InRoad Engagement Workshop Summary Note

Event: InRoad Roadmapping Engagement Workshop
Date: 14 March 2017
Location BELSPO, Brussels (Belgium)

Group Photo InRoad Roadmapping Engagement Workshop

Key Outcomes

- During the **presentation session**, the participants of the workshop were informed about InRoad's objectives, activities and relevance from a national, European and project perspective. After each presentation, the participants contributed with their feedback about the expectations towards, challenges and opportunities of InRoad.
- During the **group sessions**, the participants engaged in four active group discussions in order to reach a common understanding on the different concepts, models and definitions to be used in the project and validate the InRoad survey questionnaire. Within each group discussion, the participants helped to identify bottlenecks that hamper the decision-making and coordination processes for RI of more than national relevance. With regard to the survey the participants provided the following feedback:
  - The **target group** of the survey and the target RI (e.g. funded/non-funded, new/existing RI) need to be better defined and described.
  - **Clear instructions** and examples should be provided at the beginning of each section and for the questions in order to make it easier to answer the questions properly for the respondents.
  - The survey should have the possibility to **upload documents** and **add remarks** per question in a 'comments field'.
  - **The questionnaire is too long** even when considering that the same person will not answer all questions. Therefore, the number of questions should be reduced, by merging some and allowing to be more descriptive.
  - The **definitions** given at the forefront are too theoretical and cannot be linked to real life practices. There will thus be a need for rewording for some components and/or refining of the definitions.
  - The **terminology** must be used **consistently** throughout the entire survey in all the sections.

According to this feedback, the project consortium will revise the survey. For the reflection group, the **timeline to finalize the survey** looks as follows:

29.03.2017:   Revised survey will be sent out to the reflection group for final feedback
04.04.2017:   Deadline for feedback on the survey to project consortium
19.04.2017:   Feedback processed and latest launch of the InRoad survey

It is expected that the timeframe for answering the survey will be one month. The official date will be communicated when the survey will be launched.

Detailed Report

The '**Roadmapping Engagement Workshop'** was the first event organised by InRoad. It provided the opportunity for RI stakeholders to interact with the InRoad partners and advisory board members. The three key objectives of the first workshop were

1. to inform about InRoad's objectives and activities and gather the related expectations, challenges and opportunities from the participants;
2. to reach a common understanding on the different concepts, models and definitions to be used in the project and validate the InRoad survey questionnaire that will be released after the workshop;
3. to identify bottlenecks that hamper the decision-making and coordination processes for RI of more than national relevance.

In total, **66 participants from 20 countries**[1] participated in the workshop, of which 22 where consortium and advisory board members. Hence, the reflection group had a size of 44 persons. The workshop was structured into two parts: (1) **presentation sessions** and (2) **group discussion sessions**. The purpose of the presentation sessions was to inform the participants about InRoad from a national, European and project perspective, in order to capture their interest and engage them for the followed group sessions. These group sessions aimed to validate the definitions used in the project and receive feedback to the first draft InRoad survey questionnaire. The detailed program of the workshop can be found in Annex I.

Outcome Presentation Sessions

At the beginning of the workshop, Martin **Müller**, Project Coordinator InRoad from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF), welcomed the participants and introduced them to InRoad. According to the **first objective of the workshop**, this presentation included the project's purpose, aims, organisational progress and the aims of the engagement workshop. Thereafter, three presentations were held in order to highlight InRoad from the national, European and project perspective, which set the engagement basis to gather the related expectations, challenges and opportunities from the participant.

First of all, Ricardo **Migueis**, Advisor on technological infrastructures and international programmes from Portuguese National Innovation Agency, elaborated on the **reasons behind InRoad from a national perspective** with the aim to engage the workshop participants to the InRoad project. He pointed out the challenges of the dynamics of RI levels, the RI lifecycles, business models and funding instruments. In the end, he gave a foresight on the future challenges facing the design RI such as the development of open science and education policy in contrast to the more and more protected socio-political environment. He emphasized the need for effective supranational mechanisms and the alignment of policy is necessary to overcome these challenges.

Following up on the national perspective, Dominik **Sobczak**, ESFRI Executive Secretary, presented the **European perspective for the need of InRoad**. He emphasized that there is a need to establish adequate framework conditions for effective governance and sustainable long-term funding of RI in Europe. However, the challenge remains the fragmented RI landscape, where national roadmaps can be the glue to make the puzzle fit in the long run. As a result, the European Commission launched a call in Horizon 2020 to take a first step towards developing a modern, robust and sustainable RI ecosystem in Europe. This first step is known today as the InRoad project.

