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1. Introduction

The main objective of the present deliverable – as laid down in the Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement (GA) of the N4M+ project – is to formulate recommendations on what instruments Widening countries may introduce to be more successful in Horizon 2020 (H2020) and in Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA) in particular, how the National Contact Points (NCPs) can contribute to the more successful participation of the researchers and host organisations, and what trainings MSCA NCPs would need to change the tendency.

Based on the “Pre-study for MSCA Widening Analysis” (part 4 of the present deliverable) and “Outcomes of Widening Survey” (part 5 of the present deliverable) conducted within the N4M+ project, the following recommendations have been elaborated for the MSCA NCPs or MSCA NCP organisations to implement in order to have a structuring impact on the participation of Widening Countries in the Framework Programmes (FP)/Horizon 2020 and in MSCA in particular.

2. Recommendations for Widening country MSCA NCPs

The main aim of the following set of recommendations is to propose instruments/measures which could be implemented by the MSCA NCPs from Widening countries themselves or by the MSCA NCP organisations provided that they received the corresponding/adequate structural support of their national authorities. Instruments which would need a decision at national government/ministry level are not proposed. NCPs can choose to implement those recommendations which are relevant for them.

**Strategic recommendations:**

1. **Initiate and contribute to develop a national action plan for mobility of researchers** with special regard to increase the attractiveness of the country for incoming researchers. The action plan should be elaborated in cooperation with national stakeholders (ministries, funding agencies/NCP organisations, universities, research institutes, business sectors) which identifies national measures aimed to improve and promote research conditions (including mobility of researchers).

2. **Establish closer cooperation with thematic NCPs, policy makers and other FP/H2020 related networks** (such as EURAXESS, MCAA, EEN) to help each other’s work. On the one hand, researchers can acquire more up-to-date information on policy and practical issues (visa, accommodation, etc.), get first-hand experience from MSCA fellows and industry participants can be attracted as well. On the other hand, MSCA could be promoted at other NCPs’/EURAXESS/MCAA/EEN events.

3. **Multiply/decentralise the NCP work:** contact regional/local offices/institutions which cooperate with universities/research organisations in their regions to spread information on FP/H2020/MSCA. This way MSCA in Widening countries could be more promoted and can get closer to potential clients. Training for regional/local offices on FP/H2020/MSCA issues may also be provided.

4. **Increase the number of staff/experts responsible for MSCA or helping the MSCA NCPs work** in order to provide more professional advice/training for researchers and host organisations.
Practical recommendations:

5. Organise regular meetings with the management level of research organisations/universities together with e.g. the NCP coordinator and relevant thematic NCPs, with the aim to make the managerial level of research organisations/universities aware of the importance of H2020/MSCA participation and in this way achieve a higher level of institutional commitment which could pave the way for taking up the coordinator’s role.

6. Organise cross-border regional info days and B2B meetings/brokerage events with the participation of industry. This way more participants from different neighbouring countries and also stakeholders from industry can be attracted, partner search and forming of consortia can be fostered.

7. Organise targeted meetings/workshops/trainings with MSCA fellows/beneficiaries to show their experiences to potential new applicants.

8. Organise trainings/workshops for the administrative personnel of research organisations/universities to train them for the financial and administrative management of H2020 projects. Supporting materials such as guidelines in national languages on management and financial implementation of MSCA projects could also give impetus to have more coordinators from Widening countries in FP.

9. Organise webinars on H2020/MSCA: webinar is an adequate tool to reach many interested researchers and host organisations and to provide general information on FP/H2020/MSCA schemes. Besides, it can also be used for the promotion of Widening countries as host countries.

10. Learn from the national NCP system, experiences, best practices of more experienced MSCA NCPs (especially those from Widening countries) by participating in Twinning or other knowledge-exchange activities.

3. Executive Summary

The set of recommendations is based on a pre-study elaborated in the frame of N4M+ project analysing the RDI and FP7/H2020 performance of Widening countries - with a special focus on MSCA - and the outcomes of the widening survey and a part of benchmarking analysis carried out among MSCA NCPs from Widening countries.

The results of the pre-study based on existing reports, analyses, trends and statistics show that Widening countries in general have relatively low gross domestic expenditure on research and development (GERD) as well as weak FP7 and H2020 participation and funding compared to EU15 countries. However, FP results seem to be better in case of Widening countries with higher number of researchers and greater openness to international collaboration and co-publication. Several barriers have been identified in recent studies at structural and organisational level which hinder FP participation. Structural obstacles are among others: lack of national strategy and vision concerning the participation in FPs and researchers’ mobility, not appropriate level of national funding for

---

1 Pre-study for MSCA widening analysis of the N4M+ project (part 4 of the present deliverable)
research and national support actions to enhance FP participation, lack of leading universities and research organisations, low level of researcher salaries, lack of up-to-date research infrastructures at institutions and low involvement in infrastructures at European or international level. Structural Funds are considered as more easily accessible and attractive than Horizon 2020 in most of these countries.

The organisational obstacles of FP participation within the university/research organisation include the lack of professional and administrative support, low level of professional English knowledge, personnel competence and capacity as well as lack of funding to initiate international meetings, enhance international collaborations. FP participation is hindered by low success rates especially for coordinators from Widening countries, difficulties to get admission into good consortia led by successful research organisations and by the perception of high administrative burdens of FP projects.

Concerning the participation in MSCA, only one third of the Widening countries shows positive trends in increasing the number of host organizations in H2020 as compared to FP7: Bulgaria, Lithuania, Romania and Slovakia are outpacing the average number of hosts for FP7 while Albania, Bosna and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Malta and Serbia have already exceeded the number of host organizations for the whole FP7. The rest of the Widening countries shows equal trends or even discouraging decrease in the number of host organizations. While comparing FP7 and H2020 results to date, it is obvious that Widening countries are significantly lagging behind – 60% of the countries are lagging behind FP7 average pace or show much worse performance. It is indicative that the number of coordinators in ITN still stays extremely low in H2020. The share of Widening countries in the MSCA budget has been decreased for the period 2014-2017 in comparison to the data from the Interim Evaluation: EU-13 countries receive 3.9% of the total MSCA funding and all 27 Widening countries receive 6.6%.

Reports also show why researchers of widening countries decide to undergo international mobility. Among the academic motives of researchers are: better research facilities, better recognition of their research field or profession, cooperation with leading scientists and open, merit-based and transparent recruitment, reputation of the host. However, there have been also barriers identified hindering international mobility and thus, participation in the framework programme. These – also at structural, organisational and personal level – include language barrier, lack or insufficient guidance to tax and pension rules, outdated state of the art research infrastructure, slow reform of higher education system, low cooperation with private sector and low interdisciplinary research; low administrative capacity and support for international research projects; low connection with research and scientific diaspora.

Outcomes of the surveys\(^2\) – carried out in the frame of the N4M+ project to complement the results of the pre-study – show that in most of the Widening countries there is no national strategy or action plan for the participation in MSCA. Regarding factors influencing MSCA participation, based on the responders rating, the most positive factors are the significant international research collaboration, attractiveness of the country, existence of strong research teams, existence of leading research organisations and attractiveness of the research community in the respective Widening countries. The most negative factors are the insufficient project management and administrative support for

\(^2\) Outcomes of Widening Survey of the N4M+ project (part 5 of present deliverable)
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project preparation and implementation and the insufficient financial management. In general, it can be stated that national measures for supporting participation of entities/researchers in MSCA are not available. At the same time, in some countries there are good practices such as a national grant (lump sum) for proposal preparation for coordinators and individuals, financial support for projects with score above 85%/above threshold, funding for the meetings with potential partners, workshops, conferences. When analysing the reasons why incoming researchers tend to choose a Widening country, the results indicate that the most important national features are the attractiveness of the research landscape, the existence of strong research teams and the significant level of international research collaboration. Amongst the discouraging features are the lack of sufficient financial management support for project preparation and implementation.

Most MSCA NCPs from Widening countries state that their level of experience is average or satisfactory in most fields. In case of proposal submission and presentation skills many MSCA NCPs from Widening countries rate their experience as excellent, however, their knowledge is considered to be unsatisfactory in COFUND-training. According to MSCA NCPs from Widening countries, more national support/measures for proposal preparation seems to be the most important aspect that could help their work. Apart from that, better cooperation with policy makers, more staff, more training activities and more supporting materials are also regarded as beneficial. It is interesting to note, however, that more cooperation with other networks does not seem to play such an important role in this regard. The same is true for the better circulation of „expressions of interest” among other European countries.

4. Pre-study for MSCA widening analysis

4.1. Main objective

The main objective of the pre-study is to give an overview on the RDI performance of Widening countries, reflect on their participation in EU FP7 and Horizon 2020 with special focus on the participation in MCA and MSCA actions. Apart from statistical data and trends, main barriers hindering participation in FPs will also be touched upon. This short report (together with the outcomes of the Benchmarking survey T 2.1) will serve as a basis for further analysing the obstacles and problems MSCA NCPs and their clients face, how MSCA NCPs encourage participation and what their needs are. As a result, recommendations (D 4.1) will be formulated what instruments the Widening countries may introduce to be more successful in FP with special focus on MSCA actions.

4.2. Methodology

4.2.1. Widening countries

The target group of present analysis is the 27 Widening countries. There are two groups for Widening countries: (1) 15 Member States (currently eligible for Widening support): Bulgaria (BG), Croatia (HR), Cyprus (CY), Czech Republic (CZ), Estonia (EE), Hungary (HU), Latvia (LV), Lithuania (LT), Luxembourg (LU), Malta (MT), Poland (PL), Portugal (PT), Romania (RO), Slovakia (SK) and Slovenia (SI); (2) 12 Associated Countries (currently eligible for Widening support, subject to valid association agreements of third countries with Horizon 2020): Albania (AL), Armenia (AM), Bosnia and
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Herzegovina (BA), Faroe Islands (FO), Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (MK), Georgia (GE), Moldova (MD), Montenegro (ME), Serbia (RS), Tunisia (TN), Turkey (TR) and Ukraine (UA).

4.2.2. Joint set of criteria

The present pre-study is based on the following set of criteria which has been elaborated with the Task members of Task 4.1. The sources of data are indicated below. However, in some cases not all data were available, the unavailability or scarcity of data is also indicated.

1. RDI performance and state of play in Widening countries

1.1 National investment in research, national capacities, scientific outputs (reference year: 2015; for the examined tendencies in the period between 2008-2016 (2016 data were available only for EU member states))
- GERD (GERD as a percentage of GDP) – source: Eurostat, Unesco
- Number of researchers (headcount) – source: Eurostat, Unesco
- Number of researchers as a share of the population– source: Eurostat
- Number of new doctorate graduates per 1,000 people (aged 25-34) – source: European Innovation Scoreboard 2017 Database
- International scientific co-publications per million population – source: European Innovation Scoreboard 2017 Database
- Number of patents and patents applications – national, European, CPO – source: WIPO
- Number of ESFRI research infrastructures hosted – source: ESFRI 2018 Roadmap
- Number of ESFRI memberships – source: ESFRI 2018 Roadmap

- Expected and received amount of funding in FP7 and H2020 until May 2018
- Average EU funding per successful project (in FP7 and in H2020)
- Number of participating institutions in FP7 and H2020 until May 2018
- Number of coordinators in FP7 and H2020 until May 2018
- Thematic concentration, participation in specific parts of FP7 and H2020

2. Mobility of researchers, participation in MCA/MSCA from Widening countries
- Expected and received amount of funding in MCA/MSCA in H2020 - source: eCorda 2018 March release – only H2020 as FP7 data was not available, Commission Staff Working Document Interim Evaluation of H2020 Annex 2
- Number of MCA/MSCA hosts in FP7 and H2020 until May 2018 – source: country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC, Commission Staff Working Document Interim Evaluation of H2020 Annex 2
- Number of MCA/MSCA fellows from Widening countries in FP7 and H2020 so far (all schemes) - source: country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC, Commission Staff Working Document Interim Evaluation of H2020 Annex 2
- Nationality of MCA/MSCA fellows hosted in a Widening country (top 10), special focus on percentage of own nationality, percentage of MCA/MSCA fellows from EU-15 countries,
percentage of MCA/MSCA fellows from third countries - source: country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC
- Top 10 destination countries for MCA/MSCA fellows from Widening countries based on data available - source: country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC
- Top 5 collaborative links in H2020 - source: country fact sheets for H2020 prepared by the EC
- Number of researcher posts advertised through EURAXESS Jobs portal per thousand researchers in the public sector – these data are not available (yet), thus they are not included in the report.


