevance of the results	42	31	14	0.7	2

Compared to the first survey, where the share of non-successful applicants was higher among respondents and the projects were estimated in some areas to be weak, in the second survey the respondents evaluated their proposals to be rather strong. Around half of respondents evaluated scientific and technological quality of partners and broader economic relevance of their projects to be strong. All other aspects of the project were evaluated as rather strong than weak. However, in second survey the number of respondents who considered the scientific and technological quality of the project to be

weak was higher than in the first survey (2% and 1.8% respectively). Around 16% of respondents could not evaluate the use of finances and resources which is connected to their role in project as partner or associated partners rather than coordinators.

State institutions estimated the high scientific and technological excellence and the originality and innovativeness of their projects to be rather weak than strong while research organisations and companies estimated these aspects to be rather strong than weak. Associated partners estimated the scientific and technological quality of their partners higher than coordinators and partners.

There was no statistically significant difference in the evaluation of proposals by successful and not successful applicants. Successful applicants evaluated the practical value and broader economic relevance of their project higher than others. At the same time respondents of successful projects evaluated scientific and technological excellence of their projects somewhat less strong than respondents from not successful projects.

4.4 Importance of EU financial contribution

Table 30. Importance of the EU financial contribution to the project

Importance	Number	Percent
Project would have been implemented without EU financing	6	4
EU financing broadened the scope of the project	23	17
Project would have been implemented with different objectives	11	8
Project would not have been implemented	84	63
Other	5	4
Answer is missing	5	4
Total	134	100

63% of respondents said the project would not have been implanted without the EU financial contribution and only 4% of projects would have been implemented independently of EU financing decision. Almost every sixth respondents said that European Union financing broadened the scope of the project. Among the other aspects of EU financing one respondent mentioned that the EU financial scheme makes international cooperation easier.

Table 31. Importance of the EU financial contribution to the project by the type of organisation (percent)

	Research organisation	Company	State institution	Other
Project would have been implemented without EU financing	3	14	9	0
EU financing broadened the scope of the project	24	0	18	0
Project would have been implemented with different objectives	6	7	5	21
Project would not have been implemented	63	71	64	79
Other	4	7	5	0

Around quarter of research organisations and 18% state institutions said that the EU funding broadened the scope of the project. Among the companies the number of respondents who said that the project would have been implemented also without EU financing was highest. At the same time only 3% of research organisations and 9% of state institutions would have implemented the project without EU financial support. Interestingly the EU financial contribution did not broaden the scope of planned project for companies.

Table 32. Importance of the EU financial contribution to the project by the type of organisation (percent)

	Coordinator	Partner	Associated partner
Project would have been implemented without EU financing	14	4	0
EU financing broadened the scope of the project	7	21	0
Project would have been implemented with different objectives	14	7	33
Project would not have been implemented	50	66	67
Other	14	3	0

Half of the coordinators admitted that project would not have been implemented without EU financial support (50%). At the same time 14% of the coordinators said that the project would have been implemented also without EU financial support. The same number of coordinators also mentioned that in case they would not have been funded the project would have been implemented, but with different objectives. More than half

of the partners (66%) and associated partners (67%) said that project would not have been implemented without EU financial support.

5. PREVIOUS RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION EXPERIENCE

5.1 Previous R&D cooperation experience

Interviews found out that 88% of the respondents had previous cooperation experience in research and development. This is less than in first survey where 91% of respondents had previous experience. Thus it can be said that in second survey less experienced organisations participated.

Among those 10% who have not had previous experience in research and development were majority companies. Only 5% of research organisations and 10% of state institutions have not had previous RTD cooperation. Among companies 20% said that they have not had previous RTD cooperation experience.

Surprisingly 14% of the coordinators said that they have not had previous RTD cooperation experience. Among partners this number was only 6%.

Table 33. Research and development cooperation partners of the respondents by geographical region and type of organisation (percent)

Institutions	Estonia	Europe	USA Canada	Rest of the world
Research institutions	22	34	26	20
Companies	3	5	2	1.5
Other organisations	4	7	6	10
Research institutions and companies	9	5	0.7	4
Research institutions and other organisations	18	27	8	7
Companies and other organisations	0.7	3	1.5	0.7
Companies, research organisations and other organisations	28	7	1.5	2

Almost all respondents have had research cooperation with research organisations, companies and other institutions in Estonia. In other parts of the world, Europe USA

and Canada the cooperation with research organisations and other institutions dominated. 46 % of respondents had cooperation with international organisations.

5.2 Previous framework programme experience

Half of the respondents had previous experience in participating in framework programme calls for proposals but for 40% of respondents this project was the first participation in framework programme.

Among research organisations 60% had participated in the previous framework programme calls. 50% of companies and 52% of state institutions had experience in the participation in previous framework programme calls. Among NGOs 58% did not have previous experience.

Among the coordinators 69% and among the partners 55% of respondents have had previous experience. Among the associated partners half of the respondents have had previous experience.