Last but not least, **from a project perspective**, Gerd **Rücker**, Senior Scientific Officer from DLR Project Management Agency, laid out the **benefits from engaging in InRoad**, the first

---

[1] The 20 countries in alphabetical order are: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Norway, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey and United Kingdom.

results of the desk study and the next steps of the project. Starting with the desk study, the first results show that countries have historically different experiences with RI roadmaps. In detail, countries have different roadmap editions, update frequencies and lengths of update phases. As a result of this diversity, information gaps occur. This leads to the conclusion that there is a high need for more comprehensive up to date information, which InRoad aims to provide. With the InRoad project, **the participant benefits from demand-oriented information** sharing and possibilities to reflect about:

- ones' own national priority settings and evaluation mechanisms for RI to further improve the own system.
- the other priority settings to further improve the own system and share experiences with others.
- increased coordination on European RI priority settings and evaluation mechanisms.

This information formed the basis for the participants to engage in the group sessions (see outcomes below).

Key Outcomes Group Sessions

According to the **second workshop objective**, the group session's aim was reach a common understanding on the different concepts, models and definitions to be used in the project and validate the InRoad survey questionnaire. Moreover, according to the **third workshop objective**, the group sessions brought forward bottlenecks that hamper the decision-making and coordination processes for RI of more than national relevance.

In advance, one can state that the objectives were met successfully. The following chapter briefly summarizes the key outcomes from the four group sessions (see Annex II). Often given feedback per group session are highlighted in the 'Key Outcomes' in this summary report and not repeated in every group session summary.

General feedback from the groups to the survey:

- The target group of the survey and the target RI (e.g. funded/non-funded, new/existing RI) need to be better defined and described.
- Clear instructions and examples should be provided at the beginning of each section and for the questions in order to make it easier to answer the questions properly for the respondents.
- The survey should have the possibility to upload documents and add remarks per question in a 'comments field'.
- The questionnaire is too long even when considering that the same person will not answer all questions. Therefore, the number of questions should be reduced, by merging some and allowing to be more descriptive.
- The definitions given at the forefront are too theoretical and cannot be linked to real life practices. There will thus be a need for rewording for some components and/or refining of the definitions.
- The terminology must be used consistently throughout the entire survey in all the sections.

InRoad has been funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under grant agreement No 730928.

InRoad| 4

Specific feedback within the different groups:

Group 1: main characteristics of national research infrastructures roadmapping and evaluation procedures

- Important questions related to the purpose of a roadmap, the removal of RI from the roadmap, the decommissioning as well as on the strengths and weaknesses of procedures in country-specific circumstances are missing and should be included.
- Experiences of countries without specific RI roadmaps but with other procedures need to be captured in the survey as well.
- For countries, which are elaborating a roadmap for the first time, the survey should include targeted questions to learn more about the planning and design of a roadmap e.g. what criteria are relevant, if specific committees are set up.

Group 2: coordination and synchronization between national procedures, ESFRI and others

- The group highlighted several existing barriers that challenges more coordination and synchronisation in Europe such as the lack of common purpose of RI, missing common processes of RIs between national levels and between national and ESFRI level as well as the level of community involvement when developing RI roadmaps.
- The survey assumes that the problem lies only on the national roadmapping process and not on the European level. This assumption should be avoided and therefore a more open question needs to be asked.
- Based on the two previous points, Section 1, part 7 of the questionnaire should ask two questions:
    - *Please describe the link between your national and the ESFRI roadmapping.* The term 'link' should be described with the aim to find out *why is there a link* or *why does no link exist.* The aim of this section is to find out the purpose of the link, if existent.
    - *Please describe what can be done on the European level to enhance this link.* This question aims to find out what the European level can do to overcome the described barriers above.

Group 3: Funding instruments for research infrastructures

- The terminology for funding instruments varies between the countries and must be explained in the survey e.g. by including examples.
- 'Targeted (project) funding' can be understood as funding by users e.g. through their projects.
- Suggestion of returning to the term 'institutional funding' and making sure that it is clearly understood what is meant by this i.e. funding RI 'institutional like' irrespectively of their legal form (by the funding bodies and not by the research institutions and universities).
- The splitting of the budget among the different funding instruments shall be allowed to be described only qualitatively (accurate numbers are not available in most countries).
- Several funding opportunities are missing or not sufficiently reflected (EFSI, EIB, Cohesion Fun etc.)
- The questions shall be considered also from the perspective of ESIF regulation and state-aid-rules (some questions awake concerns on conflict with these – e.g. running / operational cost cannot be covered by ESIF).
- New funding mechanisms are explored in several member states and space shall be given to present this (and any other issue not touched upon). In the end of the funding section it should be allowed mention the success cases but also failures.

