



BILAT-UKR

Analysis of innovation orientated programmes between Europe and Ukraine

from

ZENIT GmbH

Michael Guth, Nora Anton

Mülheim an der Ruhr, February 2010



**Analysis of innovation orientated programmes
between Europe and Ukraine**

Contents

page

1. BACKGROUND	3
1.1 BILAT UKR and the Question of Innovation	3
1.2 Methodology	4
2. BILATERAL INNOVATION ACTIVITIES	5
2.1 Innovation Programmes at EU Level	5
2.2 Innovation Programmes in the Ukraine	8
2.3 Innovation Programmes in selected Member States	9
3. TOWARDS A ROADMAP FOR JOINT INNOVATION POLICY MEASURES	10
ANNEX 1: EU INNOVATION PROGRAMMES	11
ANNEX 2: INNOVATION PROGRAMMES FROM UKRAINE	35
ANNEX 3: INNOVATION PROGRAMMES IN SELECTED MEMBER STATES	53



1. BACKGROUND

The current paper and particularly its extensive annex have been elaborated in the frame of the EU FP 7 project BILAT-UKR which aims at fostering science and technology cooperation between the European Union and one of its largest and closest neighbours – the Ukraine. This particular paper picks up one important issue in the whole context of science, technology and bilateral cooperation, namely the topic of innovation.

1.1 BILAT UKR AND THE QUESTION OF INNOVATION

Innovations can be described as the result of interactions and feed-back loops of different actors in so-called innovation systems. The systemic view of innovations was introduced into the discussion by writings from LUNDVALL¹ (1992) and NELSON² (1993). With these new approaches, the traditional linear model of innovation where a fundamental basic research via applied research activities and feasibility trials leads to new marketable products became less relevant. These new ideas on innovation systems very much influenced the design of R&D policies and of innovation policies in the Member States and at EU level.

Throughout the last decade innovation thus became a focal point on the policy agendas both in the Member States and at EU level. Innovation is being regarded as a major driver towards the Lisbon goals of the Union. Furthermore, there is much evidence, that particularly in low and medium income economies as well as in transition environments current and future competitiveness and sustainable growth can also be improved by innovation.

An enhanced S&T cooperation between the Union and the Ukraine should thus take on board the issue of innovation. The BILAT-UKR project aims at providing input to the policy discussions between the Ukraine and the Union in this field. From the bilateral perspective, two issues are of high priority:

- Linking innovation activities between the EU and the Ukraine;
- Providing support for the creation of a Ukrainian innovation system.

However, the BILAT approach can at first stage only accompany processes which are being desired and subsequently actually being driven by the relevant stakeholders. In other words, the project can catalyse and facilitate processes, but not actually run them.

In order to do so, for the topic of "Innovation" current funding schemes related to the innovation field (as defined above) were selected and analysed according to two main questions:

1. Relevance of the programme for the bilateral cooperation
2. Impact on the bilateral cooperation

With this paper we present the results of this work.

¹ See LUNDVALL, B.A., Ed. (1992), *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*, London.

² See NELSON, R.R., Ed. (1993), *National Systems of Innovation: A Comparative Analysis*, Oxford.

1.2 METHODOLOGY

Within BILAT-UKR innovation programmes at three levels were looked at:

- Innovation Programmes at EU level (five programmes),
- Innovation orientated programmes in the Ukraine (four programmes),
- Innovation programmes in selected Member States (three programmes).

For the selection of the programmes we did not follow a too strict approach. Innovation was defined in a broad way. However, we did not look at general research topics (e.g. innovative surface treatment). What we took into consideration is:

- Programmes fostering links between actors;
- Cluster orientation;
- SME orientation;
- Regional orientation;
- A possible cooperation between EU and Ukraine was desired but not a must. In the latter case we looked at potentials for such cooperations.

With regard to the actual selection we also had to take into consideration the competences within the BILAT-UKR project team. Therefore we concentrated on those countries which are represented in the project. This is why we cannot claim for a fully fledged analyse. The selection criteria followed a pragmatic approach and the regional orientation was much influenced by the team. However, there is no evidence that our selection may not be representative enough for drawing justified conclusions.

In a second step, each selected programme was described in a standardised format. Based on qualitative interviews and against the background of own experiences the programmes were then evaluated according to the two main axes of interest: (1) the relevance of the programme for the bilateral cooperation and (2) its impact on the bilateral cooperation.

The evaluation was implemented in a simple Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats (SWOT) approach. For each axes, several statements had to be assessed and valued. In a second round the evaluation statements were transferred into numerical values whereby strengths and opportunities were regarded as positive vectors and, likewise, weaknesses and threats as negative ones.

The programme briefs as well as associated SWOT analyses are being provided in the annex. A summary of the evaluation is being provided in this paper.

In a next step the results will be presented at the occasion of a policy workshop to a broader public. We intend to trigger an intensive exchange about past and ongoing experiences with bilateral cooperation in the field of innovation. And against the background of this discussion we intend to identify topics for future policy debates on this issue. Primarily – but not necessarily solely - those topics will be connected to the existing funding schemes which we analysed. Finally, we will



cease our catalysing work with the proposal of a potential road map for enhancing innovation activities both in the Ukraine and between Ukraine and the Union.

2. BILATERAL INNOVATION ACTIVITIES

Within this chapter we are summarising the evaluation of the innovation orientated programmes at EU-level, in the Ukraine and in selected Member States.

2.1 INNOVATION PROGRAMMES AT EU LEVEL

The programmes analysed at this layer are being presented in annex 1. The following five EU programmes were analysed:

- Regions of Knowledge (RoK)
- Research for the benefit of SMEs
- Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP), and within this scheme the Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP)
- EUREKA
- Transnational Cooperation Programme for South East Europe


With this analysis we covered two programmes within the Seventh Framework Programme for R&D (FP 7) of the EU (Regions of Knowledge and Research for the benefit of SMEs). Both programmes are part of the Capacities section of FP 7. With RoK we obviously cover the regional orientation of our selection criteria. In addition to this, the programme is about clusters and links between actors. The research for SME programme covers the SME part of our selection criteria but also the cooperative approach.

The Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (CIP) represents the " little brother" of FP 7. Within CIP we analysed the EIP scheme which is being implemented in the frame of the Enterprise Europe Network (EEN). This network supports amongst others transnational technology transfer activities of businesses.

With EUREKA we cover the only real research programme. However, the funding does not stem from EUREKA but from national sources. The innovation aspect comes through its SME orientation as well as through the cooperation approach.

Finally we have an Interreg scheme on board. The Transnational Cooperation Programme supports various transnational innovation projects in the region of South East Europe.

Figure 1: Innovation Programmes of EU



Source: Own calculations and figure

The summary of the evaluation of the programmes is being displayed in figure 1 above. According to the two axes analyses (relevance for UA-EU cooperation and impact on the cooperation) we can identify three groups of programmes:

- (1) Programmes with positive relevance and positive impact. Those are the programmes located in the first quadrant of the figure (SME research, EUREKA and Transnational Cooperation).
- (2) Programmes with negative relevance and small but positive impact. In this second quadrant we have the Enterprise Europe Network. And thirdly:
- (3) Programmes with positive relevance but no/negative impact are located in the fourth quadrant (RoK)

First quadrant

This result shows, that at least three of the analysed five programmes are of high relevance and they also generate a positive impact. What is quite surprising is, that the programme with the highest relevance (Transnational Cooperation) represents a regional development programme rather than a genuine research and/or innovation programme. This can be interpreted as a first evidence for smaller, not too complex projects having for the time being best chances for success and visible impact in the area of cooperation in the innovation field. Highest impact figures on the other hand come from EUREKA. A programme where the international projects are being financed from national resources. Although being more difficult to organise, this financing concept seems to

have at least not too much negative effects on the operations' impact. The SME Research programme is located in the middle of this group. With a relevance of 3, the impact is reaching almost the same value.

Looking at this first quadrant two simple recommendations can be drawn:

- The high relevance and the significant impact of the Transnational Cooperation Programme needs to be further investigated and exploited. Also other cross-border programmes (e.g. the Romanian, Moldavian, Ukrainian ENPI-Interreg programme) should be used for intensifying the bilateral cooperation in innovation issues.
- Although already having significant impact, the opportunities of the EUREKA and the SME research programme should be further disseminated. Particularly the SME research bears a huge potential for a more significant role in innovation cooperation.

Second quadrant

In the second quadrant we only find the Enterprise Europe Network (EEN). Although this programme is for the time being not yet relevant for the bilateral EU-UA cooperation it nevertheless stands for a small but positive impact. This is a very surprising result. Of course we must not over interpret the numerical summary of our SWOT analysis, however, the technology transfer aspect at industry level, which is in the focus of the EEN, seems to bear at least interesting potential for the general bilateral cooperation.

We thus recommend:

- to discuss in the next steps the opportunities for Ukraine's active participation to the network. With an own network access point in the Ukraine one would significantly increase this programme's relevance and also its impact.

Fourth quadrant

When we see that the RoK programme has reached a value of almost + 3 in relevance, we must say that this definitely represents only a "potential" relevance. Ukrainian entities did not yet participate in RoK projects. We regard this programme as an important potential interface for innovation cooperation. Research driven clusters, as being funded in RoK, can influence both the innovation system in the Ukraine as well as the international cooperation in innovation issues.