- Barriers in Widening countries hindering participation in FP in general (at structural – RDI system/funding/infrastructure – and organisational level) – sources: European Policy Brief: MIRRIS (Mobilizing Institutional Reforms for Research and Innovation Systems); FP7 ex-post evaluation; H2020 interim evaluation report; EPRS - European Parliament report on Overcoming innovation gaps in the EU-13 Member States; Analysis of participation of new EU Member States (“EU-13”) in FP7 in the area of Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities.


4. RDI performance and state of play in Widening countries

4.3. General remarks on the RDI performance of Widening countries

Key findings based on the examined statistical data:
- Gross domestic expenditure on research & development (GERD) of Widening countries is under the EU28 average (only Slovenia is close to EU28 average) and much lower than in case of non-Widening EU countries (see Figure 2 and 3)
- Average GERD of Widening countries only slightly changed between 2008 and 2016 (see Figure 4) so the gap is not closing
- Small Widening countries with higher GERD are more open to international collaboration and co-publication (see Figure 5)
- Higher number of new doctorate graduates per 1000 population aged 25-34 can be a good basis for the necessary human resources in research (see Figure 6)
- Research results in the majority of Widening countries did not lead to patenting, which is one of the indicator of industrial exploitation (see Figure 7)
- High number of researchers in a country results in more H2020 grants (see Figure 1)
- Only Widening countries with higher GERD have memberships in European large strategic research infrastructures. Participation in research projects implemented with the use of those infrastructures can strengthen international collaboration of infrastructure member
countries on a given cutting edge research area, which can create new projects and consortium memberships. Hosting such infrastructure attracts foreign researchers into the host country (see Figure 8)

- FP7 and H2020 participation and funding of Widening countries are much lower than in case of non-Widening EU member states. The gap experienced in FP7 does not seem to close in H2020, either (see Figure 9 and 10, table 1 and 2)

![Figure 1/A. Relation between GERD 2015 and H2020 grants in Widening countries](Source: Eurostat, Unesco, eCorda)
4.3.2. RDI performance of Widening countries – 4 groups

Based on gross domestic expenditure on research & development (GERD) as percentage of GDP, there are large differences among Widening countries. In this short report, based on GERD data ranking, we have identified 4 groups – two groups within EU13+LU+PT (Table 1.) and two other groups in associated countries (Table 2.) – and analysed their performances accordingly. These groups are the following:

**Group 1**: Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Luxemburg, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia

**Group 2**: Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Romania, Slovakia

**Group 3**: Serbia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine

**Group 4**: Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Faroe Islands, Georgia, Moldova, Montenegro, FYR Macedonia.
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GERD data show a slight increase from 2008 until 2013 and since then stagnation or even decrease can be observed in many countries (Table 1). The set of data is fragmented in case of the associated countries but it is visible that they significantly lag behind the EU Member States.

![Average GERD - EU and Widening EU member states](image)

**Figure 4.** (source: Eurostat and Unesco, 2008-2016)

**Group 1**

Hungary, Estonia, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Luxemburg and Portugal have spent each year more than 1% of GDP on R&D since 2009. Poland reached 1% in 2015. Only Slovenia spent more than the EU average (2.57% in 2012). There was a peak between 2012-2014 and since then a slight decrease can be observed.

Poland is the largest country in the group with the highest number of researchers (157,921 in 2015), although it is only 0.42% of the population. In Portugal and in the Czech Republic more than 100,000 researchers work, which represent 1% of their population. Despite of the same number of inhabitants, Hungary has half of the number of researchers than Portugal or the Czech Republic. Due to the smaller population Slovenia, Luxemburg and Estonia have less researchers, however the share of researchers in the population is around 1%. The share of doctorate graduates among the young population is very high in Slovenia, almost double the EU average. Luxemburg spends 1.27% of GDP on research and the share of researchers in its small population (583,000 inhabitants) and the amount of H2020 grants per Luxembourgian participant is the highest in the group. Small countries like Luxemburg, Slovenia and Estonia are very open to international collaboration, showing the highest number of co-publications per million populations.
Group 2
Bulgaria, Slovakia, Lithuania and Croatia are close to 1%, while Latvia, Romania, Cyprus, Malta spent less than 0.7% of GDP on R&D in 2016.

In Romania the number of researchers is high in numbers, however it represents only 0.22% of the population. Romania used very effectively its resources for research (GERD, number of researchers). Compared to GERD and number of researchers, Cyprus performs well in terms of number of successful participants in H2020 and they manage their fewer resources more productively than others. They are active in international scientific collaboration resulting in high co-publication per million populations.
Group 3
Ukraine, Tunisia, Serbia, Turkey are in the 0.6-0.9 % range which reaches the spending of Group 2 member states which couples with high number of researchers as well. Turkey has the biggest number of researchers in Widening countries and this country submits the most patents among all Widening countries. (It is yet far from the EU28 average which is 17243.)
Number of new doctorate graduates in Serbia and Ukraine are relatively high which could provide promising human resources for research activities. Ukraine is very active in patenting.

Figure 7. (Source: WIPO, 2016)

Group 4
Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Armenia, Georgia, Montenegro, Moldova, North Macedonia spent less than 0.5% of the GDP on R&D, they have relatively small number of researchers.
Due to limited resources at home, many talented researchers work in foreign research entities.

3 There is no available data from Faroe Islands.
4.3.3. ESFRI research infrastructures and membership in Widening countries

Most of the widening countries are involved in the work of the largest European infrastructure, the CERN.

Today CERN has 22 member states, including Portugal, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovak Republic, Hungary, Bulgaria and Romania. Cyprus, Serbia and Slovenia are Associate Members States in the pre-stage to membership, and Lithuania, Turkey and Ukraine are Associate Members States. Non-member states with co-operation agreements with CERN include Albania, Armenia, Croatia, Estonia, FYR Macedonia, Georgia, Malta, Montenegro.

Only three widening counties (CZ, HU, RO) host ESFRI infrastructure. The ELI (Extreme Light Infrastructure) is a distributed laser facility which attracts foreign researchers into these countries. Hungary, Czech Republic, Portugal and Poland are the most active widening countries concerning research infrastructure memberships.


Concerning H2020 participation, Portugal is the most successful in the group, 1875 applicants received 500,000,000€ grant (267,000 € per participant and 4840 € per researcher) until 2018 March. Portugal received more grants than the next two countries – Poland (300,000,000€ grant, 221,000 per participant, 1878 € per researcher) and Hungary (200,000,000 grant, 264,000 per participant, 3400 € per researcher) - combined. Portuguese participants are often leading the consortia. Researchers from Estonia and Luxemburg are also very successful, they received more than 11,000 € H2020 grant per researcher. Despite of its small population (2,000,000 inhabitants), Slovenia received almost as much H2020 funding (180,000,000 €) as Hungary and Czech Republic (10,000,000 inhabitants). Regarding Group 2, Romania received more than 110,000,000 € from H2020, but due to the high number of participants (734), the average amount received per participant is relatively small (153,000€ per participant, 2586 € per researcher). Cyprus performs well in terms of number of successful participations (409) and the amount of grant (117,000,000 € grant, 286,000 per
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participant, 40,000 € for each researcher). Concerning Group 3, a large number of researchers (224,000) from Turkey participates in H2020 receiving more than 200,000,000 € and the amount of grant per participant is also high, 226,565 €. Relative good results of Group 3 concerning FP participation can mostly be attributed to Turkey. Countries in Group 4 do not have many successful H2020 project participants. Armenia has the fewest H2020 projects (21) and has received only 760,000 € grant so far (only 200 € for each researcher). These countries very rarely coordinate projects.

![H2020 participation and funding](chart.png)

**Figure 9.** (Source: eCorda 2018)
Compared to the 13 non-widening EU member states, the H2020 performance of even Group 1 of Widening countries is weak. While in non-widening EU countries the number of H2020 winners on average is 5265, in case of Group 1 countries it is only 876 (equals to one sixths!). In non-widening EU countries the amount of funding per participations is 392 thousand euros, while in Group 1 it is 258 thousand €, and the average amount received by countries is 2 billion €, while in Group 1 it amounts to only 221 million € (11%).

### Average H2020 performance (until May 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>average funding²/country (EUR)</th>
<th>average funding (EUR)/participant</th>
<th>average number of participations</th>
<th>average number of coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU non-widening member state (13 countries)</td>
<td>2 099 092 258</td>
<td>392 051</td>
<td>5 265</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening countries (27 countries)</td>
<td>85 942 360</td>
<td>176 017</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Widening countries (7 countries)</td>
<td>221 033 736</td>
<td>258 195</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 Widening countries (8 countries)</td>
<td>66 904 839</td>
<td>183 934</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Widening countries (4 countries)</td>
<td>53 279 618</td>
<td>175 096</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 Widening countries (8 countries)</td>
<td>3 106 295</td>
<td>96 653</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. (Source: eCorda 2018)

² Total H2020 grant received by non widening EU member states divided by the number of non widening EU member states countries (13)
If we compare Widening countries’ average performance during the 7 years in FP7 and in the first 4 and a half years of Horizon 2020, we can see that the average funding per country has decreased both in Widening and non-Widening countries. The average number of participations decreased, however the average funding per participant increased, which means that winners receive more funding in H2020 than in FP7. The average number of coordinators both in FP7 and in H2020 has been much higher in non-Widening countries than in Widening countries. Proportion of coordinators from Widening countries compared to non-Widening EU member states did not change (4%), however a slight increase can be seen in case of Group 1 Widening countries (from 9 % in FP7 to 11 % in H2020)\(^5\).

### Average FP7 performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>average funding/country (EUR)</th>
<th>average funding (EUR)/participant</th>
<th>average number of participations</th>
<th>average number of coordinators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU non-widening member states (13)</td>
<td>2 952 083 397</td>
<td>341 400</td>
<td>8 356</td>
<td>1 674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening countries (27)</td>
<td>105 277 416</td>
<td>142 195</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 Widening countries (7 countries)</td>
<td>269 365 551</td>
<td>170 658</td>
<td>1 374</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 Widening countries (8 countries)</td>
<td>77 619 648</td>
<td>151 065</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3 Widening countries (4 countries)</td>
<td>74 863 657</td>
<td>145 528</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 4 Widening countries (8 countries)</td>
<td>4 564 948</td>
<td>85 182</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. (Source: eCorda 2018)

Striking differences can be observed between Widening countries and non-widening EU countries and even among Widening countries themselves concerning H2020 and FP7 performance.