- This part of the survey will provide a comment section in order to understand how funders foresee synergies among national and supranational instruments/mechanisms.
- For the case studies, it was proposed that these address both funding systems of different countries and RI (that have succeeded in combining different funding instruments), and also the identified new models shall be explored in detail.

Group 4: research infrastructures business models and their links to national roadmapping procedures

- Since there is no universal definition of what a business plan constitutes, any indicator that is considered by the respondent as of interest to assess the financial soundness of their RI is important to mention when answering the questions.
- There is an indifferent use of the term 'business plan' and 'business model' in the questionnaire. Therefore, the survey should solely refer to the business plan, whereas the business model being the concept on which the business plan is elaborated.
- It was suggested to relocate question 3 prior to question 2 as it is crucial to the success of work package 5 analysis to receive roadmapping documents, on which funders base their decisions for their business plan. The current question 2 (the list of components) is considered more as a primary grid of analysis and also serves to emphasize the most interesting information for the project
- It was decided to add a question on how the eventual shutdown of an RI is taken into account/handled in its business plan. The aim is to find out if there a procedure the shutdown e.g. dealing with jobs losses, dismantling etc.
- There were suggestions to add components to the list such as:
  - User policy or user support: this encompasses all measures that are put in place to engage with users, to help them access the facility etc.
  - Key Performance Indicators
  - Technology Readiness Levels
  - Other suggestions: 'products' (it was suggested that it should rather seldom and would then come up in 'others' section) and 'market studies'.
  - It was noted that 'access fees' is comprised in the 'access policy' component and therefore this item should be removed.

Next Steps and Follow Up

In general, **the project follows a two-stage approach**: (1) gathering of information and (2) engaging the entire RI ecosystem to work together for a sustainable and efficient RI landscape in Europe. Currently, the project is going through its first stage up until the beginning of 2018, where the second stage will start.

After the workshop and the provided feedback, the consortium decided to adapt the survey according to the provided feedback from the group sessions. In general, the consortium decided to pursue the following actions:

- The **target group** of the survey will be experts engaged in national roadmapping procedures, typically national ministries and research councils.
- **Add clear instructions** how to answer the questions, so participants do not lose time for understanding the questions.
- **Add comment sections**, so participants can add additional comments if necessary
- Clearly indicate, if **documents** need to be uploaded for the questions.
- **Shorten the questionnaire** according to the feedback.
- **Adapt the definitions** and **use the terminology consistently** throughout the survey.

The **timeline to finalize the survey** looks as follows:

29.03.2017:   Revised survey will be sent out to the reflection group for final feedback

04.04.2017:   Deadline for feedback on the survey to project consortium

19.04.2017   Feedback processed and latest launch of the InRoad survey

It is expected that the timeframe for answering the survey will be one month. The official date will be communicated when the survey will be launched.

Last but not least, the following key project outputs are planned for 2017:

April: Launch of the project website and social media channels with up-to-date information

June – July: Project newsletter

September: Fact sheets on RI funding mechanisms

November: Result report on methodologies for RI monitoring and evaluation in Europe

December: Project newsletter

The **next InRoad workshop will take place on 16 January 2018**. Thereafter, a series of regional workshops, case studies and a validation workshop will be carried out in 2018. These workshops and case studies aim to provide a forum for discussion before the final conference in December. Invitations to the different events will be sent out timely in advance.

Annex I: Workshop programme

08:30 – 9:00	**registration**
09:00 – 9:15	**welcome and presentation of InRoad: objectives and activities** Martin **Müller**, InRoad Coordinator (SwissCore)
09:15 – 9:45	**engagement speech: barriers and challenges for research and technological infrastructures in Europe** Ricardo **Migueis**, Advisor on technological infrastructures and international programmes (Portuguese National Innovation Agency)
09:45 – 10:00	**ERA: the European RI context** Dominik **Sobczak**, ESFRI Executive Secretary (European Commission)
10:00 – 10:30	**your benefits from engaging in InRoad's desk study, survey and compendium – towards better synchronisation of national roadmapping and evaluation procedures for research infrastructures** Gerd **Rücker,** Senior Scientific Officer (DLR Project Management Agency)
10:30 – 11:00	**coffee break**
11:00 – 12:30	**discussions in four parallel groups (see details below)** **group 1**: main characteristics of national research infrastructures roadmapping and evaluation procedures **group 2**: coordination and synchronization between national procedures, ESFRI and others **group 3**: funding instruments for research infrastructures **group 4**: research infrastructures business models and their links to national roadmapping procedures
12:30 – 14:00	**lunch and group photo**
14:00 – 16:00	**report from the four break-out sessions and discussion in plenary**
16:00 – 16:30	**coffee break**
16:30 – 17:30	**wrap-up and next engagements** Martin **Müller**, InRoad Coordinator (Swiss National Science Foundation)
17:30 – …	**networking reception**