We therefore recommend:

- to disseminate the opportunities of RoK for the UA innovation system and to pro-actively foster the participation of an UA cluster at such a project.


2.2 INNOVATION PROGRAMMES IN THE UKRAINE

The following four Ukrainian innovation programmes were analysed:

- Innovative Infrastructure in Ukraine
- Kiev Municipal Programme
- Innovational Programme of Science Park Kiev
- State Programme of Forecasting

The programme briefs as well as the SWOT evaluations can be found in annex 2.

Figure 2: Ukrainian Innovation Programmes



Source: Own calculations and figure

The graphical presentation of the evaluation results as shown in figure 2 above reveals a very contrasting picture: On the one hand we find in quadrant 1 two programmes with positive or even high relevance and at the same medium positive impact scores (Innovation infrastructure and Innovational programme of Kiev Science Park). On the other hand we see two programmes with negative relevance and negative impact in quadrant 3.

First quadrant

Both programmes in this quadrant offer the general option for EU-UA cooperation. Particularly the innovation infrastructure programme is however – for obvious reasons - focussing more on UA

needs than on the cooperation needs. Therefore the relevance is limited. For both programmes higher impact figures should be sought. To this end we recommend the following actions:

- Part of the budget in the two programmes should be earmarked for topics of highest relevance for bilateral cooperation.
- A better promotion of the opportunities to participate in the programmes towards EU partners (best through the internet portal of BILAT-UKR: <http://www.st-gateukr.eu>)

Third quadrant


Unless the results of the evaluation do not need to be revised in the light of the planned policy workshop on bilateral cooperation in innovation matters, the programmes located in this quadrant do not need further investigation concerning a bilateral policy dialogue on innovation issues between the Ukraine and the European Union.

2.3 INNOVATION PROGRAMMES IN SELECTED MEMBER STATES

The programmes analysed at this layer are being presented in annex 3. We could identify and analyse one Austrian and two German programmes:

- COIN (Austria)
- Scientific and technical Cooperation Germany Ukraine - WTZ (Germany)
- Central SME Innovation Programme – ZIM (Germany)

Figure 3: Innovation Programmes of Selected Member States





With COIN and WTZ we have two programmes in the portfolio which are explicitly supporting bilateral innovation orientated cooperation between Member States and the Ukraine (or Eastern Europe generally, in the case of COIN). The German ZIM initiative only indirectly allows German-Ukrainian cooperation.

Against this background it is not surprising that COIN and WTZ represent the two programmes with highest impact scores and – apart from the Territorial Cohesion Programme – also the highest relevance scores.

First quadrant

For both programmes in this field our simple SWOT evaluation does not provide too many arguments for any modification. However, as we talk here about the programmes which rank best amongst all analysed policy actions, we can derive some important recommendation:

- Both programmes should be further scrutinized. Particularly cases of good cooperation practice need to be identified and capitalised.
- On the basis of the concrete results of this additional analysis we recommend to conduct peer workshops with the objective to transfer the lessons to other countries with huge interest in bilateral innovation cooperation. At first glance we would suggest Poland and Romania.

Third quadrant

Unless the results of the evaluation do not need to be revised in the light of the planned policy workshop on bilateral cooperation in innovation matters, the ZIM programme located in this quadrant does not need further investigation concerning a bilateral policy dialogue on innovation issues between the Ukraine and the European Union.

3. TOWARDS A ROADMAP FOR JOINT INNOVATION POLICY MEASURES

The policy programmes presented and discussed in this paper represent only a sample of possible programmes at EU level, in the Member States or in the Ukraine. Nevertheless, the SWOT analysis conducted by the project led to a number of concrete recommendations for stimulating a new phase for a bilateral policy dialogue on innovation issues between the Ukraine and the EU.

The results stemming from the analysis displayed herewith will now be presented to and discussed with relevant stakeholders. For this purpose, the conduction of a policy workshop in Kiev is planned. In the light of the discussion we will modify and summarise the policy recommendation and - if possible - a roadmap towards joint innovation policy measures will be elaborated in the aftermath of this planned workshop.



ANNEX 1: EU INNOVATION PROGRAMMES

- Competitiveness and Innovation Programme
- EUREKA
- Regions of Knowledge
- Research for the benefit of SMEs
- Transnational Cooperation Programme for South East Europe



PROGRAMME NAME:	CIP- EIP
------------------------	-----------------

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	European Commission
Complete name of programme	The Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme (EIP)
Overall aims	<p>The EIP is one of the specific programmes under the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP). With this programme, the European Commission seeks to support innovation and SMEs in the EU. EIP focuses in particular on the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Facilitate access to finance for the start-up and growth of SMEs and encourage investment in innovation activities. - Create an environment favourable to SME cooperation, particularly in the field of cross-border cooperation. - Promote all forms of innovation in enterprises. - Support eco-innovation. - Promote an entrepreneurship and innovation culture. - Promote enterprise and innovation-related economic and administrative reform. <p>The analysis will focus on the Enterprise Europe Network as one of the actions supported by the EIP. The Enterprise Europe Network is the largest network of contact points providing information and advice to EU companies on EU matters, in particular small and medium enterprises (SMEs).</p>
Total budget of programme	€ 2.17 billion for the overall period of 2007-2013 (all EIP), 320 million for Enterprise Europe Network for the overall period 2007-2013
Website	http://ec.europa.eu/cip/eip/index_en.htm
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grants
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Max 75% of total eligible cost for EIP, max. 60% of total eligible cost for Enterprise Europe Network partners
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	<p>Calls for proposals ;</p> <p>At the beginning of each year the European Commission publishes its annual EIP Work Programme and its associated support measures that give detailed information on the specific actions to be supported that year.</p>
Institution providing funding	European Commission
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	<p>Applicants must be legal entities established in EU 27, Candidate countries, EEA member countries, the Western Balkan countries and other Third countries as defined in Article 4 of the Competitiveness and Innovation Programme (i.e. EFTA countries which are members of the EEA, accession countries and candidate countries benefiting from a pre-accession strategy, Western Balkan countries, other third countries, when Agreements and procedures so allow).</p> <p>Applicants from Third countries such as Ukraine can be eligible if their origin country has established a bilateral agreement (memorandum of Understanding) with the EC to participate in the CIP programme or parts of it. (These countries have to express their interest to participate in the CIP before the deadline of the call – otherwise the proposed projects are not eligible) Otherwise, they can still co-operate with the network and any such expression of interest can be submitted at any time during the CIP programme and is not</p>



	subject to the deadline for this call for proposals. In this particular case the host organisation from the third country does not qualify for any financial support through the CIP programme budget. However, organisations established in countries which are not participating in the Framework Programme may be permitted to benefit from the coordination and operational support provided to the Network partners by the European Commission.
Target sectors	All sectors
Eligible activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Information, feedback, business co-operation and internationalisation services 2. Innovation, technology and knowledge transfer services 3. Services encouraging the participation of SMEs in the Community Framework Programme for RTD
Project duration	36 months
Minimum requirements of the partnership	Proposals may be made by single organisations able to provide the services as described above or by consortia comprising a group of host organisations. However, given the size of the proposals, most proposals are made up of consortia.
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	No Ukrainian network partners at the moment. Ukrainian entities could collaborate under certain conditions (cf. Eligible organisations)
Example projects & Experiences	Some success stories can be found here: http://www.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu/info/files/een_brochure_en.pdf

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: CIP- EIP

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation					
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree.. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.					
STRENGTHS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Network offers easily accessible services for SMEs through local/regional contact points - Most services are free of charge - Established methodologies for mediating transnational business, technological and research partnerships - Advise on public funding is very useful for UA companies 					
WEAKNESSES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ..)				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entities from UA cannot participate unless Ukraine signs a Memorandum of Understanding with the EU Commission to participate in CIP or parts of it. Even then, they might not have the same funding conditions as EU partners. - Enterprise Europe Network is not a funding agency for companies or projects itself, though partners can advise companies on public funding sources. 				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)				
The network is being widened among non-EU countries. Ukraine could negotiate a Memorandum of Understanding with the EU Commission. The chances are probably higher than for non European countries, due to the geographical proximity and the market opportunities for EU companies in Ukraine.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				
The Commission could go back to a Europe-only approach and not admit further associated partners from regions outside the EU.				

Section 2 : Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:
First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree.
Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				
Local contact points facilitate easy access to the services offered.				
WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			X
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only			X
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale			x
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact		x	
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
Enterprise Europe Network is a relatively young network, so the brand name and the associated services are not yet known to a wide public even in Europe. In Ukraine it would take a lot of time to build up a brand name.				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		X	
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"			X
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation			x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
If there was a new Ukrainian partner, this partner could benefit from the experience of other partners with experience in the Enterprise Europe Network and/or the predecessor networks (Euro Info Centre and Innovation Relay Centres). Thus the Ukrainian Enterprise Europe Network staff it would not start from zero and this would probably be reflected in the impact.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme		X	
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				
Up to now there has been no bilateral cooperation with Ukraine in this project. Most services by the Enterprise Europe Network deal with internationalization/ international partner search/ international funding services. This may not be the main concern of Ukraine SMEs (i.e.the target group) who have to deal with more essential issues. Visa regime can be a barrier for free movement of persons cooperating under this programme.				