**4.3.5. Barriers in Widening countries hindering participation in FP in general**

The barriers and bottlenecks hindering the participation of EU 13 Widening countries and non EU Widening Countries in EU Framework programmes have already been the subject of several reports and analyses\(^6\). These analyses identify organisational and structural gaps in these countries which contribute to their weak participation. Apart from these, some specific, FP related obstacles have been identified as well.

**Structural gaps**

Structural barriers identified by several reports are related to the research and innovation systems of the countries. These obstacles are the following:

\(^5\) Regarding the average number of coordinators from non-Widening EU countries as 100% and the average of Widening countries reaches only 4% of this

\(^6\) European Policy Brief: MIRRIS (Mobilizing Institutional Reforms for Research and Innovation Systems); FP7 ex-post evaluation; H2020 interim evaluation report; EPRS - European Parliament report on Overcoming innovation gaps in the EU-13 Member States; Analysis of participation of new EU Member States ("EU-13") in FP7 in the area of Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities (SSH)
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- low RDI spending and innovation performance: according to the study on how to overcome innovation gaps, the EU 13 Member States as a group has lower research and development expenditure and lower innovation performance. At the same time, they have achieved much stronger per capita growth GDP and are catching up economically. There are some EU 13 countries, such as CY, CZ, EE, and SI which perform much better than the rest of EU 13;
- lack or not appropriate level of national funding for research;
- often lack of national strategy and vision and/or lack of participation in FPs as a priority;
- insufficient dedicated (financial or policy) support for participating in FPs;
- lack of appropriate level of private investment in R&D;
- lack of attractiveness of FP funding compared to ESIF funding: Structural Funds are considered as more easily accessible and attractive than Horizon 2020 funds, therefore, no added value is seen in participating in FP7/H2020;
- the wage gap: the level of researcher salaries is very low in general compared to EU 15 countries;
- a lack of leading universities and research organisations.

Organisational obstacles

Apart from structural barriers, there are several obstacles at organisational/institutional level. These are:
- lack of up-to-date, high level infrastructures at institutions, low involvement in infrastructures at European or international level;
- insufficient research facilities;
- lack of institutional support from within the university/research organisation: neither from the professional nor from the administrative side;
- lack of time and personnel competence in professional and bureaucratic issues resulting in lack of capacity for taking up leading roles in projects;
- language barriers – the lack or low level of professional English is still an obstacle in applying for EU funding;
- lack of practice in project management and international projects,
- administrative and teaching work overload for research staff, especially at universities resulting in lack of capacity of drafting proposals;
- a low emphasis on internationalisation: a lack of funds to initiate international meetings, to start and enhance international contacts, collaborations.

FP specific barriers

- perception of high administrative burdens of FP projects and low success rate of project proposals also have hindered these countries from participating in FPs;
- existing networks/consortia under FP constitute barriers to entry. These networks tend to be dominated by research performing organisations from the large countries and it is like a “closed shop” it is very difficult to join them, if at all;
- low visibility of researchers from Widening countries;
- results show that proposals involving mostly EU13 or widening country organisations are less likely to be successful. The gap between the EU13 and EU15 is concentrated in proposals coordinated by EU 13 organisations: there are just a few coordinators among EU13 countries especially what the successful proposals are concerned.
### 4.4 Mobility of researchers, participation in MCA/MSCA from Widening countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>299.208</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>238.59</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Source - Country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC, eCorda 2018 March release

**Legend:**

- **H2020 outpacing the average for FP7**
- **same pace for H2020 as for FP7**
- **H2020 results to date are exceeding the entire FP7 performance**
- **significantly lagging behind FP7 average pace**
Only one third of the Widening countries show positive trends in increasing the number of host organizations. Bulgaria, Lithuania, Romania and Slovakia are outpacing the average number of hosts for FP7 while Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Malta and Serbia have already exceeded the number of host organizations for the whole FP7. The rest of the Widening countries show equal trends or even discouraging decrease in the number of host organizations.

While comparing FP7 and H2020 results to date it is obvious that Widening countries are significantly lagging behind – 60% of the countries are lagging behind FP7 average pace or show much worse performance.

It is indicative that the number of coordinators in ITN and RISE still stays extremely low in H2020.

Evidence shows that the vast majority of MSCA applications rejected due to budgetary reasons were not subsequently implemented as originally planned: 77% of unsuccessful applicants indicated that they did not proceed with the project while 17% went ahead with significant changes to the project such as fewer partners or activities. Only 6% of unsuccessful applicants went ahead with the project as planned. Evidence shows that the vast majority (94%) of MSCA applications rejected due to budgetary reasons were not subsequently implemented as originally planned.

**Horizon 2020 - MSCA budget distribution to Widening countries**

All Widening countries (except for Hungary) are increasing their budget in H2020 while around two thirds of them are increasing their budget by outpacing the average for FP7 or exceeding the total amount for FP7 to date.

However, the share of Widening countries in the MSCA budget has been decreased for the period 2014-2017 in comparison to the data from the Interim Evaluation: EU-13 countries receive 3.9% of the total MSCA funding and all 27 Widening countries receive 6.6%.

Widening countries have applied for € 2.4 billion but have received ca. € 211 million (8.8% successful rate).
### TOP 10 NATIONALITIES OF FELLOWS HOSTED IN FP7/RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>2 AM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>1 AU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>45 BG</td>
<td>22 RS</td>
<td>9 US</td>
<td>5 ES</td>
<td>4 IT</td>
<td>3 IE</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>2 PL</td>
<td>2 RU</td>
<td>1 CL</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>48 EL</td>
<td>21 CY</td>
<td>8 FR</td>
<td>6 IT</td>
<td>5 US</td>
<td>4 BE</td>
<td>4 ES</td>
<td>2 AU</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 IN</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>90 CZ</td>
<td>29 SK</td>
<td>12 IT</td>
<td>12 PL</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>9 IN</td>
<td>8 RU</td>
<td>7 FR</td>
<td>6 IL</td>
<td>5 CN</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>30 EE</td>
<td>16 DE</td>
<td>8 FI</td>
<td>8 SE</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>6 IN</td>
<td>5 ES</td>
<td>5 NL</td>
<td>5 UA</td>
<td>4 CN</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>17 HR</td>
<td>6 SI</td>
<td>2 BA</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 RS</td>
<td>2 RU</td>
<td>1 AU</td>
<td>1 CN</td>
<td>1 CZ</td>
<td>1 EL</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>140 HU</td>
<td>15 CN</td>
<td>15 TH</td>
<td>13 DE</td>
<td>13 IN</td>
<td>12 RO</td>
<td>9 NL</td>
<td>8 FR</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>6 DK</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>4 IN</td>
<td>3 LT</td>
<td>2 BY</td>
<td>1 IL</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>1 UA</td>
<td>1 US</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>34 FR</td>
<td>19 IT</td>
<td>18 DE</td>
<td>15 LU</td>
<td>14 BE</td>
<td>10 FI</td>
<td>8 CN</td>
<td>5 IN</td>
<td>5 RO</td>
<td>4 EL</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>4 LV</td>
<td>1 CA</td>
<td>1 DE</td>
<td>1 ID</td>
<td>1 IN</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>2 MD</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>1 US</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>1 CA</td>
<td>1 EG</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>219 PL</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>21 ES</td>
<td>20 IN</td>
<td>16 IT</td>
<td>13 RU</td>
<td>8 PT</td>
<td>7 FR</td>
<td>7 IR</td>
<td>7 UK</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>158 PT</td>
<td>59 IT</td>
<td>50 ES</td>
<td>36 DE</td>
<td>20 FR</td>
<td>17 UK</td>
<td>13 TR</td>
<td>12 CY</td>
<td>10 IN</td>
<td>7 BR</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>72 RO</td>
<td>8 BE</td>
<td>5 CN</td>
<td>5 MD</td>
<td>5 PL</td>
<td>3 BR</td>
<td>3 IN</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 AR</td>
<td>1 CI</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>8 RS</td>
<td>2 BA</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>1 DE</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 IN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>10 IT</td>
<td>8 SI</td>
<td>6 IN</td>
<td>5 HR</td>
<td>4 AT</td>
<td>4 JP</td>
<td>3 RS</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 IR</td>
<td>2 PL</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>58 SK</td>
<td>12 CZ</td>
<td>12 KZ</td>
<td>10 EL</td>
<td>10 RS</td>
<td>7 SI</td>
<td>4 UA</td>
<td>3 UK</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 IN</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 TN</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>236 TR</td>
<td>16 GE</td>
<td>6 DE</td>
<td>6 US</td>
<td>4 IT</td>
<td>4 UK</td>
<td>3 CA</td>
<td>3 FR</td>
<td>3 IR</td>
<td>2 BE</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>10 UA</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 UK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Source: Country fact sheets for FP7 prepared by the EC (31 October 2016)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>2 AT</td>
<td>2 TR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>11 BG</td>
<td>5 EL</td>
<td>3 MK</td>
<td>3 UA</td>
<td>3 GE</td>
<td>2 HR</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 AT</td>
<td>1 AR</td>
<td>1 AM</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>2 RS</td>
<td>1 BA</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>19 EL</td>
<td>6 BY</td>
<td>6 ES</td>
<td>5 IT</td>
<td>4 BG</td>
<td>4 MA</td>
<td>4 TR</td>
<td>2 GE</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>38 EL</td>
<td>19 CY</td>
<td>13 IT</td>
<td>6 UK</td>
<td>3 PT</td>
<td>2 BE</td>
<td>2 ES</td>
<td>2 IN</td>
<td>2 IE</td>
<td>2 BG</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>13 IT</td>
<td>12 CZ</td>
<td>10 SK</td>
<td>9 DE</td>
<td>6 IN</td>
<td>5 BE</td>
<td>5 PT</td>
<td>4 BY</td>
<td>4 ES</td>
<td>4 FR</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>7 EE</td>
<td>6 KH</td>
<td>5 LV</td>
<td>4 VN</td>
<td>3 LA</td>
<td>3 RU</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>2 FI</td>
<td>2 TR</td>
<td>1 CN</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>7 AZ</td>
<td>1 BY</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>6 VE</td>
<td>5 BY</td>
<td>3 BA</td>
<td>3 RS</td>
<td>3 RO</td>
<td>2 BE</td>
<td>2 CO</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>2 SK</td>
<td>2 UK</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>12 HU</td>
<td>8 ES</td>
<td>8 IT</td>
<td>8 SK</td>
<td>4 RS</td>
<td>4 UK</td>
<td>3 FR</td>
<td>3 IN</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>2 IE</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>10 BY</td>
<td>7 LT</td>
<td>5 EL</td>
<td>3 MD</td>
<td>3 UA</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>2 PT</td>
<td>1 AT</td>
<td>1 CY</td>
<td>1 CN</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>6 UK</td>
<td>5 DE</td>
<td>4 BE</td>
<td>4 ES</td>
<td>3 CN</td>
<td>3 IT</td>
<td>2 AR</td>
<td>2 NL</td>
<td>1 AU</td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>4 LV</td>
<td>3 BY</td>
<td>1 EL</td>
<td>1 LT</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1 US</td>
<td>1 UA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>7 UA</td>
<td>2 MD</td>
<td>1 BY</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 RO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>7 ZA</td>
<td>5 TR</td>
<td>2 ET</td>
<td>1 IN</td>
<td>1 UK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>31 UA</td>
<td>24 PL</td>
<td>20 IN</td>
<td>18 IT</td>
<td>18 BY</td>
<td>16 SI</td>
<td>11 DE</td>
<td>10 ES</td>
<td>9 CZ</td>
<td>9 SK</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>68 ES</td>
<td>34 IT</td>
<td>33 PT</td>
<td>33 PT</td>
<td>21 EL</td>
<td>19 FR</td>
<td>18 UA</td>
<td>15 IN</td>
<td>13 LT</td>
<td>13 DE</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>12 EG</td>
<td>8 TN</td>
<td>7 CO</td>
<td>6 RO</td>
<td>5 HR</td>
<td>5 MA</td>
<td>4 PT</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>3 IS</td>
<td>3 UA</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>6 ES</td>
<td>5 IT</td>
<td>2 AU</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>2 RU</td>
<td>1 BA</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 HR</td>
<td>1 IR</td>
<td>1 IN</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>14 PL</td>
<td>9 UK</td>
<td>7 ES</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>6 EL</td>
<td>5 SI</td>
<td>4 CN</td>
<td>4 KR</td>
<td>3 BA</td>
<td>3 DE</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>24 CZ</td>
<td>14 PL</td>
<td>11 Hu</td>
<td>8 PT</td>
<td>7 SK</td>
<td>6 US</td>
<td>4 IE</td>
<td>4 TH</td>
<td>3 AT</td>
<td>3 RS</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>2 RO</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>1 ES</td>
<td>1 ET</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>38 TR</td>
<td>8 IT</td>
<td>6 EL</td>
<td>4 BG</td>
<td>4 EG</td>
<td>4 UK</td>
<td>3 CN</td>
<td>2 AM</td>
<td>2 IN</td>
<td>2 SI</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>18 PL</td>
<td>17 UA</td>
<td>16 FR</td>
<td>8 UK</td>
<td>5 IT</td>
<td>5 PT</td>
<td>5 RO</td>
<td>4 BY</td>
<td>4 MA</td>
<td>4 MD</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Source: Country fact sheets for H2020 prepared by the EC (13 June 2018)

