## Actions arising from the meeting of the FP6 Task Force on Instruments 20 September 2002

Chair: R.J Smits (RTD-B2)

**Present**: G. Valcarcel (RTD-B3), A. Arabatzis (RTD-A2), J.D Malo (RTD-A3), L. Karapiperis (RTD-B2), M.Moller (INFSO), N. Pantalos (ENTR), C. Profilis (RTD-B2), C.Renier (RTD-B2), M. Richards (RTD-G05), E.Rille (RTD-L4), G. Valgarcel (RTD-B 3), R.Zimmermann (INFSO).

## Results of the Expressions of interest exercise

- **D. Miles** made a summary statement of the results of the exercise, the main conclusions of which are as follows:
- <u>Distribution of the EoI</u>: about 82 % from Member States, 12 % from Associated States (not really satisfactory and usually without opening towards MS), and 6 % from third non Associated Countries (of which the half from Turkey);
- Limited <u>involvement of industry</u> at that stage (probably for confidentiality reasons);
- High risk of <u>oversubscription</u>, since "good" proposals already represent about three times the resources available;
- <u>Positive impacts</u>: involvement of new actors, support to the Commission for the mapping of the work programmes, identification of the main issues to be clarified (by the potential participants and by the Commission);
- Follow up:
  - publication by Monday 23 September of the "annex III" of the application form for EoI, possibility being offered to those having expressed their interest to have the complete 5 pages published (on an entirely voluntary basis)
  - a short analysis (anonymous) by the services of the Commission will be available on the same address by the end of September.

# Working document regarding the stimulation of SMEs participation in FP 6

- **GV** introduced briefly the main changes brought to the previous version;
- The <u>main comments</u> expressed regarded the following issues: minimum number of participants (rather 3 SMEs and 1 RTD performer than more); necessity of identifying the instruments that are most suited to SMEs participation in order not to create fictitious expectations; evaluation criterion regarding SMEs involvement (necessity to ensure urgently that each work programme reflects such criterion); two-steps process: necessity of including the criteria to be applied during the first step;

• Other wording observations were made; <u>further possible minor comments</u> to be transmitted directly to **XG** or **GV** by <u>Monday</u>, <u>23</u> September.

# Working documents regarding coordination actions and specific support actions

- Necessity of underlining the distinction between the two instruments for what regards the objectives and the activities: B2 to provide MM with a proposal to be discussed at the next meeting;
- SSA evaluation criteria: "standard" text to be taken from the evaluation manual (page 43, annex L)
- <u>Further</u> wording and minor <u>comments</u> to be sent to **MM** by Tuesday 24 September.
- Options on financial regimes for AC and SSA (document by JDM and NRS), as well as evaluation criteria to be dealt with at the next meeting.

#### FP 6 Launching Conference in November

- Material on the new instruments: a draft has been circulated; comments to be sent to **LK** by <u>Tuesday 24 September</u>;
- "New instruments island": organising table to be electronically circulated by **LK**, answers expected by <u>Tuesday 24 September</u>.

## Training on the new instruments

- **MR** to circulate a document underlining the issues identified as needing further clarification after the "Rules for participation training sessions";
- Identification of the issues to be clarified regarding the new instruments during the next TF meeting and preparation of an action plan for the two coming months;

# The next meeting will take place on a date/room to be later confirmed, with the following agenda:

- Options for the financial regime of CA and SSA (on basis of a document by JDM and NRS)
- Identification of the issues to be clarified regarding the new instruments and discussion of an action plan for the 2 coming months (notably on basis of MR document regarding "Article 167 training")
- Discussion on FCF cost model in the SME context (on basis of document by JDM)