PROGRAMME NAME: EUREKA

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	
Complete name of programme	EUREKA (European network for market-oriented R&D)
Overall aims	<p>EUREKA aims to enhance European competitiveness through its support to businesses, research centres and universities who carry out pan-European projects to develop innovative products, processes and services.</p> <p>EUREKA is an intergovernmental initiative. Beside individual project funding it also initializes cluster projects and thematic networks (umbrellas).</p> <p>THE <u>EUREKA label</u> shall add value to a project and gives participants a competitive edge in their dealings with financial, technical and commercial partners.</p> <p>To make it simple: EUREKA shall leverage National Funding Instruments for European Research Projects and the EUREKA Label is a kind of hallmark of quality to support positive funding approvals.</p>
Total budget of programme	-
Website	http://www.eureka.be
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grants; But: The grants do not come from EU budget. The funds for the participating companies come from national budgets. The funding situation thus very much depends on the home country of the participant.
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	The National Authorities (EUREKA NCPs) support proposers. The contribution from any given country must not exceed 66% of the total budget. In parallel, the contribution from any one partner (affiliated organizations count as one partner) must not exceed 66% of the total budget either.
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Depending on national programs, because EUREKA does not fund projects. The funds for project come from national funds. The application for the EUREKA label is possible at any time.
Institution providing funding	EUREKA is not a finance program. The participants of the project have the responsibility to assure the funds for the projects.
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Large companies, SMEs, Research Institutes, Universities, Government/National Administration
Target sectors	EUREKA follows a clear bottom up approach. There is no limitation whatsoever concerning the themes.
Eligible activities	Market orientated industrial research.
Project duration	<i>24 month</i> Projects - covering medium-short term horizon - should be market oriented and based on Industrial R&D.
Minimum requirements of	Minimum of two participants established in two different EUREKA member



the partnership	countries The organizations of States non-member can participate at the project with accept of lead partner and national coordinators of the project only.
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes; Ukraine is member of the EUREKA initiative
Example projects & Experiences	- number of running projects: 722 - total budget for these projects: 1.3 billion euro - number of organisations involved in EUREKA projects 2640 Large companies 476 SMEs 1174 Research Institutes 491 Universities 459 Government/National Administration 40 The topics of the projects embrace several technological areas like healthcare, transport or even winery. By the end of 2009 there were 13 finished and 10 running projects with UA participation.

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: EUREKA

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

	i)			ii)
IS1 The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x			
IS2 Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme		x		
IS3 The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x			

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

Bottom up approach allows to cover themes relevant for UA researchers/industry.
UA entities participate under the same conditions as other EUREKA member countries.

WEAKNESSES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

	i)			ii)
IW1 Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme			x	
IW2 EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme				x
IW3 The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users	x			

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users)				
EUREKA is not sufficiently enough promoted in UA. The program does not provide funding.				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme			x
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme		x	
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation			x
Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)				
Participants of national UA R&D programs should be systematically informed about the EUREKA program and its opportunities. Having the EUREKA label should lead to better evaluation scores for national programs in UA.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase			x
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			x
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value			x
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				
EUREKA may not be perceived as a relevant/helpful program as long as it is not directly connected to better funding opportunities.				

Section 2 : Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.				
STRENGTHS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable		x	
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted		x	
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme			x
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures		x	

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				
UA made a good start in EUREKA. However, the absolute number of projects/participation organisations is rather small: 10 running and 13 finished projects. 18 participating organisations in running and 14 organisations in finished projects.				
WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners		x	
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only			x
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale			x
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact		x	
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
The EUREKA label only comes into action after a project is approved to be funded by a national program. The question				
Maybe UA needs to better promote EUREKA and its opportunities. With limited UA funds it will remain difficult for UA researchers to fully exploit EUREKA.				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		x	
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation			x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
With an increased national R&D budget in the UA plus a more intensive marketing of the program EUREKA could play a more crucial and visible role in EU-UA R&D cooperation.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact		x	
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			X
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme		x	
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				

PROGRAMME NAME: REGIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	EU Commission
Complete name of programme	7 th Framework programme – Capacities - Regions of knowledge
Overall aims	To strengthen the research potential of European regions, in particular by encouraging and supporting the development, across Europe, of regional 'research-driven clusters', associating universities, research centres, enterprises and regional authorities.
Total budget of programme	€ 126 million
Website	http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/capacities/regions-knowledge_en.html
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grant
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	60% of eligible costs
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Specific calls for proposals
Institution providing funding	EU
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Research organisations; universities; industry including SME; research programme managers and owners (ERA-NET and Research Infrastructure actions).
Target sectors	all
Eligible activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Analysis, development and implementation of research agendas for regional or cross-border clusters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • thematic issues or priorities, based on the analysis of the existing regional plans of RTD and on the development policies of economic sectors; • regional RTD public and private actors (engaged and non engaged); • the strengths and weaknesses of the regions concerned in terms of their capacity to produce, transfer and use knowledge; • economic development needs; • existing RTD policy and activities, their evolution and impact; • European and international context; • synergies and opportunities for mutual learning; • mentoring and cooperation possibilities between regional actors involved in research driven clusters. <input type="checkbox"/> Mentoring of regions with a less-developed research profile by highly developed ones <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • organising events including conferences, meetings, workshops or seminars, related studies, exchange of personnel, exchange and dissemination of good practices and, if necessary, the definition, organisation and management of joint or common initiatives. <input type="checkbox"/> Initiatives to improve integration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing the research potential and researcher mobility; • Improving and sharing RTD infrastructure; • Supporting research projects; • Promoting networking between research organisation and enterprises, in particular SMEs; • Enhancing knowledge transfer between firms and between research



	<p>organisation and enterprises, in particular SMEs;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving availability of and access to SME support services and private financing for RTD; outlining of a business plan: defining how to finance the joint action plan by using possibilities afforded at national/local level or at Community level (Framework Programmes, Structural Funds). <p><input type="checkbox"/> Dissemination activities - conferences, workshops, publications, web-based initiatives</p>
Project duration	No formal minimum or maximum duration. However, coordination actions have a duration of typically two to four years, while support actions are expected to have a shorter duration from some months to four years.
Minimum requirements of the partnership	At least 3 different types of organisations (research institutes, companies, local/regional authorities) from at least 3 countries
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes
Example projects & Experiences	<p><i>Example project: BRIDGE2GEO</i></p> <p>The provinces Salzburg (AT) & North Rhine-Westfalia (GE) are collaborating at political level and through economic partnerships. BRIDGE2GEO intensifies the existing links and initiates science-business partnerships within and between the regions in order to enhance S&T-based development. The cross-cutting topic is Geographic Information. Building on earlier joint actions, technological developments & recent trends in advanced visualisation and social interaction in web2.0 will be bridged (social nets, Wikis, Second Life).</p> <p>Within five Strategic Networks the benefit of GI-technology will be brought to different economic sectors with affinity to selected competence priorities of the two regions. Strategies, communication & business models will be elaborated via the challenging GIS 2.0 window to promote implementation of GI-services. Special regard will be given to the European GMES initiative. Universities, research institutes and SMEs in both regions are strong players in the standardization initiatives.</p> <p>Research area: REGIONS-2007-1-01 Bringing the benefits of research to SMEs Project Acronym: BRIDGE2GEO Project Reference: 205007</p>

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: REGIONS OF KNOWLEDGE

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) (I fully support this statement) to ii) (I disagree).

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x	
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme	x	
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA		x

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)					
The programme is open for ICPC countries without restrictions – UA participants are free to apply. The priority “Mentoring of regions with a less-developed research profile by highly developed ones” could be especially interesting for UA.					
WEAKNESSES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)					
Possibly among European partners the awareness of the cooperation opportunities with UA are too low, it is more convenient or easier for them to cooperate with neighbour countries, existing contacts, etc. UA participants may just be lacking information about the programme and the means to find EU partners. The programme is based on the main principles of EU economic policy and thus more oriented towards the European target groups. However, this doesn't mean that UA participants couldn't benefit from it as well, though it probably is even harder to involve Ukrainian SMEs in this type of programmes than European SMEs, due to more essential concerns and a more difficult working situation.					
OPPORTUNITIES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)					
Cluster policy is an essential part of European economic policies, so the programme has wide support in Europe and will keep existing throughout the next years. This means that UA participation can grow if the programme is actively promoted in this country.					
THREATS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)					
Programme is open for the whole of Europe. Whether EU-UA cooperation takes place or not does not seem to be critical for the programme, it's just one possibility out of many. Though UA participation may have an added value, this added value is probably not important enough to encourage (European) policy makers to better promote it in UA.					

Section 2 : Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) (I fully support this statement) to ii) (I disagree).

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable				x
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x			
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	x			
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures		x		

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)

Positive results could be measurable IF UA-EU/MS cooperation took place. Evaluations are carried out as part of FP7. Applicants are supported by National Contact Points and CORDIS portal.

WEAKNESSES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners				x
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only		x		
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale			x	
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact		x		

Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)

At the moment, there are no REGIONS-projects with UA participation. So even though good projects potentially have an impact in the EU member states, the programme does not have a significant impact in UA. Looking back to FP6, there were no UA participants at all in the action line "Specific projects for SMEs" which can be considered a kind of precursor of the Capacities programme in FP7.