Total: 1322
Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

N4M+ (H2020 GA No. 785632)
MSCA NCP Network: www.net4mobilityplus.eu

Figure 10a. Source: Country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC (31 October 2016 and 13 June 2018)

Figure 10b. Source: Country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC (31 October 2016 and 13 June 2018)

7 Percentage of fellows hosted
For example - Poland in H2020 – 14.50 % of all fellows hosted in Poland are with Polish nationality, 23.40 % of fellows hosted are from EU-15 and 22.80 % of fellows hosted are from Third Countries. The rest 39.3 % of fellows hosted in Poland are from the widening countries.
The results show that Widening countries have significantly decreased the percentage of fellows from their own nationality in H2020 (two thirds of countries) but have increased the percentage of fellows from both categories – fellows from EU-15 and fellows from third countries.

Figure 10c. Source: Country fact sheets for FP7 and H2020 prepared by the EC (31 October 2016 and 13 June 2018)
# Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

**Net4Mobility**

**MSCA NCP Network:** [www.net4mobilityplus.eu](http://www.net4mobilityplus.eu)

## TOP 10 DESTINATION COUNTRIES IN FP7/ RANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>6 DE</td>
<td>5 UK</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
<td>2 EL</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>2 NL</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>1 ES</td>
<td>1 FI</td>
<td>1 IE</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>6 UK</td>
<td>5 FR</td>
<td>4 BE</td>
<td>4 DE</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>2 AM</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 IE</td>
<td>1 PL</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>6 UK</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 HR</td>
<td>2 RS</td>
<td>1 AT</td>
<td>1 CH</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>1 SI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BG</td>
<td>45 BG</td>
<td>40 UK</td>
<td>31 DE</td>
<td>23 FR</td>
<td>18 NL</td>
<td>13 ES</td>
<td>13 IT</td>
<td>12 BE</td>
<td>10 CH</td>
<td>6 DK</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>42 EL</td>
<td>21 CY</td>
<td>19 UK</td>
<td>12 PT</td>
<td>8 DE</td>
<td>8 ES</td>
<td>7 CH</td>
<td>7 NL</td>
<td>6 IT</td>
<td>5 FR</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>90 CZ</td>
<td>57 UK</td>
<td>29 DE</td>
<td>19 IT</td>
<td>13 FR</td>
<td>12 AT</td>
<td>12 SK</td>
<td>11 ES</td>
<td>10 NL</td>
<td>8 CH</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>30 EE</td>
<td>15 FI</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>10 UK</td>
<td>7 NL</td>
<td>5 AT</td>
<td>5 SE</td>
<td>3 BE</td>
<td>3 DK</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>GE</td>
<td>16 TR</td>
<td>3 IT</td>
<td>2 NL</td>
<td>1 BE</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 IE</td>
<td>1 IL</td>
<td>1 NO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>32 DE</td>
<td>25 UK</td>
<td>17 HR</td>
<td>16 ES</td>
<td>13 CH</td>
<td>12 IT</td>
<td>11 AT</td>
<td>10 IE</td>
<td>9 NL</td>
<td>8 BE</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>140 HU</td>
<td>76 UK</td>
<td>64 IT</td>
<td>56 DE</td>
<td>25 FR</td>
<td>24 CH</td>
<td>21 DK</td>
<td>20 NL</td>
<td>12 ES</td>
<td>11 Fi</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>18 UK</td>
<td>11 DE</td>
<td>8 ES</td>
<td>7 EL</td>
<td>6 FR</td>
<td>4 PL</td>
<td>3 IE</td>
<td>3 LT</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>15 LU</td>
<td>4 DE</td>
<td>4 US</td>
<td>3 BE</td>
<td>3 CA</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>9 UK</td>
<td>8 DE</td>
<td>4 LV</td>
<td>3 SE</td>
<td>2 FI</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>1 EE</td>
<td>1 ES</td>
<td>1 HR</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>8 FR</td>
<td>5 DE</td>
<td>5 RO</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>2 BE</td>
<td>2 ES</td>
<td>2 MD</td>
<td>2 PL</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>3 IT</td>
<td>1 DE</td>
<td>1 EL</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>4 ES</td>
<td>3 DE</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>1 AT</td>
<td>1 EL</td>
<td>1 IE</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 SE</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>3 DE</td>
<td>3 UK</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 ES</td>
<td>2 IE</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>1 MT</td>
<td>1 SE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>243 UK</td>
<td>219 PL</td>
<td>132 DE</td>
<td>83 IT</td>
<td>78 BE</td>
<td>77 NL</td>
<td>70 FR</td>
<td>52 ES</td>
<td>43 CH</td>
<td>37 IE</td>
<td>1034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>158 PT</td>
<td>140 UK</td>
<td>122 IT</td>
<td>76 ES</td>
<td>71 DE</td>
<td>52 NL</td>
<td>34 FR</td>
<td>29 CH</td>
<td>22 EL</td>
<td>21 DK</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>72 RO</td>
<td>57 UK</td>
<td>54 DE</td>
<td>32 ES</td>
<td>29 FR</td>
<td>23 NL</td>
<td>22 IT</td>
<td>21 CH</td>
<td>14 AT</td>
<td>14 BE</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>32 DE</td>
<td>27 UK</td>
<td>22 BG</td>
<td>16 ES</td>
<td>15 NL</td>
<td>10 EL</td>
<td>10 IT</td>
<td>10 SK</td>
<td>8 AT</td>
<td>8 FR</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>27 UK</td>
<td>16 DE</td>
<td>15 IT</td>
<td>8 SI</td>
<td>7 IL</td>
<td>7 SK</td>
<td>6 HR</td>
<td>6 NL</td>
<td>5 AT</td>
<td>5 DK</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>58 SK</td>
<td>29 CZ</td>
<td>27 UK</td>
<td>15 DE</td>
<td>9 AT</td>
<td>9 ES</td>
<td>6 FR</td>
<td>4 CH</td>
<td>4 IT</td>
<td>4 NL</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>15 FR</td>
<td>10 UK</td>
<td>5 DE</td>
<td>4 BE</td>
<td>4 IT</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 LU</td>
<td>2 PL</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>236 TR</td>
<td>79 UK</td>
<td>43 DE</td>
<td>29 NL</td>
<td>24 ES</td>
<td>22 FR</td>
<td>21 CH</td>
<td>21 EL</td>
<td>19 BE</td>
<td>16 IE</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>62 BE</td>
<td>47 UK</td>
<td>40 DE</td>
<td>25 NL</td>
<td>23 FR</td>
<td>20 IT</td>
<td>17 ES</td>
<td>10 UA</td>
<td>7 EL</td>
<td>6 CH</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Source: Country fact sheets for FP7 prepared by the EC (31 October 2016)

