

Macro Analysis Erasmus Mundus Overall Observations

ALEXANDRA MAYR UNIVERSITY OF ALICANTE, SPAIN CAMPINAS, 26TH MARCH 2009



Overall observations

• Active Players

- Wide range of EU countries are engaged with BRIC countries
- o UK, Germany, France.. biggest role
- Mediterranean well represented with Italy and Spain
- Eastern European countries are less represented with Poland being the most active. Less involvement from countries such as Slovenia, Slovakia, Czech Republic and the Baltic States.



Areas of cooperation

- depend on BRIC countries own foreign policy & science and technology policies
- EU science and technology agreements, joint action plans, country strategy papers
- However, the source of funding plays a crucial role in developing areas of cooperation (donor-funder relation).
- If country specific data available: observe if individual countries develop niche areas of cooperation (diff. from EU)
- environment (an increasing requirement for EC grants) appear as a cross cutting theme, often pairing with other areas of cooperation eg ICT and other technological cooperation



Sources of funding

• Important Role of EC programmes

- × Given strong EC role, furhter research could look into whether termination of certain EC calls result in reduction of cooperation
- Some EU member states have a strong presence in funding projects
 - × Germany, France...
- Strong correlation with forms of cooperation as well as duration of partnership (determined by the calls)



Erasmus Mundus



Macro-analysis Working Session

"EU-BRIC COUNTRIES HIGHER EDUCATION R&D COOPERATION TRENDS" DRAFT DOCUMENT

ALEXANDRA MAYR UNIVERSITY OF ALICANTE, SPAIN CAMPINAS, 26TH MARCH 2009



Objectives and purpose of this activity

- Outputs against workplan
 - Share experiences
- Summary of partner contributions received
- Proposed structure and contents of the document
 - Next steps



Objectives & Target

- study the *higher education R&D trends* between the EU and BRIC countries
- *identify the main cooperation areas* and its fluctuation based on EC and BRIC countries databases
- *most important projects* where IP and exploitation issues could have a crucial role will be later contacted to gain learning experiences from participants
- Handy document *targeted* at Higher Education Institutions, Researchers, Scientists of EU and BRIC countries interested in cooperation



Workplan

- 2/12/2008 1/4/2009
- Input Person/days: 346
 45 days per Partner
- UA coordinate 2.1 & 2.2
- UNICAMP coordinate 2.3
- All partners participate

Outputs against Workplan

• Analysis Guidelines Development

• First draft guidelines:	11.12.08
• Deadline for comments:	18.12.08
• Several later comments and changes	
• Final version:	13.01.09
• Additional excel sheet:	16.01.09
Data Collection	
• Deadline for data collection	02.03.09
 Last input received 	18.03.09
Draft document	
o First draft	23.03.09



Lessens Learned

No problems

- Minor delays but still in schedule
- Try to meet deadlines
 - So all of us can plan their time
 - Timely comments on guidelines avoid delays the data collection process

Guidelines

- Important to read well and keep in mind while filling in questionnaires and forms
- o not clear enough in some aspects
 - What was expected exactly from partners may not have been clear enough

P		Partner	inputs		
Partner	General & Sources	Excel (nr proj.)	Narrative	Question- naires	Case Studies
UA	\checkmark	280 B 260 I	\checkmark	1 Brazil	
CU	\checkmark	89 P	\checkmark	2 China	2 Very detailed
UJ	\checkmark	78 P	\checkmark	3 Russia	
Unicamp	\checkmark	135 A	\checkmark		
LETI		35 P		2 Russia	
IITR	\checkmark	160 P		2 India	
KUST		96 China		1 China	

Status-quo of Outputs

	Brazil	Russia	India	China	
Priorities	\checkmark		\checkmark	1	Ok
Sources	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	Ok
Excel	135 A. 260 P.	32 89	160 308	98 89	Ok
Narrative	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	
Questionnaire	1	4	2 **	4**	?
Case Study	1 Institution			2 Projects	?

→How to organize this best for a good output?
→Some more input from BRIC partners on funding sources in their country?



Lessens learned

- Guidelines need to be more specific
- Interesting cultural aspects
- ask in case of doubt
- Always check you have the most recent analysis guidelines and questionnaires (Intranet!) before starting analysis
- Good response when asking for more input
- THE RESULT IS FOR ALL OF US!



Structure final document

- I. Introduction (aim, methodology)
- II. Overview EU–BRIC cooperation
- III. Analysis by BRIC country

IV. Case studies / Questionnaires

Let's try to keep it short and interesting!! It's not about quantity but about quality!



Structure final document

Introduction

- 1.1. Introduction
- 1.2. Methodology

II. Overview EU – BRIC country cooperation

- 1.3. General Trends
- 1.4. Most active players
- 1.5. Source of funding
- 1.6. Drivers of Cooperation and Agreements
 - Brazil, Russia, India, China
 - Agreements, Funding Programmes, Priority Areas

III. Analysis of Cooperation by BRIC country

- 1.7. Drivers of cooperation & Agreements (by country)
- 1.8. Most active players
 - countries,
 - institutions
- 1.9. Main scientific areas of cooperation
- 1.10. Sources of funding
- 1.11. Common forms and duration of cooperation

IV. Case studies / Questionnaires – discuss



Proposals for Next Steps

- Decide on most interesting information to include
- Balance information per country
- homogeneous representation of graphs?
- Include some questionnaires in little boxes next to the related countries information ?
- Include some general info on IP ?
- ••••
- LETS DISCUSS!



THANKS FOR YOUR EFFORTS!

Together we can achieve truly interesting results!