OPPORTUNITIES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x			
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation				x

Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
<p>Technology and science is one of the key areas of EU-UA cooperation. On the one hand, the general EU/UKRAINE ACTION PLAN (available on http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/action_plans/ukraine_enp_ap_final_en.pdf) foresees an enhanced cooperation in this area. On the other hand, the 2008 EU Commission's Progress report on the "Implementation of European Neighbourhood Policy in 2007" (available on http://ec.europa.eu/world/enp/pdf/progress2008/sec08_402_en.pdf), clearly states that "There remains a need for an increased participation of Ukraine in the FP7". The "Action plan to enhance cooperation between EU and Ukraine in the field of Science and Technology" is still not available. It will thus depend on the efforts and political will by both EU and UA policymakers to stronger promote UA participation in the FP7 programme in general and "Regions of knowledge" action in particular, and make this programme a success in EU and UA.</p>				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme.	x		
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				
<p>If no specific efforts are made in order to involve UA partners in this programme, it will remain irrelevant for the UA in spite of its potential.</p>				



PROGRAMME NAME:	FP 7, Capacities: Research for the benefit of SMEs
------------------------	--

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	European Commission
Complete name of programme	FP 7, Capacities: Research for the benefit of SMEs
Overall aims	<p>The aim is to strengthen the 'innovation capacity' of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Europe and their contribution to the development of new technology based products and markets. The programme enables them to outsource research and it helps to increase their research efforts, extend their networks, better exploit research results and acquire technological know how, bridging the gap between research and innovation. The programme is being implemented through the following two schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research for SMES • Research for SME associations. <p>The programme aims at SMEs with no own R&D capacity. The actual research work will be conducted by external research organisations which "offer" their service under market conditions.</p>
Total budget of programme	Foreseen budget: € 1,336 million for funding SME research support over the duration of FP7
Website	http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/capacities/research-sme_en.html
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grants
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Up to 70 per cent of total eligible cost. Maximum funding around 1 mill. EUR. Usually the funding will be sufficient to finance the costs for the research services conducted by the R&D organisations.
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Call for proposals
Institution providing funding	European Commission
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	SMEs from eligible countries: the EU Member States and the Associated Countries.
Target sectors	Research for SMEs from all sectors of the economy.
Eligible activities	The activities to be carried out should include:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - research and technological development activities aimed at a significant advance beyond the established state-of-the-art, including scientific coordination - demonstration activities, designed to prove the viability of new technologies that offer a potential economic advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product-like prototypes) - activities to disseminate research results and to prepare for their take-up and use, including knowledge management and, activities directly related to the protection of foreground; - training of researchers and key staff, including research managers and industrial executives (in particular for SMEs) and any potential users of the knowledge generated by the project.
Project duration	The duration of the project should normally be between 1 and 2 years
Minimum requirements of the partnership	<p>Research for SMEs projects require participants from the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SME participants: At least three independent SMEs, established in three different Member States or associated countries. - RTD performers: At least two RTD performers which must be independent from any other participant and which can come from any country. <p>Research for SME associations projects require participants from the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SME associations: At least three independent SME associations, established in three different Member States or associated countries - SME participants: At least two independent SMEs, established in two different Member States or associated countries. - RTD performers: At least two RTD performers which must be independent from any other participant and which can come from any country. <p>Examples of RTD performers are universities, research organisations and industrial companies, including research performing SMEs.</p> <p>In addition, other enterprises and end-users may participate by making a particular contribution to the project. They must also be independent from any other participant.</p> <p>SMEs/SME associations from international cooperation countries such as Ukraine can participate as additional partners, i.e. the minimum requirements of the partnership must have been met before UA SME/SME association can join.</p> <p>As the RTD performer can come from any country, also a Ukrainian entity may act as RTD performer.</p>
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	<p><i>Generally: Yes.</i></p> <p>However, UA SMEs can only be additional partners (in addition to the minimum requirement of three independent SMEs from the EU/Associated Countries)</p>
Example projects & Experiences	<p>Example projects:</p> <p>Ship inspector: The objective of this project is to develop new and novel ultrasonic phased array techniques, sensors and systems for finding defects and corrosion in safety critical areas of ships and tankers without taking the</p>

	<p>vessel out of the water. The Ship-Inspector technology will help operators, classification societies and regulatory agencies worldwide to manage risk more effectively. The Ship Inspector Consortium will disseminate the technology and associated training to the SMEs represented by the participant SME-Associations. Furthermore, the Ship-Inspector technology will reduce the risk to which inspectors are exposed whilst working on ships. This project will drastically reduce injuries and deaths to SME workers in the ship maintenance and inspection industry.</p> <p>UA Partner: Ukrainian Society for non-destructive testing URL: http://www.shipinspector.eu</p> <p>Nanoray: This project aims to realize an innovative device capable to generate X-rays by means of a novel concept of cold cathode, based on carbon nanotubes. The system will be portable, with an overall weight of less than 5 kg (including power supply), allowing the use of X-rays in places like ambulances or in field security surveys. In addition to portability and easiness to use, the system will provide higher image resolution with respect to the state of the art of X-rays devices thanks to the smaller focal spot, and it will represent a cost effective solution for everyone is facing the economic issues related to the maintenance of thermionic cathodes.</p> <p>INCO Partner: IOFFE Physico technical institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences</p>
--	--

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Research for the benefit of SMEs

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x	
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme		x
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x	

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

The programme follows a clear bottom-up approach and can thus take on board all relevant SME issues. Due to the outsourcing character, UA research institutions can already participate in this programme.

WEAKNESSES

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme		x
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme		x
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential	x	

users				
Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ..)				
Underdeveloped SME sector and business services in UA Poor quality of cross-border infrastructure Also, UA SMEs can only participate as additional partners, i.e. when the minimum partnership requirements for participation in the programme are already met. This makes it difficult for them to define the research topics which are covered in the projects.				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme			x
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme			x
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation			x
Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)				
The opportunities of the "Research for the benefit of SMEs" programme need to be brought on the agenda of the Science and Technology negotiations between UA and the EU.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase		x	
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			x
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value			x
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				

Section 2: Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree.

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable			x
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x		
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme		x	

The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures			x		
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)					
Many projects implemented successfully in the target area UA participation so far has been too limited to measure the impact					
WEAKNESSES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>					
		i)			ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners				X
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only			X	
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale				
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact			x	
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)					
IIW3 not relevant					
OPPORTUNITIES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>					
		i)			ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x			
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation				x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)					
The programme could have a significant impact for UA-EU scientific cooperation.					
THREATS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>					
		i)			ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact		x		
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact		x		
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x	
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x			
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)					
Only "additional" UA SMEs can participate (they cannot be a genuine partner!) Weak SME structure in UA					



PROGRAMME NAME:	Transnational Cooperation programme for South-East Europe
------------------------	--

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	European Commission
Complete name of programme	Transnational Cooperation programme for South-East Europe
Overall aims	<p>The South East Europe Programme aims to develop transnational partnerships on matters of strategic importance, in order to improve the territorial, economic and social integration process and to contribute to cohesion, stability and competitiveness of the region. For this purpose, the Programme seeks to realize high quality, result oriented projects of strategic character, relevant for the programme area.</p> <p>The programme shall improve the territorial, economic and social integration process and contribute to cohesion, stability and competitiveness through the development of transnational partnerships and joint action on matters of strategic importance.</p> <p>The South East Europe Programme helps to promote better integration between the Member States, candidate and potential candidate countries and neighbouring countries.</p> <p>The programme shall amongst others facilitate innovation, entrepreneurship, knowledge economy and information society by concrete co-operation action and visible results.</p>
Total budget of programme	50 mill. EUR for 2010
Website	http://www.southeast-europe.net
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grants
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	<p>Max. funding amount per project: n. a. Funding in per cent: usually up to 90 %</p> <p>The co-financing of the project beneficiary is 10% of total project budget.</p>
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Calls for proposals ;
Institution providing funding	European Commission and SEE Joint Technical Secretariat, Hungary
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associations: non-governmental organisations, trade unions, employers' associations, professional associations etc. • Institutions: public sector operators, educational and research institutions, etc. • Foundations; • Chambers of Commerce, Chambers of Crafts and Trade, public employment services • Canton, municipalities/towns and the district