Total: 4942
## Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

### MSCA NCP Network:
www.net4mobilityplus.eu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOP 10 DESTINATION COUNTRIES IN H2020/ RANKING</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
<th>6th</th>
<th>7th</th>
<th>8th</th>
<th>9th</th>
<th>10th</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>5 UK</td>
<td>4 ES</td>
<td>3 AT</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>2 US</td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>1 DE</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>1 PT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>7 EL</td>
<td>6 DE</td>
<td>6 ES</td>
<td>5 IS</td>
<td>4 AT</td>
<td>4 IT</td>
<td>2 CH</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>2 PT</td>
<td>2 TR</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>4 AT</td>
<td>3 DE</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>3 HR</td>
<td>3 SI</td>
<td>2 BE</td>
<td>1 BA</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>1 EL</td>
<td>1 IT</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>17 IT</td>
<td>16 EL</td>
<td>12 FR</td>
<td>12 UK</td>
<td>11 AM</td>
<td>10 JP</td>
<td>8 AZ</td>
<td>8 DE</td>
<td>7 BR</td>
<td>7 RU</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>27 EL</td>
<td>19 UK</td>
<td>18 CY</td>
<td>16 IT</td>
<td>8 US</td>
<td>7 ES</td>
<td>3 CH</td>
<td>3 DE</td>
<td>2 AT</td>
<td>2 CA</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>24 SK</td>
<td>16 US</td>
<td>13 UK</td>
<td>12 CZ</td>
<td>11 DE</td>
<td>9 PL</td>
<td>7 CH</td>
<td>6 AT</td>
<td>6 JP</td>
<td>6 KE</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>8 UK</td>
<td>7 EE</td>
<td>6 US</td>
<td>5 DE</td>
<td>4 VN</td>
<td>3 FR</td>
<td>3 FI</td>
<td>3 KH</td>
<td>3 NL</td>
<td>3 SE</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>1 DK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>4 AZ</td>
<td>4 BY</td>
<td>3 AM</td>
<td>3 CN</td>
<td>3 IT</td>
<td>3 RU</td>
<td>2 BG</td>
<td>2 FR</td>
<td>2 IE</td>
<td>1 CA</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>11 DE</td>
<td>11 AT</td>
<td>8 IT</td>
<td>8 UK</td>
<td>8 FR</td>
<td>6 NL</td>
<td>6 ES</td>
<td>5 BE</td>
<td>5 IE</td>
<td>5 RO</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU</td>
<td>21 UK</td>
<td>18 ES</td>
<td>17 DE</td>
<td>12 HU</td>
<td>11 SK</td>
<td>9 FR</td>
<td>8 IE</td>
<td>8 AT</td>
<td>8 US</td>
<td>7 NL</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>16 BY</td>
<td>13 PT</td>
<td>8 UK</td>
<td>7 LT</td>
<td>7 DE</td>
<td>5 EG</td>
<td>5 BE</td>
<td>4 EL</td>
<td>4 FL</td>
<td>3 MA</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>1 CH</td>
<td>1 ES</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 JP</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>1 US</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>7 BY</td>
<td>6 PT</td>
<td>5 EE</td>
<td>4 CZ</td>
<td>4 LV</td>
<td>3 DK</td>
<td>3 FR</td>
<td>3 UK</td>
<td>3 UA</td>
<td>2 NL</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>4 BY</td>
<td>4 UA</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>3 LT</td>
<td>3 FR</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 MD</td>
<td>2 RO</td>
<td>1 AM</td>
<td>1 CZ</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 NL</td>
<td>1 SK</td>
<td>1 UK</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MK</td>
<td>3 AM</td>
<td>3 ES</td>
<td>3 RU</td>
<td>2 SE</td>
<td>1 AT</td>
<td>1 CZ</td>
<td>1 CH</td>
<td>1 DE</td>
<td>1 FR</td>
<td>1 UK</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>3 UK</td>
<td>2 DE</td>
<td>2 IT</td>
<td>1 ES</td>
<td>1 IE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>108 ES</td>
<td>86 UK</td>
<td>57 IT</td>
<td>53 DE</td>
<td>40 FR</td>
<td>33 PT</td>
<td>31 NL</td>
<td>29 US</td>
<td>21 CV</td>
<td>15 BE</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>41 UK</td>
<td>30 US</td>
<td>15 FR</td>
<td>13 DE</td>
<td>11 ES</td>
<td>11 SE</td>
<td>7 CN</td>
<td>7 DK</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>7 NL</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RS</td>
<td>23 ES</td>
<td>20 UK</td>
<td>15 FR</td>
<td>13 NL</td>
<td>9 DE</td>
<td>9 IT</td>
<td>7 AU</td>
<td>6 ZA</td>
<td>5 CL</td>
<td>5 EL</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>16 PL</td>
<td>15 UK</td>
<td>14 US</td>
<td>11 AT</td>
<td>10 IT</td>
<td>9 JP</td>
<td>7 EL</td>
<td>6 ES</td>
<td>5 FR</td>
<td>5 SI</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SK</td>
<td>16 AT</td>
<td>11 US</td>
<td>10 CZ</td>
<td>9 IT</td>
<td>9 PL</td>
<td>8 HU</td>
<td>7 ES</td>
<td>7 SK</td>
<td>5 NL</td>
<td>4 CH</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>10 DE</td>
<td>7 IT</td>
<td>8 RO</td>
<td>6 EL</td>
<td>5 ES</td>
<td>5 FR</td>
<td>4 LB</td>
<td>4 UK</td>
<td>3 BE</td>
<td>2 AU</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>51 UK</td>
<td>38 TR</td>
<td>26 NL</td>
<td>25 DE</td>
<td>20 FR</td>
<td>19 US</td>
<td>18 EL</td>
<td>11 IT</td>
<td>10 AT</td>
<td>10 ES</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>47 FR</td>
<td>40 UK</td>
<td>33 DE</td>
<td>32 IT</td>
<td>31 PL</td>
<td>18 PT</td>
<td>17 UA</td>
<td>13 BY</td>
<td>12 AT</td>
<td>9 ES</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Source: Country fact sheets for H2020 prepared by the EC (13 June 2018)

Total: 2629
Tables 6. and 7. present detailed information on Top 10 destination countries. The most attractive EU destination is the UK, followed at a distance by Germany, Spain, Italy, France and the Netherlands.

The overall pattern in both programmes is that very few fellows do their fellowship in a Widening country. All 27 Widening countries scored 15.6% as destination countries for long-term mobility (compared to FP7 where they scored 25.7%).
Table 8. Source: Country fact sheets for H2020 prepared by the EC (13 June 2018)

Table 8 and Figure 13 show that Top 5 partners in H2020 are from Germany, the United Kingdom, Spain, Italy and France. Around half of all collaborative links of Widening countries are with partners from Germany and the UK where both countries are almost equally preferred. The next three countries - Spain, Italy and France, are very close to one another but still only half way to the number of links with Germany and the UK. Widening countries are collaborating between each other at a very low level (only 1.5%).
4.4.1 Typical academic and personal motives for undergoing mobility or applying for MCA/MSCA fellowship

Motives for doctoral fellows: Motives for both, moving to a new country to take on a PhD fellowship (PhD degree mobility), as well as in terms of periods of mobility during their doctoral training (during PhD mobility) are mostly related to improving conditions for research, rather than to improving “material” conditions, in line with findings on career paths and working conditions.

Among the most important academic motives (or job related reasons) are the following (given in priority ranking), while first four are of almost equal importance:
- Better research facilities
- Better recognition of their research field or profession
- Cooperation with leading scientists
- Quality of training and education, combined learning offer of supervisor, particular research field, and courses offered
- Open, merit-based and transparent recruitment
- Ranking and reputation of the host institution

Least important motives in both types of PhD mobility are ameliorating one’s pension plan, social security and other benefits, facilities and services for international students (e.g. assistance with finding accommodation, processes of visa and residence permits, child care), as well was personal or family reasons and improved remuneration and job security.

Personal and non-science motives include (priority ranking):
- International networking - building up personal and professional networks
- Career progression, incl. preparing for employments abroad/ enhancing future employment prospects abroad
- Wanting to live and work in another culture and meet new people and to gain knowledge of another country or city
- Good financial conditions
- Developing soft/transferable skills (such as adaptability). Only around 1/3 of PhD candidates in the EU receive transferable skills training focused on skills related to core research activities such as research skills, communication and presentation skills, decision making and problem solving, and critical and autonomous thinking, time management, people and project management. Skills such as engagement with society and entrepreneurship are less frequently part of transferable skills training and are seen as less important for carrier progression (MORE3)
- Importance of ranking and reputation of host institution
- Partner’s/family member’s career plans

The ranking of motives is also similar for both types of PhD mobility: only availability of suitable positions is more important for PhD degree mobility, while research autonomy and access to research facilities and equipment are more important reasons for during PhD mobility.

Motives for post-PhD mobility: Independent of the type of international mobility the general motives are the same: international networking, career progression and working with leading scientists. These motives are found in the EU HE survey MORE3. An overview:

Mobility within the EU: international networking (83%), career progression (80%; main motive for 23% of individual moves) and working with leading scientists (79%; main motive for 20% of individual moves). More than in 2012, research autonomy is also mentioned as a very important factor (76% of the researchers; main motive for 17% of individual moves) in the 2016 survey.

8 “remuneration and other material factors” includes remuneration, social security and other benefits, quality of life, job security, and pension plan
Both the important and less important motives point at the conclusion that international mobility is driven by scientific knowledge production factors, rather than by “material” factors such as remuneration or social security.

**Motives for outgoing mobility:** For EU researchers that move from the EU to a non-EU country, the Global survey finds that the availability of a suitable position (86%) and career progression (84%) are the main motives. While academic researchers are willing to trade off salary against superior conditions for research, in case all other things being equal, salaries also matter. The OECD/UNESCO study on Careers of Doctorate Holders (CDH 2009) shows that the US is not only the country attracting major flows of researchers due to the quality of its PhD programmes and working conditions for researchers - it is also the country in which the highest median gross annual earnings are found.

All three MORE studies consistently reported that working conditions are typically seen as being better outside the EU, and most notably in the US, especially concerning remuneration, which indicates that these motivations are more strongly related to EU-US mobility than in the case of intra-EU mobility. These motives, however, are not always ranked equally for all destination countries. Moving to the US to do a PhD is generally related to the prestige of its programs and the prospects for career progression, but the negative perceptions of its lifestyle discourage many to move to the US since quality of life is perceived as being better in Europe than abroad.

The importance of mobility motives is influenced by the gains that the different types of mobility can offer. Therefore motives can be further discussed in view of the following 4 types of mobility:

**Geographical mobility (physically movement between countries):** Geographical mobility may result in building up a great network, which is seen as a very beneficial aspect of doctoral education when compared to other doctoral students within the host university.

**Intersectoral mobility (between universities and industry, policy making, and non-governmental organisations):** By far the largest type of intersectoral collaboration is with industry. Many also collaborate with government institutions. PhD fellows doing research in industry were collaborating with a university. Many fellows stated that they experienced no negative aspects but benefitted from the collaborations by acquiring work experience outside academia, getting to know specific scientific and technical qualifications and skills and gaining from new perspectives and broader views of their research field. The work experience outside academia is mostly valued because of gaining:

- Scientific and technical qualifications/skills
- New perspective, broader view of research field
- Research in practice
- New data
- Increased networking
- Experience of working in a different culture (country, language, work culture)
- Insight into different working environments
- Joint publications
- Career development

Networking is still the most important motive for working outside academia, regardless of the destination sector (70% of the cases). Other motives depend more on the destination sector e.g. contribution to society is more common as a motive to move to government and not-for-profit sectors, whereas gaining first-hand experience of industry, remuneration and bringing research to the market are more common in moves to the private industry.

Motives for moving to private industry also depend more on the family situation: researchers with a family seek more security in terms of pension plan, quality of life, positions etc.

**Interdisciplinary mobility (where doctoral candidates work with researchers from another discipline):** Fellows appreciate the different insights into another discipline, which this type of collaboration gives them achieving a greater understanding of a topic, being fed with new inputs from their interdisciplinary
collaborations and how theories are applied or used in a different context. Fellows value the opportunity for access to new knowledge, technologies and expertise from other disciplines that is related to:

- Understanding different approaches
- New data
- Larger scientific network
- Improved communication skills between disciplines
- Interdisciplinary and joint publications
- Experience of working with people speaking different technical languages
- Inspiration, new ideas and motivation
- Working in multilingual and international environment

Social mobility (across social class or between lower and higher ranked universities) - insight into doctoral fellows’ educational level compared to their social background – whether they moved across social classes and whether doctoral fellows’ parents have also been geographically mobile.

The MORE3 data thus showed a great deal of social mobility taking place among MSC fellows. This means that more than 90% of doctoral fellows were improving their social status in terms of educational background compared to the educational levels of their parents. Where doctoral education used to signal a career within academia, far more companies in the private sector now recruit employees with doctoral degrees. There is therefore also higher competition for employees to have a doctoral degree, especially within industry.

Mobility may be also seen in a different aspect - as a ‘natural’ step in a research career, though not required. This is referred to as ‘expected mobility’ and is situated in-between the two concepts of escape and exchange mobility. Moreover, this information can point to important differences between disciplines, related to the discussion on effects of mobility per discipline.

Exchange mobility refers to the situation where a researcher chooses to move (positive motivation, self-chosen) with the aim of exchanging knowledge and work in an international network, or with the aim to use international mobility as a way to boost one’s career. The latter is expected to have more positive effects in terms of expanding a researcher’s network and improving career progression opportunities. The latter also closely relates to the concept of Open Science, where global cooperation becomes increasingly important.

Escape mobility is the case where a researcher is ‘pushed’ away from his or her environment because of lack of funding, positions, etc. – if they want to pursue a career as a researcher, they have to change countries. The hypothesis is that this kind of forced mobility may show a different pattern of effects. Compared to the other types of mobility, the negative effects of escape mobility might be more pronounced, such as the loss of network at home or a deterioration of working conditions. The option of mobility in order to escape from ineffective national research systems should be regarded as a temporary solution, with the first best solution addressing the effectiveness of the research system.