Table 34. The relationship between earlier experience and the success of the project (percent)

Respondents	Previous experience	
	Exists	Absent
Respondents of successful proposals	54	46
Respondents of unsuccessful proposals	64	36

There was no evident relationship between the success of the proposal and previous experience in the framework programmes participation. 64% of the not successful respondents have had previous experience in the framework programme calls for proposals. Among the successful applicants 54% have had previous experience and respectively 46% have not had previous experience in participating in framework programmes.

Already 88% of the respondents were planning to participate in the next framework programme. Successful and unsuccessful participants were equally positive about the participation in the next framework programme.

Table 35. Plans for participation in the next framework programme (percent)

Organisations	Yes	No	Cannot say
Successful projects	89	4	7
Not successful projects	83	8	8
Information is missing	100	0	0

6. USE OF ESTONIAN NATIONAL CONTACT PERSON FOR FP5

Strong majority (93%) of the respondents were aware of the existence of the National Contact Persons (NCP) of FP5. Compared to the results of the first survey the use of NCP system has not increased considerably. However, the number of people who have consulted with respective area NCP has risen between surveys from 25% to 31%. 42% of respondents are subscribers of monthly newsletter *Innovaatika*.

Table 36. The nature of the contact with FP5 NCP in Estonia (percent)

	Yes	No
Subscriber to the <i>Innovaatika</i> information bulletin	42	57
Has read some numbers of <i>Innovaatika</i> , but is not subscriber	12	87
Subscribed to IRCIS list	35	63
Participation in information days/workshops/conferences on FP5	51	49
Consultation with NCP during the project writing	31	68
Looking for additional information from NCPs	16	83
Have heard about FP5 NCP, but have never had direct contact	17	81

Successful applicants consulted with NCP more often than unsuccessful applicants. Among successful applicants 36% consulted with NCP of specific programme while among unsuccessful applicants only 8% did so. Companies were more active in participating in information days, workshops and conferences on FP5.

Table 37. Assistance expected from NCP (percent)

	Certainly	Somewhat	Certainly not	Cannot say
General information about calls for proposals	52	36	7	2
Consultation on thematic priorities and running projects	37	37	19	4
Assistance in partner search	17	41	44	4
Assistance in filling in the application form	42	43	7	2
Assistance in writing the thematic parts	11	39	43	4

of proposal				
-------------	--	--	--	--

Survey revealed that organisations are mostly expecting from NCPs all kind of general information about calls for proposals and assistance in filling in the application forms. Consultations on thematic priorities and running projects were also regarded as necessary. Assistance in partner search and writing the thematic parts of the proposal were not considered necessary. Other areas of assistance expected from NCPs included consultation in financial rules, project management, intellectual property rights and all sorts of contracts. Interestingly two respondents considered the need to get contact with programme committee members to get their support to Estonian proposals and in order to get information directly from Brussels.

Companies expressed more often the need for consultation on thematic priorities and running projects than research organisations. Similarly companies and state institutions were in more need of assistance in partner search and filling in administrative forms. Coordinators expressed more often the need for assistance in finding partners than the others.

There was no statistical difference between the respondents with previous framework programme experience and no experience at all in the assistance needs.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of second survey conducted in summer and autumn 2002 was to interview successful applicants from Estonia. In addition to the questions about writing and submitting the proposals, managements of the projects and previous research cooperation, questions about using NCP structures were asked. In total 134 organisations were interviewed.

Among the respondents the most numerous were organisations participating in Quality of Life and Environment programmes. As in general FP5 participation, research organisations constituted 60% of the respondents. Participation in research projects was most numerous, however, compared to the first survey the number of respondents who participated in accompanying measures and thematic networks projects had increased.

Majority of respondents participated as partners in the projects. Estonian coordinators constituted 11% of respondents, which is similar to previous survey. Among Estonian coordinators companies dominated. This is significant change compared to the first survey where majority of Estonian coordinators were research organisations.

Respondents had relatively modest role in writing proposals. Most of them participated in proposal writing in a medium degree. Similarly to previous survey the initiators of proposals were mostly foreign cooperation partners and partners were found through previous personal contacts. Knowing partners prior to submission of proposal was good.

Among the problems arising during the preparation of proposals most often was mentioned lack of previous experience and lack of time. Number of respondents who needed additional information or consultation during the preparation of proposal has decreased compared to the first survey. Majority of respondents did not need information or consultation.

There was significant change in the purposes of participation of respondents between previous and current survey. While in the first survey majority of respondents considered getting additional financial resources as main reason of participation, in second survey this criterion was less important. Finding new partners and obtaining new knowledge became more or equally important objectives of participation for Estonian organisations. None of the respondents expressed strongly any negative aspect arising from the participation in framework programme projects. 63% of the respondents said the project would not have been implemented without EU financial contribution.

Estonian organisations valued high the scientific and technological quality of their partners. Additionally the broader economic relevance of the project results were estimated to be strong.

There were more newcomers among the respondents of the second survey. Majority of them were companies. Surprisingly 14% of the coordinators said they have not had previous RTD cooperation experience. For the 40% of the respondents this was the first experience in participation in framework programme projects.

Although majority of respondents had heard about Estonian National Contact Point for FP5, only 31% had used the services of NCP. Majority of respondents said they expect from NCP dissemination of general information about calls for proposals and assistance in filling in administrative forms of proposals.

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.