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regional development agencies, business incubators, entrepreneurship centres, research and development Institutes and other business support institutions. <p>Eligible are those institutions from the following countries: Austria, Greece, Italy (Regions: Lombardia, Bolzano / Bozen, Trento, Veneto, Friuli-Venezia-Giulia, Emilia Romagna, Umbria, Marche, Abruzzo, Molise, Puglia, Basilicata), Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Croatia, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Bosnia, Muntenegro și Serbia, Moldova and Ukraine (Regions: <u>Cjermovestka, Ivano-Frankiviska, Zakarpat-ska, Odessa</u>).</p>
Target sectors	Programme is not limited to a specific sector.
Eligible activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preparing activities that support the development of technology and innovation-oriented networks in specific technology fields (e.g. feasibility studies, set up of databases) 2. Developing transnational partnerships around research, technology and innovation centres and agencies in sectors with high technology contents 3. Facilitating the formation or consolidation or restructuring of transnational networks of productive clusters 4. Creating or reinforcing co-operation networks between companies and research, technology and innovation facilities of different countries and promoting joint action regarding applied research 5. Creating transnational exchange-teams (out of technology and innovation agencies, centres) specialised in measures building up technology and innovation capacity for improved products, processes and services 6. Transnational partnerships promoting the inclusion of innovative aspects in the public procurement regarding the application of technologies of common interest 7. Strategic co-operation aiming at enhancing the use of innovative and cleaner new technologies and its application at local and regional level 8. Establishing transnational networks between appropriate tertiary education and research, technology and innovation facilities 9. Establishing joint training courses in connecting with technology and innovation networks 10. Establishing science- and technology park networks developing standards and locational requirements for successful technology oriented real estates ("integrated high tech campus") to be situated in the programme area 11. Increasing the internationalisation level of research, technology and innovation facilities, especially in universities and in those areas, where the international rating for high educational level and research offer is still inadequate 12. Facilitating the application of technological innovation in the programme area by enhancing the mobility of researchers, supporting the exchange of knowledge 13. Fostering policies to support access to and link between research, technology and innovation facilities.
Project duration	Duration should not exceed 36 months.
Minimum requirements of the partnership	Partners from a minimum of three partner states, of which at least one shall be from a member state.
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes
Example projects & Experiences	Promoting Innovation in the Industrial Informatics and Embedded Systems Sectors through Networking, 2009 - 2012 UA partner: University of Odessa



http://www.southeast-europe.net/en/projects/approved_projects/?id=87

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Transnational Cooperation programme for South-East Europe

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) = I fully support this statement) to ii) (= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x	
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme		x
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA		x

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

Strategic importance of East and South East European regions for European Union and in international context. Although not focussing on research, the programme has a strong edge on research and the knowledge based society. Some 10 projects with UA participants were already selected.

WEAKNESSES

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme		x
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme		x
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		x

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ..)

Central Government bodies which are responsible for the programme, often do not have direct information about regions participating in the projects.
Poor quality of cross border infrastructure

OPPORTUNITIES

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree	
		i)	ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme		x
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme		x
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation		x

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)

The existent base of universities in the programme area can constitute a good start for future networks to stimulate innovation and research
Competitive labour costs.

THREATS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase				x
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)				x
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value				x

Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)

Concrete and relevant threats are not visible.

Section 2 : Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree.

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable		x		
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x			
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme		x		
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures		x		

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)

Many projects implemented successfully in the target area

Existence of the European programmes led to better co-operations amongst the partners.

WEAKNESSES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners				x
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only				x
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale			x	
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact			x	

Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
Low levels of IT systems and computers A better promotion of the benefits of the programme might have led to better participation and to better projects.				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		x	
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation		x	
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
The general interest in the cooperation across the borders in the region represents a good asset for UA-EU R&D cooperation. Impact could be increased by including private entities under certain conditions, i.e. technological centres with the legal status of private entities.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact		x	
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects		x	
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme			x
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				
Visa regime can be a barrier for free movement of persons cooperating under this programme.				



ANNEX 2: INNOVATION PROGRAMMES FROM UKRAINE

- Innovative Infrastructure in Ukraine
- Kiev Municipal Programme
- Innovational Programme of Science Park Kiev
- State Programme of Forecasting

PROGRAMME NAME:	Innovative Infrastructure in Ukraine
------------------------	---

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Complete name of programme	State Target Economic Programme "Foundation of Innovative Infrastructure in Ukraine" for 2009-2013
Overall aims	The Programme is aimed at the creation in 2009-2013 in Ukraine of the innovation infrastructure capable of providing the efficient use of the domestic scientific and technical potential, increased innovation and competitiveness of the national economy.
Total budget of programme	UAH 280.35 mln
Website	http://www.in.gov.ua/index.php?get=230
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	State budget, local budgets, other sources
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Not specified
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	The Ukrainian institutions may apply for the Programme by applying to the line agencies (Ministries and the like)
Institution providing funding	Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine is the key beneficiary.
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Parties responsible for the implementation of the Programme are: ministries, other central governmental authorities, Council of Ministers of the Autonomous Crimean Republic, Provincial, Kyiv Municipal and Sevastopol Municipal State Administrations, National Academy of Sciences.
Target sectors	Innovation infrastructure: SMEs, state system of info support of innovation activity, innovation sectors at universities, IPR institutions,
Eligible activities	The industrial-engineering subsystem will be created in the following priority directions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creation of the integral innovation infrastructure based on research institutions and higher educational institutions; • support and development of innovation small-scale enterprises; • creation of the innovation infrastructure at the regional level with simultaneous interregional coordination; • optimization and extension of the network of innovation activity information and advisory support centers; • development of the innovation activity staffing support infrastructure.
Project duration	To be determined separately within the term of the Programme
Minimum requirements of the partnership	Not specified
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes

Example projects & Experiences	http://www.invest.gov.ua/index.php?lang=ua&get=news&id=1148 ; http://www.invest-crimea.gov.ua/news_body.php?news_id=85&menu_id=8&locale=ua ; http://oblrada.odessa.gov.ua/Main.aspx?sect=Page&IDPage=17222&id=462 ; http://lq.tcvin.snu.edu.ua/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=97%3A2009-09-16-06-12-59&catid=7%3A2009-04-12-16-44-31&Itemid=15&lang=uk ; http://uiis.com.ua/conf_22/ ; http://technobiz.org/news/news_ukraine/178-zvit-za-2009-rik-zabezpechennya-rozvitku.html
--------------------------------	--

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Innovative Infrastructure in Ukraine

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation				
<p>Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i) = I fully support this statement) to ii) (= I disagree.. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.</p>				
STRENGTHS				
Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree				
		i)		ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)				
WEAKNESSES				
Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree				
		i)		ii)
W1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
W2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
W3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)				
Only question No 2 is appropriate for this Programme. –				
OPPORTUNITIES				
Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree				
		i)		ii)
O1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
O2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
O3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)					
THREATS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)					

Section 2: Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:
First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree.
Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)

--	--	--	--	--

WEAKNESSES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IIW2	The programme is focussing on UA policy issues only	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results	x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation		x	
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact		x	
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			<u>x</u>
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme		<u>x</u>	
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				

PROGRAMME NAME:	Kyiv Municipal Programme
------------------------	---------------------------------

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	The Main Department for Industrial, Scientific and Engineering and Innovation Policy of the Executive Committee of the Kyiv Municipal Council (Kyiv Municipal State Administration)
Complete name of programme	Kyiv Municipal Programme for the Innovation-Based Industrial Development for 2007-2011
Overall aims	Creating conditions for the innovation-based development of the city's industry for satisfying municipal demand for industrial products by increasing outputs of high tech, competitive, ecologically clean, export-oriented and import-replacing products
Total budget of programme	Implementation of the Program assumes that the total amount of its funding during 2007 to 2011 will be UAH 8,083.36 mln.
Website	http://www.kmv.gov.ua/divinfo.asp?id=205052
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	State budget, municipal budget, internal funds of enterprises, bank loans, attracting investments. Funding is awarded through tenders.
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Funding of individual project will be determined when elaborating target programmes
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Tender submission procedure will be determined by adopting by the Kyiv Municipal Council of the relevant legal documents
Institution providing funding	The Customer will be the Main Department for Industrial, Scientific and Engineering and Innovation Policy of the Executive Committee of the Kyiv Municipal Council (Kyiv Municipal State Administration)
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Enterprises and organizations of all property and subordination form involved in the Program; main departments, divisions and structural subdivisions of the executive body of the Kyiv Municipal Council (Kyiv Municipal State Administration), district state administrations in Kyiv
Target sectors	Municipal economy, energy, ecology
Eligible activities	<p>The Programme is oriented to the performance of the following tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meeting the city's demands in industrial products to the maximum extent, encouraging domestic producers by creating orders for the products required for the municipal economy; - introducing on Kyiv industrial enterprises high technologies according to priority directions of the innovation activity; - technical and technological modernization of the industrial complex, introducing advanced structural changes, increasing the number of implemented innovative projects; - accelerated development of industries capable of expanding their export potential; - increasing the import-replacing product output; - enhancing financial conditions of businesses, arranging conditions for the

	<p>attraction of investments;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - optimizing volumes, improving the quality of qualified workers, engineers and managers training; - introducing mechanisms of withdrawal from industrial enterprise of the lands which are not used efficiently, for the purpose of the development on such lands of high tech industries required by the city; - large-scale ecologization of the industrial production; - ensuring energy saving. <p>Solving industrial complex development problems as a whole:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - meeting the city's demands in industrial products to the maximum extent from the domestic manufacture; - product quality improvement, encouraging the development of the product quality assurance and certification system, first of all in high tech and knowledge-intensive industries by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • developing voluntary certification systems, rising requirements in compliance with the international standards, norms, rules and best world examples; • increasing efficiency of metrological and control-test operations through the improvement of the metrological support system and creating resource sharing centers; • developing and technically reequipping high tech control-test centers, services of metrological support in the manufacture of knowledge-intensive high-tech products; - certification of knowledge-intensive high-tech conversion products for the legitimated entrance to the domestic and global markets; - increasing the innovation-oriented functioning of the industrial complex for enhancing export competitiveness and import-replacement potentials; - introduction of energy saving technologies.
Programme duration	2007 to 2011
Minimum requirements of the partnership	No specified
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	No
Example projects & Experiences	http://www.expert-ua.info/document/archiveja/law5xwott/page2.htm ; http://www.kreschatic.kiev.ua/ua/3263/doc/11646.html ; http://www.auc.org.ua/?id=31557&q=%EA%F0%E5%E4%EC%E0%F8&ln= ; http://kreschatic.kiev.ua/ru/3068/doc/1213127475.html

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Kyiv Municipal Programme

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

The programme does not provide for EU-UA cooperation issues this is why there is no possibility to analyse the EU factor in the Programme.