Attractiveness: Along with attractiveness driven by common factors related to overall conditions for research, or scientific knowledge production, that makes researchers choose a location for their research there are important differences depending on the origin and destination of researchers. This is likely to be interrelated with the different working conditions across the countries. Weak working conditions lead to opting out of a research career or to “escape”/“forced” international mobility. Attractive working conditions and career paths can also compensate for dissatisfaction with salary. Since there is no dedicated EU survey on researchers in Widening countries, important country differences are discussed in the current report only based on relevant information and conclusions provided with the Survey on researchers in both EU HEI (Higher Education Institution) and outside the EU institutions (MORE 3). Remuneration and financial security mask large country variation along lines of economic development and performance. On the average in the EU, 2 out of 3 researchers perceive salaries to be reasonable. However 25% of researchers in Eastern European countries and Greece consider being reasonably paid.
On average, 42% of researchers in the EU28 are satisfied with the availability of research funding and 76% with the access to research facilities (financial support for researchers). Possibly linked to overall economic conditions, Western and Northern European researchers (49 and 45% for research funding; 84 and 85% for access to research facilities), less satisfied are their colleagues in Southern and Eastern Europe (21 and 41% for research funding; 53 and 66% for access to research facilities). Levels of satisfaction with research funding are much lower than for other working conditions.

By comparison with outside academia, on average close to 60% of researchers in the EU academic institutions feel less well paid than their counterparts outside academia, with later stage researchers more likely to report this than early stage researchers. Close to 10% feel better paid on average, with some exceptions such as Romania (above 40%) reporting higher shares of researchers being better paid than their non-academic counterparts.

The assessment of researchers on the attractiveness of the institution where s/he has obtained their PhD in terms of working conditions shows big disparities. Institutions from Anglo-Saxon and Nordic Systems, where researchers (e.g. Sweden: 75%) perceive their studies as more attractive than Continental or Southern European ones (e.g. Cyprus: 32%). The Anglo-Saxon and Nordic system seem also to be more transparent and accountable than the Southern and Continental system. The lowest shares can be found in Portugal (26%), Romania (28%), and Hungary (29%).

Career perspectives are cross-cutting working conditions, as they influence both financial conditions and scientific knowledge production. Career perspectives are particularly important to early stage researchers, for whom a performance-based model (“tenure-track” versus a seniority-based model) can make a substantial difference to their careers. To this end, cooperating with industry or commercialising own research results can be added as influencing attractiveness.

Attractiveness is hence a result of the structure of career paths and the quality of working conditions and is influenced by improvements in satisfaction with open, merit-based and transparent recruitment. Most researchers (EU28: 80%) are of the opinion that recruitment in their home institutions is sufficiently externally and publicly advertised, but there are country differences regarding the assessment of researchers whether recruitment at their home institution is generally merit-based (EU: 77%) and transparent (EU28: 74%). In particular researchers in some Southern (e.g. Italy 60%, Portugal 61%) and Eastern European countries (e.g. Hungary 55%) think that merit-based recruitment is less standard than on average in the EU28.

International, intersectoral or interdisciplinary mobility may also vary due to different perceptions of researchers across countries. International mobility is highly valued by most researchers across countries. 93% of researchers in Latvia, Estonia and Luxemburg would agree that international mobility experiences positively affect recruitment. On the lower bound 76% of researchers in Bulgaria and 82% of researchers in Portugal and Lithuania still perceive international mobility as being positive factor for recruitment. An intersectoral mobility experience is seen as positive only by 58% participants in the MORE3 study. It is perceived as a very positive factor for recruitment especially by researchers in Latvia (83%) and the Czech Republic (72%). Interdisciplinary mobility is perceived to be positively affecting recruitment in Latvia (83%), Romania (83%) and Iceland (82%), whereas only about 64% of researchers in Bulgaria would agree (EU28 average: 74%).

4.4.2 Barriers in Widening countries hindering participation in MCA/MSCA in particular – structural, organizational, personal level

Drivers are those crucial overall attractive conditions for research, or scientific knowledge production, which make researchers choose a location for their research because it will foster their career and advance their research agenda. Among these are attractive career paths (a tenure track model) and career perspectives and working with leading scientists. Important enabling framework conditions – or barriers to coming to the EU - are immigration options (rules relating to non-EU nationals working in the EU), the general availability of jobs in the ERA as well as getting funding for research.
In interviews researchers outline the following **overall barriers to international mobility** (both, the outgoing and incoming mobility):

- Obstacles to the employment of foreign researchers - visa and residence permit arrangements, issues concerning time-consuming processes, complicated procedures and paperwork, fees
- Recognition of foreign qualifications
- To overcome these obstacles there is a need to smooth immigration and work permit procedures for incoming researchers and to make work permits, grants, social benefits and (supplementary) pension rights portable across borders for researchers and their families, including for researchers from third countries, i.e., from outside Europe. Further, to facilitate procedures for returning home, and ensure fair recognition of experience abroad (closed recruitment)
- Working conditions
- Obligations of researchers in their institutions (Lecturing)
- Break in workflow’ as a result of periods with mobility
- Language barrier and the need to learn a new language when moving from their home country. Sometimes fellows have to learn a new language even twice in the course of their PhD because a lot of the documents and also the PhD programme are not exactly set in English. It’s often the case with Central, Eastern European countries and AC countries
- Short-term contracts, part-time employment
- Job insecurity - lack of opportunities for permanent employment in the host country; lack of opportunities for permanent employment in the home country/ previous country
- Significant differences between usual salaries at institutions and salaries funded from European projects (MSCA). It often turns into barrier for participating in MSCA projects and to hosting MSCA fellows who would receive a salary times bigger than the usual one of the supervisor
- Issues related to tax, pensions, and social security and respectively the lack or insufficient guidance to tax and pension rules
- Too much planning and travelling, accommodation issues
- Psychological aspects of moving to a new country: Distance from close family and friends was mentioned by fellows as one the greatest personal challenges when moving to another country. It takes (long) time to settle in the new environment and to establish a new social network.
- Arrangements for accompanying family members – schools, banks, healthcare, unemployment/ social insurance, registration with police and local authorities, burdensome surveillance, work for partner and lack of opportunities for her/his permanent employment in the host country. Many fellows also mentioned that they have met their partner or built other social ties as a result of their geographical mobility and therefore now have personal restrictions on moving back to their home country or the country they were living in prior to the fellowship.
- No cooperation between the host and the EURAXESS service centres.

**Barriers to PhD mobility:**

The main barriers for PhD mobility indicated by the non-mobile researchers are personal or family related (58%), the ability to obtain funding for mobility (44%) or for research (43%) and finding a suitable position (42%). Move-related practical matters such as culture, obtaining a visa or language are not considered that important. This pattern is stable compared to 2012. Not surprisingly, the further one explored mobility (but finally not engaging in it), the more practical barriers are mentioned (e.g. funding and language of teaching and PhD programme). R1\(^9\) show the same, but more pronounced pattern than the average in total. The general pattern is also more pronounced for female researchers. Family status again determines the barriers, with researchers in a couple paying more attention to logistics, remuneration and personal/family reasons. Funding and network are more important to single researchers and to researchers without children.

---

\(^9\)R1: First Stage Researcher (up to the point of PhD),
R2: Recognised Researcher (PhD holders or equivalent who are not yet fully independent),
R3: Established Researcher (researchers who have developed a level of independence),
R4: Leading Researcher (researchers leading their research area or field).

**N4M+ (H2020 GA No. 785632)**
MSCA NCP Network: [www.net4mobilityplus.eu](http://www.net4mobilityplus.eu)
Barriers during long term mobility in post-PhD career stages:
Long-term mobility is less common in southern and Eastern European countries. Family situation is found to have an important effect on mobility: having a partner and having children reduce the likelihood of being mobile.

As per MORE3 Study, the most important barriers for mobility for EU and non-EU researchers are finding a suitable position (38%), obtaining funding for research (38%) and obtaining funding for mobility (36%); the only exceptions being personal and family reasons, and logistical problems. 1/3 of non-EU researchers indicates that obtaining a visa was a significant barrier. Language is also still an important barrier, when considering it for teaching (27%) and for contact or for collaboration with colleagues (23%). Interestingly, this factor is a more relevant barrier for male researchers, and also for R2 researchers compared to R4, and to a lesser extent to R3 researchers. In this sense, the most relevant barriers for the R2 group are those related to funding and employability: finding suitable positions, getting access to funding for return mobility or, as abovementioned, funding for research.

More experienced researchers (R4) tend to give a greater importance to barriers related to maintaining the status quo of their position. They are concerned about access to research facilities, but most of the main barriers are related to maintaining the level of remuneration, transferring pension and social security, finding suitable child-caring or schooling for children, and facing a different culture.

R2 researchers tend to encounter more barriers for long-term mobility than R3 and R4 researchers.

Personal and family reasons are the most important motives to decide not to move, to a greater extent than in 2012 (77% in MORE3 compared to 67% in MORE2).

Obtaining funding for research and mobility, as well as finding a suitable position are also important reasons for non-mobility. In this sense, the reasons to be non-mobile are similar to the barriers to mobility, with a similar distribution across career stages.

These are, as such, the factors that allow for mobility to take place at all, i.e. they are important enablers of mobility. At the lower end are transferring social security and transferring pension.

Further there are some more issues related to the different types of mobility.

**Intersectoral mobility** (mobility across academia, industry and public sectors):
There is limited awareness among researchers regarding career opportunities outside academia.

The main barriers among industry relate to the unclear benefits to participating firms, the high administrative burden on companies as well as the additional workload linked to integrating new people into the company. The need to understand the impact of the various types of programmes and the observed lack of high quality evaluations for existing programmes provide a strong argument for strengthening the evaluation capacity in member states and encouraging frequent and systematic assessments.

Doctoral fellows describe their issues with the intersectoral collaborations as follows:
- Little relevance or alignment with PhD project or academic career;
- Bureaucratic challenges and time-consuming processes of resettling in new place;
- Company not prepared to be host which leads to loss or waste of time;
- Poor coordination and communication between university and company;
- Not able to publish due to confidentiality of research or intellectual property;

Mobility from academia to industry is today often a one-way issue as lack of high-ranked scientific publications in industry often prevents return to an academic position. The difficulties in returning to the academic sector after working in industry are said to be an important barrier for researchers wanting to engage in this type of mobility.

Different research cultures and salary levels;
- Unclear agreements and planning of secondment;
- Company using PhD fellow as manpower or free labour;
- Increased workload - relatively heavy workload in industry, which is difficult to balance with academia;
- Not possible or difficult to access data;
Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

- No future job opportunities in company;
- Psychological aspects - it may be even harder to establish oneself in the host country when doing a PhD in a company as the company may offer a less diverse or smaller group of colleagues to socialize with.

Interdisciplinary mobility (mobility across research fields).
There are often barriers that can hinder this type of mobility. One of them refers to the fact that disciplinary affiliation might have a positive impact on scientific recognition: If a researcher does not publish and collaborate in a defined discipline, they are likely to be penalised in terms of scientific impact. In view of existing discrepancies between the claim for inter- or transdisciplinarity in research projects on the one hand and sometimes persisting disciplinary assessment procedures on the other, the following issues are subject to concern:
- Recognition of diverse, nonlinear careers;
- Problems for expert evaluators to judge and acknowledge achievements outside their own mainstream field;
- How to evaluate multidisciplinary versus new borderline concepts and new knowledge created by combining fields;
- Persisting problems to get papers published outside mainstream fields or own former field;
- Hard collaboration together because of different standards and expectations;
- No or little contribution towards PhD research;
- Loss of time, slowing down research progress;
- Not clearly defined or poorly organised collaboration;
- Time-consuming process to establish fruitful collaboration, little short-term gains;
- Difficult communicating in common technical language, lower scientific quality;
- Too great gap between disciplines or expertise.