Annex II: Description of Group Discussions

Group 1: main characteristics of national research infrastructures roadmapping and evaluation procedures

Moderator: Gerd **Rücker**, Senior Scientific Officer (DLR Project Management Agency)

Rapporteur: Isabel **Bolliger**, Scientific Advisor (*Université de Lausanne*)

Group 1 will discuss and validate the survey dealing with RI roadmapping and evaluation procedures with respect to the related opportunities, challenges and bottlenecks. This group will deal with the key aspects below:

• the stakeholder responsibilities for decision making on RI;

• criteria for inclusion in national decision making calls;

• links to smart specialisation strategies;

• methodologies for prioritization, evaluation, monitoring during the whole life cycle.

The key questions to answer in this group are: does the survey include the main characteristics of national research infrastructures roadmapping and evaluation procedures? Should other items be added? Are the definitions of those items clear?

Group 2: coordination and synchronization between national procedures, ESFRI and others

Moderator: Martin **Müller**, InRoad Coordinator (SwissCore)

Rapporteur: Max **De Boer**, Scientific Advisor (Swiss National Science Foundation)

Group 2 will examine existing barriers for more coordination and synchronisation in Europe. The 2014 European Research Area (ERA) progress report states that, in order to guarantee the sustainability of European RI, "there is a need for further synchronisation of national and European roadmaps for RI and the related pooling of funding". It is evident that the interaction is far from being optimal between on the one hand European strategic priority-setting through the European Strategic Forum for Research Infrastructures (ESFRI), and on the other hand the national and regional setting of priorities, funding instruments and cost models. National procedures depend on strategic and political objectives and on the requirements of the national decision-making processes, including those of national budget regulations. The results are very diverse in scope and there is not only a mismatch between strategic priority-setting exercises for RI between the European, national and regional levels, but there is as well a great diversity of funding instruments and cost models across countries and regions. As soon as the RI are gaining a European scope, this diversity brings the risks of making the funding of construction and operation of RI across Europe inefficient and not transparent for the communities of users. In other words, the lack of comparability and synchronisation challenges the sustainability of RI.

Group 3: funding instruments for research infrastructures

Moderator: Teresa **Jorge**, Head of the Cooperation and Promotion Unit (Comissão de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento Regional do Centro)

Rapporteur: Jan **Hrusak**, Senior researcher , J. Heyrovský Institute physical chemistry v.v.i. Academy of Sciences of the Czech republic

Group 3 will discuss a first series of categorization and definitions of funding instruments that will feed the InRoad survey. There is broad agreement that the widening of access and investment into research infrastructures across geographical, disciplinary and sectoral borders would foster the creation of a true ERA. There is, however, a lack of synchronisation and interoperability amongst RI funding instruments available at different levels (regional, national and European) to support the needs of research infrastructures and the community of users along the full life cycle.

Some of the key questions to answer in this group are:

• how are the national research infrastructures roadmapping procedures interlinked with funding of the different life cycle stages?

• in general, how are funding decisions on RI taken in the different regions/countries?

• what are the synergies between roadmapping and the different mechanisms for financing RI, at regional, national and European levels, and the resulting implications for financing pan-European infrastructures?

• what can be said about the mechanisms that link with, or have emerged from, national roadmapping and evaluation procedures for funding RI, in terms of management of intersectorial coordination and implementation plans: funding calls, eligible recipients, industry partnerships, requirements, evaluation process, timings, etc. ?

Group 4: research infrastructures business models and their links to national roadmapping procedures

Moderator: Mehran **Mostafavi**, Deputy Director (CNRS institute of chemistry Paris)

Rapporteur: Stéphanie **Lecocq**, chargée d'affaire (CNRS institute of chemistry Paris)

National research infrastructures roadmapping procedures often consider the costs/business models of the facilities. However a big disparity exists between different countries and methodologies on which items to consider and the terminology and concepts used.

Group 4 will discuss:

• whether the list of items of a business plan/model is thorough and clear, i.e.: does it include the most important components of a business plan/model? Should other items be added? Are the definitions of those items straightforward?

• the business plan assessment in national research infrastructures roadmapping procedures for the countries represented at the workshop;

The objective of these two parts of the discussion will be to give InRoad's Work Package 5 (Business plan development for assessment of the Research Infrastructure sustainability) an indication as to what is considered a business plan/model in each country and how it is assessed, in a bottom up approach where the definition of such a plan is not imposed.

• the identification of the relevant stakeholders to contact and engage.