WEAKNESSES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)

OPPORTUNITIES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)					
There are no obstacles to implement the Programme. Like with any National Programme, the funds in this one are foreseen for the whole duration of it which means that they are and will be in the State Budget.					
THREATS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)					
The Programme does not provide for EU-UA issues this is why discussing of added value in relation to this Programme, as regards the UA-EU cooperation, is useless.					

Section 2: Impact					
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme .					
STRENGTHS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)					
The programme does not provide for any bilateral cooperation. At the same time the positive results of the Programme implementation are covered in the media. Some pieces of coverage are possible to find in the Internet however in Ukrainian only.					
WEAKNESSES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IIW2	The programme is focussing on UA policy issues only	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)					
OPPORTUNITIES					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results	x			
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"				x
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation				x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)					
Innovation is an important issue of the Ukrainian economy which is in the transition. And the line agencies and the actors are highly interested in the Programme results. It is possible to discuss what it might have been at the end provided the international (bilateral) factor is involved in the Programme at any level, but the Programme is approved and not going to be changed.					
THREATS					
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				i)	ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact				x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact				x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects				x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x			
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)					
The questions in this section can not be applied to this Programme and, accordingly, can not be answered.					

PROGRAMME NAME:	Innovational Programme of Science Park «Kyiv Polytechnics»
------------------------	---

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	Ministry of Science and Education of Ukraine
Complete name of programme	Innovational Programme of Science Park «Kyiv Polytechnics»
Overall aims	The organisation of mass innovational activities directed on the intensification of treatment processes, production and implementation of highly technological productions on the internal and external markets, increase of incomes to the state and local budgets, acceleration of economics of Ukraine innovational development.
Total budget of programme	The forecasted volume of financing: 280,35 million UAH
Website	http://spark.ntu-kpi.kiev.ua/ ; http://spark.kpi.ua/
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Direct financing from the state budget or at the expense of scientific park or customer means.
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Not specified
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Continuous call
Institution providing funding	Scientific park, its partners or customers and/or the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine.
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions of higher education; • Research organizations; • State and private industrial enterprises and firms
Target sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Energetics of sustainable development; • The development of innovational components of informational society; • Complex analysis and strategic planning of big cities and regions of Ukraine life sustenance systems development; • Biotechnic systems and technologies; • Systems of special and double assignment.
Eligible activities	Implementation of specific projects in accordance with the target sectors in applied research
Project duration	Three years
Minimum requirements of the partnership	Not specified
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes

Example projects & Experiences	http://www.kmu.gov.ua/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=86711844&cat_id=33355500; http://almamater.com.ua/modules/news/article.php?storyid=332; http://www.invest.gov.ua/index.php?get=news&id=392; http://patent.km.ua/ukr/news/i1418; http://www.dt.ua/3000/3100/59792/; http://www.osvita.org.ua/news/29782.html; http://www.kreschatic.kiev.ua/ua/3177/news/4762.htm; http://elections.unian.net/ukr/news/news-195479.html; http://www.kraina.org.ua/ua/material/593/; http://www.ndiiv.org.ua/index.php/2009-05-25-13-09-10/32-2009-03-24-13-05-44
--------------------------------	--

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Innovational Programme of Science Park «Kyiv Polytechnics

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) = I fully support this statement) to ii) (= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree		i)			ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x			
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme		x		
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x			

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

International factor can be regarded as a strength of this Programme.

WEAKNESSES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree		i)			ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme				x
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme			x	
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		x		

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)

Kommentar [na1]: Which one is more adequate?

Formatiert: Hervorheben

Formatiert: Hervorheben

OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
	i)			ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
	i)			ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				
UA-EU cooperation serves to the better implementation of this Programme. At the same time, there is no possibility to foresee any follow-up of this Programme.				

Kommentar [na2]: What exactly do you mean by follow-up? That the results are not evaluated or that there will be no similar programme after this programme ends?

Section 2: Impact				
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.				
STRENGTHS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
	i)			ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				

Kommentar [na3]: To ensure coherence with IIT4, could the x be moved more towards (ii)?

WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			x
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only		x	
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale		x	
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact			x
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
There is no specific answer to questions No 2 and 3. They depend on specific activities (see "Eligible activities").				
OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results	x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation			x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x		
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				

Kommentar [na4]: To ensure coherence with IIT4, could the x be moved more towards (ii)?

PROGRAMME NAME:	State Programme of Forecasting
------------------------	---------------------------------------

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Complete name of programme	State Programme of Forecasting of the Scientific and Technical and Innovation Development for 2004-2006
Overall aims	Creation of the forecasting system of the scientific, technical and innovation development of Ukraine, scientific substantiation of the national social and economic policy; determining topical development directions of science and technology, and the most promising innovation activity directions
Total budget of programme	UAH 2000 thousand
Website	http://zakon1.rada.gov.ua/cgi-bin/laws/main.cgi?nreg=1086-2004-%EF
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Financing sources include State budget funds, international technical aid, and others.
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Not specified
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Specific competitions
Institution providing funding	Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Research institutions and organizations
Target sectors	Sectors of science and technology which are the most perspective as regards innovation development, i.e. no narrow sector of economy is targeted
Eligible activities	Evaluating the potential of the scientific-technical and innovation field. Development based on the judgment method of medium- and long-term scientific-technical and innovation activity development forecasts. Determining the base and alternative scientific-technological and innovation activity development scenarios, the most promising technologies and innovations to provide the global market entry of domestic high tech products and technologies, critical technologies to ensure scientific-technical and social progress, sustained economic growth and national security.
Programme duration	2004-2006
Minimum requirements of the partnership	Not specified
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	No
Example projects & Experiences	http://www.minregionbud.gov.ua/ib/bul/05_n01/kol2004_167.htm ; http://www.lib.ua-ru.net/diss/cont/28907.html ; http://iee.org.ua/files/alushta/68-popovi4-k_voprosu_o_suschnosti.pdf ; http://www.rusnauka.com/19_NNM_2007/Philosophia/23451.doc.htm ; http://www.narda.org.ua/?fuseaction=menu.main&id=89

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: State Programme of Forecasting

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) = I fully support this statement) to ii) (= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

The EU-UA factor is not involved in the Programme this is why there is no materials to analyses in this section.

WEAKNESSES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ..)

The questions No 1 and 3 are not appropriate for this Programme

OPPORTUNITIES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

		i)			ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)

The questions No 1 and 2 are not appropriate for this Programme.

THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	X		
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			X
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value	X		
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				

Section 2: Impact				
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.				
STRENGTHS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable			X
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	X		
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	X		
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	X		
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				
Unfortunately bilateral cooperation or any kind of international cooperation was not foreseen in this Programme, and there is no possibility at all to see and/or measure this factor. However evaluations of the Programme implementation conducted on the regular basis worked to the Programme positive results.				
WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			X
IIW2	The programme is focussing on UA policy issues only	X		
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale			X
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact		X	
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				



OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
	i)			ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results	x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"			x
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation			x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
	i)			ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact		x	
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact		x	
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x		
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				



ANNEX 3: INNOVATION PROGRAMMES IN SELECTED MEMBER STATES

- COIN (Austria)
- Scientific and Technical Cooperation Germany-Ukraine
- Central SME Innovation Programme – ZIM (Germany)

PROGRAMME NAME: COIN

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	FFG - Österreichische Forschungsförderungs-Gesellschaft (Austrian Research Promotion Agency)
Complete name of programme	Cooperation and Innovation <u>Specific subline:</u> International Consortia - Strategic RDI cooperation with South-Eastern and Eastern Europe within the scope of COIN
Overall aims	<p>COIN contributes towards fostering Austria's innovation performance by a better and broader transposition of knowledge into innovation. The "Cooperation and Network" line encourages technology transfer within entrepreneurial cooperation schemes, thus raising the level of innovation within businesses and strengthening their cooperation capacities. It focuses on output-oriented cooperation projects to develop and improve innovative products and processes.</p> <p><u>For the specific subline:</u> The countries of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe are of eminent importance for Austria's economy. For South-Eastern Europe, Austria acts as a beacon economy, and the emerging markets of Eastern Europe offer outstanding prospects for Austrian businesses. Achieving sustainable cooperation between Austria and these regions will require explicit endeavours in the pursuit of a focus on research, technological development and innovation.</p> <p>Considering the different starting points for Austria and South-Eastern and Eastern-Europe as regions for prospective cooperation, the situation offers a clear win-win potential which needs to be strategically utilised. Austrian enterprises can offer an impetus and participate in the increased growth thus induced. In this way, a joint axis between players in Austria and in the South-Eastern and Eastern European states can enjoy competitive advantages in a global context which benefit all parties involved. In view of the geographical and cultural proximity, major advantages should accrue from this win-win potential in particular to technology-focused SMEs in Austria (as well as in the partner countries).</p>
Total budget of programme	Altogether € 8.8 million in federal funds (Approximately € 2 million for projects with international cooperation)
Website	http://www.ffg.at/content.php?cid=984
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Grants
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	<p>Max. 60% of the total eligible costs, max. € 500,000 in absolute terms Projects totalling less than € 100,000 in eligible costs are not accepted</p> <p><u>For the specific subline for international cooperation:</u></p> <p>Funding rate in terms of overall projects: max. 75% of eligible overall costs.</p> <p>* For intermediaries and research institutes involved: max. 75%. * For enterprises involved: same as the generally valid COIN regulations (for large, medium and small enterprises respectively)</p>