Barriers to mobility are relevant also when non-EU researchers and EU researchers currently working outside the EU would be interested in principle to move to the EU because they think that it is an attractive location for a research career, but various hurdles for mobility prevent them from doing so. Barriers related to the easy access to EU finding are shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to the use of EU funding by group of researchers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>TG1</th>
<th>TG2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative burden</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest to be mobile</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of programs</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge of the procedure</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of matching fund</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No barriers</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MORE3 Global survey (2017)
Notes:
- Total: Researchers currently working outside the EU (n=1,727)
- TG1: EU researchers currently working outside the EU (n=417)
- TG2: Non-EU researchers who have worked in the EU in the past (n=263)

Table 9.

Further specifics related to Widening countries: The discrepancy between a ‘global awareness’ on what matters for successful research careers and the national differences in research systems gives rise to varying perceptions of attractiveness between countries, as well as varying patterns of international mobility, including asymmetric mobility or brain drain. This is not only pertinent at the global level, but also at the European level. (MORE3 findings). This heterogeneity is not just a result of different higher
education systems and career structures, but also of economic development influencing public budgets for research and hence research funding and salaries of researchers. Research institutions of similar attractiveness will lead to knowledge exchange and brain circulation, while major differences may lead to brain drain. Researchers in most Widening countries identify the following main problems of their research systems which are mostly prerequisite for forced mobility and brain drain:

- Low investment in R&D and lack of national funding (Western Balkans) or limited national funding for research;
- Outdated or lagging behind the state of the art research infrastructure;
- Weak strategic research planning without clear research policy, low strategic priorities in the national economy;
- Slow reform of higher education system - Universities and higher education institutions are focused on teaching. Research is subordinate to teaching activities. Academic staff is faced with the long term mobility (more than 1 year) issues due to teaching activities.
- Low cooperation with private sector and low interdisciplinary research;
- Low administrative capacity and support for international research projects;
- Low connection with research and scientific diaspora;
- Huge differences in salaries between EU funded researchers and public ones;
- Low level of internationalisation and participation in EU funded projects (example Horizon 2020).

List of documents analysed

*General reports on Widening countries’ performance:*
- MIRRIS - briefs report
- H2020 interim evaluation report
- Overview of sources for the indicators presented in the Country Profiles (Deloitte)
- EPRS - European Parliament report on Overcoming innovation gaps in the EU-13 Member States
- Analysis of participation of new EU Member States (“EU-13”) in FP7 in the area of Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities (SSH)
- NCP_WIDENET project benchmarking
- FP7 report
- UNESCO database: [http://uis.unesco.org/en](http://uis.unesco.org/en) - you can browse by country
- European Innovation Scoreboard 2017 database
- OECD database
- WIPO
- eCORDA database, March 2018 release

*Specific reports on Widening countries’ mobility and MCA/MSCA participation:*
- SpB49- SF report on various type of mobility
- The Working Paper 25 - The mobile academic A survey of mobility among Marie Skłodowska-Curie doctoral fellows
- Net4Mobility Task 2.4 Twinning “Conditions for researchers and research landscape in the Western Balkans”
- MORE3 study: [https://www.more3.eu/](https://www.more3.eu/)
- Country reports on MSCA participation by the EC (FP7 and H2020)
- eCORDA database, March 2018 release

5. Outcomes of Widening survey
5.1. Main objective

The main objectives of the survey targeting MSCA NCPs from Widening countries were (1) to find out the main obstacles/problems MSCA NCPs and their clients from widening countries face when applying for or participating in H2020 MSCA programme; (2) to learn the strengths of these countries in terms of MSCA application or participation; (3) to map activities/measures Widening countries implement to promote MSCA programme and enhance participation and (4) to learn Widening MSCA NCPs or their clients’ needs for training or other forms of assistance which can result in enhanced participation. Apart from analysing the outcomes of the survey, the replies given to two sets of questions of the Benchmarking survey under T 2.1 have also been analysed: 1) Questions targeting the level of experience of MSCA NCPs and their training needs in different areas of MSCA (G2Q1 – Training in MSCA issues) and 2) Promotion of the MSCA (G7Q - Promotion of MSCA services). The present analysis (together with the Pre-study for MSCA widening analysis) will serve as a basis for the recommendations (D 4.1) to be formulated what instruments the Widening countries may introduce to be more successful in FP with special focus on MSCA actions.

5.2. Methodology

5.2.1. Widening countries

The target group of present analysis is the 27 Widening countries. There are two groups for Widening countries: (1) 15 Member States (currently eligible for Widening support): Bulgaria (BG), Croatia (HR), Cyprus (CY), Czech Republic (CZ), Estonia (EE), Hungary (HU), Latvia (LV), Lithuania (LT), Luxembourg (LU), Malta (MT), Poland (PL), Portugal (PT), Romania (RO), Slovakia (SK) and Slovenia (SI); (2) 12 Associated Countries (currently eligible for Widening support, subject to valid association agreements of third countries with Horizon 2020): Albania (AL), Armenia (AM), Bosnia and Herzegovina (BA), Faroe Islands (FO), Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (MK), Georgia (GE), Moldova (MD), Montenegro (ME), Serbia (RS), Tunisia (TN), Turkey (TR) and Ukraine (UA).

5.2.2. Widening survey

The widening survey was elaborated by IPPT PAN with the contribution of NKFIH, ETAg, BAS, TUBITAK, BUAS, AMEUP. The online template was created by CERTH and it was launched on 20 September 2018. In case of the Widening survey, altogether 21 countries (out of 27) responded to the questionnaire: Cyprus, Croatia, Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Armenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Faroe Islands, Montenegro, Republic of Serbia, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine. One officially nominated NCP per country filled in the survey. The analysis of the replies is based on the responses of 21 MSCA NCPs.

5.2.3. Benchmarking survey

The Benchmarking survey was elaborated and launched under Task 2.1 by CERTH in May 2018. The Benchmarking survey targeted every MSCA NCP, but when analysing the replies given to the two set of questions on the level of experience of MSCA NCPs and their training needs and promotion, we have only examined the responses given by MSCA NCPs from Widening countries. Altogether 28 MSCA NCPs from 22 Widening countries filled in the benchmarking questionnaire. The respondents were from the following countries: Albania, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Faroe Islands, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tunisia, Turkey and Ukraine. Only 1 NCP per country replied to the questions of the survey apart from...
Bulgaria, Croatia, Tunisia where 2 NCPs and Poland where 4 NCPs answered. The analysis of the replies is based on the responses of the 27 MSCA NCPs.

5.3. Outcomes of the Surveys

5.3.1. Results of the Widening Survey

The short analysis of the results – per question/topic or set of questions – is presented below.

Question 1: Do you have a national strategy for participation in MSCA? If yes to what extent is it implemented?

Out of 21 responders, 17 reported that they do not have a national strategy for participation in MSCA and 4 reported that they do (Tunisia, Portugal, Romania and Turkey). Out of the 4 that have a strategy, Tunisia and Portugal reported that the strategy is considerably implemented, Romania that is implemented to some extent and Turkey that is implemented to a large extent.

Question 2: Responders were requested to rate how negative/positive the following national factors were in terms of participation in MSCA:

- Attractiveness of the country
- Significant International research collaboration
- Attractiveness of the research community in your country
- Existence of leading research organisations
- Existence of strong research teams
- Quality of research facilities (incl. infrastructure)
- Access to research facilities (incl. infrastructure)
- Possibilities to join the existing networks / consortia
- Sufficient project management and administrative support for project preparation and implementation
- Sufficient financial management support for project preparation and implementation
- Sufficient scientific support for project preparation
- Expertise on international project management
- Sufficient legal support (entry conditions, work permit) for project preparation and implementation
- Level of professional English in research institutions

Out of 21 responders, 17 reported that they do not have a national strategy for participation in MSCA and 4 reported that they do (Tunisia, Portugal, Romania and Turkey). Out of the 4 that have a strategy, Tunisia and Portugal reported that the strategy is considerably implemented, Romania that is implemented to some extent and Turkey that is implemented to a large extent.
Each of the above factors was rated as follows:

**Attractiveness of the country**

- Very positive: 4
- Positive: 12
- Negative: 4
- N/A: 1

Out of 21 responders, 12 rated the **attractiveness of the country** as a **positive** factor, 4 as very positive and 4 as negative.

**Significant international research collaboration**

- Very positive: 4
- Positive: 13
- Negative: 4

13 NCPs indicated that the **significant international research collaboration** is a **positive** factor. 4 find it very positive and 4 negative.

**Attractiveness of the research community in your country**

- Very positive: 3
- Positive: 13
- Negative: 4
- N/A: 1

12 of them rated the **attractiveness of the research community** as a **positive** factor, 3 as very positive and 4 as negative.

**Existence of leading research organisations**

- Very positive: 4
- Positive: 12
- Negative: 5

N4M+ (H2020 GA No. 785632)
MSCA NCP Network: [www.net4mobilityplus.eu](http://www.net4mobilityplus.eu)
12 respondents stated that the existence of leading research organisations is a positive factor, according to 4 of them, it is very positive and 5 rated as negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existence of strong research teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 MSCA NCPs rated the existence of strong research teams as a positive factor, 4 as very positive and 5 as negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of research facilities (including infrastructure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 of them indicated that the quality of research facilities (including infrastructure) is a positive factor. 5 of them rated it as very positive, 6 as negative and 1 as very negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access to research facilities (including infrastructure)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of the respondents (12) rated the access to research facilities (including infrastructure) as a positive factor, 2 as very positive, 6 as negative and 1 as very negative.
11 MSCA NCPs stated that the possibilities to join the existing networks/consortia is a positive factor. 2 found it even very positive and 7 of them negative.

11 respondents rated the sufficient project management and administrative support for project preparation and implementation as a negative factor, 2 as very negative, 7 as positive and 1 as very positive.

Most of the responders (13) find the sufficient financial management support for project preparation and implementation to be a negative factor, 1 very negative, 6 positive and 1 very positive.
11 NCPs rated the **sufficient scientific support for project preparation** as a **positive** factor, 3 as very positive and 7 as negative.

14 responders rated the **expertise on international project management** as a **positive** factor, 1 as very positive and 6 as negative.

12 NCPs find that the **sufficient legal support (entry conditions, work permit) for project preparation and implementation** is a **positive** factor. Only 2 of them find it very positive, but 6 negative and 1 very negative.
9 respondents rated the level of professional English in research institutions as a positive factor, 6 as very positive, 5 as negative and 1 as very negative.

Other Comments:

As additional negative factors, the following issues have been mentioned:

- brain-drain phenomenon,
- low salaries for researchers
- obligations of the researchers in their own institutions (example Universities and lecturing) and participation in MSCA projects (ITN, RISE and supervising fellows) is additional unpaid work
- weak support mechanism for foreign researchers to further develop research career in the country.