	<p>Maximum portion of Austrian aid flowing abroad:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Generally 20–40%, depending on the number of partners and partner countries involved (in South-Eastern and Eastern Europe); * not less than 15%; and * not more than 50%.
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Specific calls
Institution providing funding	Federal Ministry of Economy, Family and Youth of the Republic of Austria
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	<p>As applicant (consortium leader):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * enterprises * intermediaries/organisations working in the field of technology transfer (e.g. technology, innovation or start-up centres; entrepreneurial clusters) * RDI institutions (university, extra-university, cooperative) * universities of applied sciences and their transfer agencies <p>As partners: The consortium may include as partners other enterprises, technology transfer facilities, intermediaries, research institutions and, possibly, also public institutions or interest groups.</p> <p><u>Specifically for projects with international cooperation:</u></p> <p>Partner countries for consortium partners:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Albania * Armenia * Azerbaijan * Belarus * Bosnia and Herzegovina * Bulgaria * Croatia * Georgia * Kazakhstan * Kosovo * Macedonia * Moldavia * Montenegro * Romania * Russia * Serbia * Turkey * Ukraine
Target sectors	Any.
Eligible activities	Eligible for funding are staff costs and other project-related items (use of RDI infrastructure, third-party costs, travel expenses, cost of materials) subject to the prerequisites as defined in the Community Framework for State Aid for Research and Development and Innovation (2006/C 323/01).
Project duration	<p># At least one year</p> <p># Generally not more than two years</p> <p># Not more than three years in well-reasoned cases</p>
Minimum requirements of the partnership	<p><u>For projects in the specific subline:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Involvement of at least four enterprises (of which at least three SMEs), of which at least two from Austria and at least two from the partner region. * Partners within a minimum-scale consortium must not be interlinked. * Where projects involve the development of a network a higher number of



	partners is desirable. * This call explicitly permits cooperation between "clustered systems"
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes, but EU/MS only Austria, Bulgaria and Romania are eligible to receive funding.
Example projects & Experiences	Previous calls were launched under the acronym CIR-CE. Sample projects have been analysed with a network analytical approach.

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: COIN

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation				
<p>Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree.. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.</p>				
STRENGTHS				
Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree				
		i)		ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x		
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme		x	
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x		
Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)				
IS1: The programme provides cooperation opportunities only for selected EU-MS. The list of possible international partners is relatively broad (i.e. from Albania to Turkey). IS2: The applicant / coordinator needs to be Austrian. IS3: There are no specific topics pre-defined. The activities have to lead to innovation.				
Other important points: - well embedded international cooperation subline within a major funding programme - Bottom up topics, no pre-defined themes - Company driven				
WEAKNESSES				
Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree				
		i)		ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme		x	
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme			x
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		x	
Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)				
IW1: COIN is primarily to foster cooperation and innovation projects by Austrian companies, the international cooperation is only a subline of the programme. Within international cooperation, there are different East-European and South-East-European countries eligible. Within the previous programme line (CIR-CE) the cooperation with Ukraine did not take place (but was not forbidden). In the "proposer's day" which took place in Vienna recently, interest in projects with Ukraine has been demonstrated. IW2: Cooperation between Austria and Ukraine is foreseen in the programme. Other EU Member States (except Bulgaria and Romania) are not eligible to receive funding.				



IW3: The opportunity for international cooperation within the COIN programme is known by potential applicants. Coordinators of projects need to be Austrian, so they are the main target group for information campaigns. It is assumed that the potential users in Ukraine (and the other South-East- and East-European countries) are not so aware of the possibilities.

Other important points:

- Ukraine is not a very well established partner country in Austria (opposed to e.g. Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, etc.)
- only limited number of other EU MS can receive funding – rarely other EU MS companies will participate in a project without receiving funding

OPPORTUNITIES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme				
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme			x	
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	x			

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)

IO1: EU-UA cooperation is foreseen. Thus, this statement has not been assessed by us. Further EU partner may participate in the projects without receiving funding.

IO2: In projects funded under the previous CIR-CE programme, networking projects allowed Austrian companies to use "bridging" intermediaries and also "bridging" countries for their cooperation efforts (i.e. a Serbian partner facilitating cooperation with partners from Republica Srpska, BiH). Nevertheless, bilateral contacts are very important when drafting the project proposals. However, in many previous projects under CIR-CE more than one country was involved. Thus, a multilateral shape is dominant.

IO3: The programme is part of the Austrian policy on cooperation with South-Eastern and Eastern Europe. It is responding to the official Austrian strategy for RTD.

Other important points:

- that the international cooperation subline is embedded in the overall COIN programme

THREATS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase				x
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)				x
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value				x

Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)

IT1: It is not assumed that the programme COIN will end after the current phase. The international cooperation subline may not be called at the next call deadline but it is not assumed that it will be discontinued.

IT2: No particular conflicts were assessed.

IT3: The Austrian project coordinator will assess the added value to integrate an Ukrainian partner to his/her proposal. A winning proposal will hopefully lead to an added value. Evaluation results show a true added value of cooperation.

Other important points:

- it is likely that the full amount available for funding is not exhausted due to the sometimes low quality of proposals

Section 2: Impact

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree.

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	x			
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x			
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme		x		
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	x			

Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)

IIS1: The COIN subline for international cooperation is called for the first time, but the predecessor programme CIR-CE has shown positive results of bilateral cooperation.

IIS2: Evaluations of CIR-CE have been periodically carried out, there is an elaborated evaluation and monitoring concept.

IIS3: The CIR-CE funding available has not always been fully exploited by the target group. Participation in COIN remains to be seen. The proposers day was successful.

IIS4: Management is carried out by the Austrian Research Promotion Agency in a professional way. Some bureaucratic measures are necessary due to the State-Aid regulations, etc.

Further important points:

- network analysis carried out with CIR-CE projects showed that the networks are quite sustainable also after the funding ends.

WEAKNESSES

<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>		i)			ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			x	
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only			x	
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale				x
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact			x	

Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)

IIW1: The coordinator of the project often has a bigger interest in the project. As the projects are company driven innovation projects, the protection of Intellectual Property Rights plays a major role. Generally results are being shared among the partners, but there are – of course – competition concerns.

IIW2: The programme certainly follows Austrian policies, but not only (given the fact that it is unilaterally funding).

IIW3: The size and length of the project is adequate to reach impact.

IIW4: The reporting burden is considerable based on given state-aid rules, but it is still feasible (esp. compared to FP7).

Further important points:

- innovation projects can also fail

- IPR issues need to be respected by the participating international partners

OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results			x
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation	x		
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
IIO1: the implementing body has subsumed CIR-CE under the new COIN programme. Maybe this will contribute in the future to an even better exploitation of the programme, but – for the time being – this cannot be guaranteed.				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x		
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				
IIT4: this is not caused by the programme itself, but rather by the initial cooperation relations between Austrian and UA companies. Anyway, COIN is a good framework to initialise such cooperations.				



PROGRAMME NAME:	Scientific and technical cooperation Germany-Ukraine
------------------------	---

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) / International Bureau of the BMBF
Complete name of programme	Scientific and technical cooperation Germany-Ukraine
Overall aims	Initiation and enhancement of cooperation (of research groups and institutions) in application-oriented research, promotion of the exchange of scientists working in joint research projects
Total budget of programme	
Website	http://www.bmbf.de/foerderungen/12346.php
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	Non-refundable supporting grants. The BMBF supports the German participants while the Ukrainian Ministry supports the Ukrainian participants.
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	No formal limit, usually several 1.000 EUR per project and year (up to a few 10.000 EUR per year in special cases)
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Formally one call or two calls per year for mobility support projects, continuous submission possible on the German side
Institution providing funding	German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) (for German participants, for Ukrainian participants: Ministry for Education and Science of Ukraine)
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	Universities, research institutes, hospitals active in research, private companies
Target sectors	Priority areas: health sciences, nanotechnology, optical technologies, biotechnology, ICT, environmental science and sustainability
Eligible activities	Travel costs for cooperation initiation, project-related scientific exchange, expert meetings and thematic project planning workshops; in special cases: costs for events, for devices (which are not part of the regular laboratory inventory) or also for feasibility studies and staff costs
Project duration	Max 18 months in the first phase
Minimum requirements of the partnership	One research group in each country (Germany and Ukraine)
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	Yes
Example projects & Experiences	see http://www.kooperation-international.de/ukraine/themes/projektbeginn/projekte/

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: Scientific and technical cooperation Germany-Ukraine

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked to **give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) = I fully support this statement) to ii) (= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

	i)	ii)
IS1 The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation	x	
IS2 Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme	x	
IS3 The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x	

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

On the German side, the programme is based on the national High-tech strategy including the federal programme for health research. It is thus part of a wider strategy, at least in Germany. The programme is clearly cooperation-oriented.

WEAKNESSES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

	i)	ii)
IW1 Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme		x
IW2 EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme		x
IW3 The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		x

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ...)

Each country funds its own participants. Information about the funding on the Ukrainian side is not easily accessible (for German participants). Generally, no support is provided for partner search.

OPPORTUNITIES

Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree

	i)	ii)
IO1 EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme		x
IO2 Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme	x	
IO3 Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation	x	

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)

Similar programmes have existed since the beginning of the 1990s which proves the programme's coherence and sustainability. It is unlikely to end after this phase. UA-DE cooperation is a (prerequisite for the success of the programme, so the involved actors (policymakers, programme managers) have a strong interest in promoting the programme in both participating countries

THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase	x		x
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			X
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value			x
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				

Section 2: Impact				
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.				
STRENGTHS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable	x		
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x		
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme		x	
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures		x	
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				
From the German perspective, Ukraine is the 2 nd most important country in S&T cooperation with the CIS states, behind Russia. In 2007, Ukraine was in the 5 th position of all 73 countries with which Germany has signed technical and scientific cooperation agreements. The programme and the general cooperation structures have made an important contribution to this development.				
WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			x
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only		x	
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale		x	
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact		x	
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
Projects are rather small-scale. The programme supports mainly mobility in individual research cooperations, only some additional funds are available for general innovation-oriented measures, networking, etc. SME participation is still limited in the programme. Though SMEs are encouraged to apply, most of the participants are research institutions.				

OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results	x		
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"	x		
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation		x	
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact			x
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects			x
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme			x
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				

PROGRAMME NAME:	ZENTRALES INNOVATIONSPROGRAMM MITTELSTAND (CENTRAL SME INNOVATION PROGRAMME; ZIM)
------------------------	--

PART I: PROGRAMME FILE

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Managing institution	Funding agent: Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology Programme manager: AIF Berlin, EuroNorm, VDI/VDE/IT
Complete name of programme	Central SME Innovation Programme
Overall aims	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - encourage SMEs to undertake more efforts for market-oriented research, development and innovation - reduce technical and economic risks related to technology-based R&D projects - transform R&D results in market- relevant innovations - promote cooperation between SMEs and research institutes and extend technology transfer - promote the dedication of SMEs towards R&D cooperation and participation in innovative networks - improve innovation, cooperation and networking management capacities in SMEs
Total budget of programme	2009/2010: total € 1.5 billion
Website	www.zim-bmwi.de
FUNDING	
Type of funding Grants/loans/etc.	grants
Funding per project (max., in % and/or €)	Individual SMEs: 35-45% of total eligible costs (depending on size and location of the company, research institutes up to 100% of eligible costs) Cooperation Projects: 35-50% of total eligible costs (depending on size and location of the company, research institutes up to 100% of eligible costs) Max. project volume 350 000€ Networking Projects: cost of an external network managers are funded, up to 70% during the first year of the project
Application procedure Specific calls/permanent call/etc.	Individual SME's projects and cooperation project: permanent call Networking projects: 4 evaluation rounds per year
Institution providing funding	Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology
DETAILED INFORMATION	
Eligible organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SMEs according to EU SME definition - temporarily: larger enterprises with up to 1000 employees - research institution in cooperation with SMEs
Target sectors	Open to all sectors
Eligible activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - research and innovation projects SME-SME(s) or SME(s)-research institute(s) - Networks
Project duration	2-3 years
Minimum requirements of the partnership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Individual SME projects: no partnership required - Cooperation projects: depending on project types, at least 2 partners (SME-SME(s) or SME(s)-research institute(s)) - Networks: at least 6 companies + an external network manager
EU/MS - UA cooperation possible?	- Yes, though Ukrainian partners do not receive funding. In the case of participation of a foreign partner, the funded German companies receive an extra 10% in overhead costs

Example projects & Experiences	
--------------------------------	--

PART II: SIMPLIFIED SWOT EVALUATION: ZIM

Section 1: Relevance for bilateral UA-EU cooperation

Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts:

First you are asked **to give your opinion on pre-defined issues** on a scale ranging from i) =I fully support this statement) to ii(= I disagree..

Then you have some space for your own **comments and observations**. We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.

STRENGTHS

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree			
		i)			ii)
IS1	The programme provides good opportunities for a fruitful EU-UA cooperation			X	
IS2	Parties from both EU and UA have equal access to programme				x
IS3	The eligible topics reflect the needs of target groups both in EU and in UA	x			

Comments (Other observations speaking for strengths or reasons for the success)

Cooperation with Ukrainian SMEs or research institutes is possible. German companies receive a supplement towards their overhead costs when cooperating with a foreign institution. There are no pre-defined topics (bottom-up approach), so there is a great flexibility.

WEAKNESSES

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree			
		i)			ii)
IW1	Although generally possible, UA-EU cooperation does not take place in this programme	x			
IW2	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen in the programme			x	
IW3	The opportunity for UA-EU cooperation in this programme is not well known by potential users		x		

Comments (e.g. obstacles for sufficient UA-EU cooperation in the programme; reasons for the programme not being known by potential users, ..)

The programme was designed according to German needs. Only German companies are funded. The programme does not aim at enhancing cooperation between Ukrainian and German companies.

OPPORTUNITIES

		Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree			
		i)			ii)
IO1	EU-UA cooperation is not foreseen, but it could be a fruitful element in the programme	x			
IO2	Bilateral cooperation seems to be a critical factor for the success of the programme				x
IO3	Programme is part of integrated policy strategy for EU-UA or MS-UA cooperation				x

Comments (E.g. what makes you think the programme will be successful in the future)

The programme was equipped with extra funding because of the world economic crisis and is open to all sectors, so it has a high potential in terms of the numbers and variety of funded projects. Furthermore, the administrative effort is limited, which makes the programme particularly attractive for SMEs.

THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IT1	The programme will end after the current phase			x
IT2	Programme objectives are in conflict to other important policy lines (security, ..)			x
IT3	UA-EU cooperation does not/cannot lead to added value		x	
Comments (Why will the programme end? What are problems concerning weak efficiency)				
<i>It is not sure how the programme will continue after 2010 when the extra funding is stopped or used up. Currently there are no specific efforts to promote EU-UA co-operation and there probably won't be in the future, either.</i>				

Section 2: Impact				
Please note: The evaluation consists of two parts: First you are asked to give your opinion on pre-defined issues on a scale ranging from i)=I fully support this statement to ii)= I disagree. Then you have some space for your own comments and observations . We kindly ask you to make good use of this possibility in order to give us a better insight into the programme.				
STRENGTHS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIS1	Positive results of bilateral cooperation are visible and measurable			x
IIS2	Evaluations are foreseen and are being periodically conducted	x		
IIS3	The target group participates as expected in the programme	x		
IIS4	The programme has a good support structure, efficient delivery systems and transparent selection procedures	x		
Comments (Examples of good results, reasons for the good performance)				
<i>The programme is easy to handle and appropriate for SMEs. Relatively small bureaucratic effort and high probability of approval. Evaluations are regularly conducted. Based on these evaluations, the programme was extended in terms of geographical scope, types of potential applicants and financing.</i>				
WEAKNESSES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIW1	Results are not being shared equally among the partners			x
IIW2	The programme is focussing on EU (UA) policy issues only	x		
IIW3	The projects are by far too small to have visible impact at bilateral scale		x	
IIW4	Administrative burdens counteract efficiency and impact			x
Comments (e.g. other obstacles for the programme to come up with sufficient impact)				
<i>No impact on a transnational level because the programme is not designed for promoting DE-UA cooperation, but to help German SMEs innovate in times of crisis.</i>				



OPPORTUNITIES				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIO1	The implementing body has already started actions to better exploit programme results		x	
IIO2	The programme is in line with current and future bilateral policy measures in the field of "Innovation"			x
IIO3	The programme has already gained huge interest for bilateral cooperation			x
Comments (e.g. some examples, why are actors so much interested in this specific programme)				
<i>The programme is being heavily promoted in Germany and there is an option to cooperate with foreign partners even though this is not a priority.</i>				
THREATS				
<i>Please tick: i) I fully support this statement, ii) I disagree</i>				
		i)		ii)
IIT1	A considerable number of cooperation projects failed to show impact			x
IIT2	Low efficiency: high costs for limited output and minimal impact		x	
IIT3	Cooperation is perceived as a burden rather than as a factor bringing added value to projects		x	
IIT4	Although generally possible, EU-UA cooperation has not taken place in this programme	x		
Comments (e.g. reasons for the weak impact and the low efficiency)				
<i>Cooperation is possible but not a priority. This situation cannot be expected to change in the future, so impact on a transnational level is probably going to stay low.</i>				