Overall, it can be stated that most national factors were seen as positive in terms of participation in MSCA. Based on the responders rating, the most positive factors were the significant international research collaboration (13 positive and 4 very positive), attractiveness of the country (12 positive and 4 very positive), existence of strong research teams (12 positive and 4 very positive), existence of leading research organisations (12 positive and 4 very positive) and attractiveness of the research community in your country (13 positive and 3 very positive). The national factors that were seen as negative, were the sufficient project management and administrative support for project preparation and implementation (11 negative and 2 very negative) and sufficient financial management support for project preparation and implementation (13 negative and 1 very negative).

Question 3a: Are there any national measures, in the topics below, supporting participation of entities/researchers in MSCA?

Out of 21 responders, 11 stated financial support for project preparation is not available as a national measure and 10 stated that it is.
Although, as best practices, the following types of support have been mentioned by several Widening Countries:

- National grant for Coordinators wishing to submit a proposal with a consortium in two segments; 2000 euro for preparation and additional 5000 euro if their proposal passes the threshold. (Cyprus)
- The Decision of the Ministry of Science and Education to encourage the application of international competitive projects in Horizon 2020 programme includes:
  - small financial support for the meetings with potential partners, workshops, conferences
  - small one-time financial support for projects with score above 85% which can finance the preparation of future project proposal. (Croatia)
- The national support grant is retroactive. It is given to Estonian organisations, whose H2020 proposal receives a score that is above threshold. The grant is only for two types of applicants: (1) coordinators (4000 €), and (2) individual proposals, such as ERC and MSCA IF, but also other mono-contractor types of grants (2400 €). The grant is a lump sum ("no questions asked"). (Estonia)
- Incentive Program for ‘H2020 Coordinators’, has been established for encouraging our institutions to lead consortia in projects submitted under H2020 Calls and increasing the success rate of them in H2020. This Programme contains five sub-supports which help coordinators through their H2020 application: Travel Support for Consortium Building Activities; Organization Support for Consortium Building Meeting; Training for Project Writing and Submission Process; Project Writing Support; Project Pre-evaluation Support. (Turkey)
- Financial grant for project preparation (Lithuania)
- Support for the preparation of research and development projects under the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation 2020 - Horizon 2020. (Slovakia)
- “Support for the project preparation - financial support for building a consortium (travel costs for attending brokerage events, organising consortium meetings as a coordinator), covering personal costs for project preparation as a coordinator. (Hungary)
- National Grant for proposals above threshold (Portugal)
- Financial support to cover the costs of preparing a project proposal based on unit cost. (Slovenia)
- “Grants for Grants” instrument for reimbursement the project preparation costs if the project has been scored above the threshold. It doesn’t include MSCA Individual Fellowships. (Poland)

**Question 3b: Additional funding for project implementation**

Out of 21 responders, 20 stated additional funding for implementation of COFUND, ITN and IF Projects is not available as a national measure and 1 stated that it is. In case of RISE, additional funding is not available in 19 countries.

Additional funding for COFUND, ITN and IF is only available in one country (Poland). In case of COFUND:
1. Instrument which provides the Polish beneficiaries up to 90% of their own contribution. 2. Additional funding for remuneration for the project implementation team. In case of ITN and IF: additional funding for remuneration for the project implementation team is available.

Additional funding for RISE is only available in two countries (Turkey and Poland):

- National funding mechanism in Turkey which can fund the researchers coming from high income countries (USA, Canada, Japan etc.). Institutions having a RISE project have to apply to this national funding separately to get funding for the researcher coming from high income countries. (They are mostly funded.)
- Instrument which provides the Polish beneficiaries with additional funding for secondments exceeding 2000€; 2. Additional funding for remuneration for the project implementation team.

**Question 3c: Points for entities in the process of national evaluation of their research performance**

12 NCPs find that the points for entities in the process of national evaluation of their research performance is not available as a national measure and 9 stated that it is.

**Question 3d: Funding for not accepted MSCA projects (e.g. Seal of Excellence)**

18 countries stated funding for not accepted MSCA projects is not available as a national measure and 3 stated that it is. These countries are: Bulgaria, Cyprus and Slovenia.

**Overall, responders state that national measures for supporting participation of entities/researchers in MSCA are not available.** Some exceptions can be seen for financial support for project preparation and points for entities in the process of national evaluation of their research performance.
Question 3f: Awareness level of the applicants concerning national measures

10 countries stated that applicants are moderately aware of the national measures, 4 stated that they are extremely aware and 5 stated that they are slightly aware.

Question 4: How appropriate are the following MSC Actions to influence national structural changes?

COFUND

10 respondents stated that MSC action COFUND is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 3 stated that it is slightly appropriate and 5 stated that it is slightly inappropriate.
Out of 21 responders, 7 stated that MSC action RISE is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 6 stated that it is slightly appropriate, 2 stated that it is slightly inappropriate and 2 stated that it is inappropriate.

10 MSCA NCPs stated that MSC action ITN is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 5 stated that it is slightly appropriate and 4 stated that it is slightly inappropriate.
10 countries stated that MSC action IF – European Fellowships is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 5 stated that it is slightly appropriate, 2 stated that it is slightly inappropriate and 1 stated that it is inappropriate.

11 NCPs indicated that MSC action IF – Global Fellowships is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 3 stated that it is slightly appropriate, 3 stated that it is slightly inappropriate and 1 stated that it is inappropriate.
Out of 21 responders, 11 responded that MSC action IF – Widening Fellowships is appropriate to influence national structural changes, 3 stated that it is slightly appropriate, 2 stated that it is slightly inappropriate and 2 stated that it is inappropriate.

Overall, responders state that all MSCA Actions are appropriate to influence national structural changes. Based on the responses, the most appropriate actions seem to be MSCA-IF Widening Fellowships (11 appropriates), MSCA-IF Global Fellowships (11 appropriates), MSCA-ITN (10 appropriates), MSCA-COFUND (10 appropriates) and MSCA IF-European Fellowships (10 appropriates).

Question 5: National programmes supporting researchers’ international mobility

Out of 21 responders, 12 stated that national programmes supporting researchers’ international mobility are available in their country and 9 stated that they are not available.

Respondents were asked to describe the 2 most successful national programmes. The following good examples have been provided:
• Several bilateral agreements for cooperation in RTD have been signed and these agreements provide financial support for joint undertaking of projects designated as of national importance for both parties. (Republic of Serbia)

• Bilateral Cooperation (open for countries with bilateral agreement). (Cyprus)

• A programme of returning Croatian scientists to their homeland - managed by the Ministry of Science and Education. (Croatia)

• Researcher mobility projects (MC). Mobility projects for experienced researchers of diaspora (MCD). (Romania)


• Co-funded programme is a COFUND project and the calls are very similar to MSCA-IF. National programme very similar to Reintegration Grants of MSCA. (Turkey)

• Scientific ideas exchange, scientific mobility. Post-doc internships. (Lithuania)

• National Fellowship programme. (Slovakia)

• FNR inter mobility. (Luxembourg)

• Momentum programme - one of its aims is to attract Hungarian world-class researchers to return to Hungary. Stipendium Hungaricum - its mission is to increase the number of foreign students (incl. doctoral students) in Hungary and to encourage Hungarian higher education institutions to attract top foreign students. Currently there are 65 sending partners engaged. (Hungary)

• National Agency for Academic Exchange - new Polish organisation starting to implement several programmes for international exchange. HOMING – programme of the Foundation for Polish Science supporting incoming mobility of researchers to Poland. (Poland)

• US Aid program. (Tunisia)

Out of 21 responders, 9 stated that the availability of those national funding mechanisms does not influence negatively the number of applications to MSCA in their country and 3 stated that it does.

Question 6: Responders were requested to rate how attracting/discouraging for incoming researchers are the following national features:
- research landscape,
- international research collaboration,
- existence of research teams,
- quality of research facilities,
- visibility of scientific results,
- international project management and administrative support for project preparation and implementation,
- financial management support for project preparation and implementation,
- supervisor’s support for project preparation,
- administrative and legal support (entry conditions, work permit, family)
- language,
- scientific training opportunities,
- transferable skills training opportunities,
- career development opportunities after MSCA,
- quality and content of the institutional website.

Out of 21 responders, the majority (14) stated that the research landscape for incoming researchers is attracting, 2 that it is discouraging and 5 that it is neutral.

Out of 21 responders, the majority (8) stated that the career path and quality of working conditions for incoming researchers is attracting, but the same number of NCPs stated that these factors are discouraging.
12 countries indicated that the international research collaboration feature is attracting, 2 that it is strongly attracting, 1 that it is discouraging and 5 that it is neutral.

13 MSCA NCPs from Widening countries find that the existence of research teams feature is attracting, 4 that it is strongly attracting and 4 that it is neutral.

12 respondents indicated that the quality of research facilities is attracting, 2 that it is strongly attracting, 2 that it is discouraging and 5 that it is neutral.
8 NCPs stated that the visibility of scientific results feature is attracting, 1 that it is strongly attracting, 4 that it is discouraging and 8 that it is neutral.

8 countries indicated that International project management and administrative support for project preparation and implementation feature is discouraging, 7 that it is attracting and 6 that it is neutral.

Out of 21 responders, 8 stated that the financial management support for project preparation and implementation feature is neutral, 4 that it is attracting, 3 that it is strongly attracting and 6 that it is discouraging.
11 NCPs indicated that the supervisor’s support for project preparation is attracting, 1 that it is strongly attracting, 3 that it is discouraging and 4 that it is neutral.

10 countries stated that the administrative and legal support (entry conditions, work permit, family) feature is attracting, 1 that it is discouraging and 10 that it is neutral.

8 NCPs find that the language feature is attracting, 1 that it is strongly attracting, 4 that it is discouraging and 8 that it is neutral.
10 NCPs stated that the scientific training opportunities feature is attracting, 1 that it is strongly attracting, 3 that it is discouraging and 7 that it is neutral.

8 countries indicated that the transferable skills training opportunities feature is attracting, 6 that it is discouraging and 7 that it is neutral.

10 NCPs stated that the career development opportunities after MSCA feature is neutral, 6 that it is discouraging and 5 that it is attracting.
7 of them find that the quality and content of the institutional websites feature is neutral, 6 that it is attracting, 1 that it is strongly attracting, 5 that it is discouraging and 2 that it is strongly discouraging.

**Overall**, the results show that the most important national features are the attractiveness of the research landscape: out of the respondents 14 indicated it as attracting; the existence of strong research teams: 4 respondents indicated it as strongly attracting, while 13 as attracting; the significant level of international research collaboration: 2 respondents indicated it as strongly attracting, while 12 as attracting; the quality of research facilities: 2 respondents indicated it as strongly attracting and 12 as attracting.

Amongst the discouraging features the lack of sufficient financial management support for project preparation and implementation plays a key role.

**Other comments:**

As additional negative factors, the following issues have been mentioned:

- unwillingness to adapt to change and implement new perspectives at universities,
- low salaries for researchers and closed system for career development
- remoteness of the country combined with not so good connections.

**Question 7: National studies on researchers’ mobility**
Out of 21 responders, 11 stated that national studies on researchers’ mobility are not available. Only 4 of them indicated that they have national studies (Estonia, Poland, Romania and Turkey) and 6 that they are not certain.

Links to national studies:

- **Estonia**: http://tips.ut.ee/index.php?module=32&op=1&id=3691 (2015; Study is in Estonian, 2-page summary in English available)
  http://tips.ut.ee/index.php?module=32&op=1&id=3702 (2015; The career of scientists: Estonia in the international system; Study is in Estonian, executive summary in English available)


- **Turkey**: There are expertise thesis prepared by experts at the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey.

3 countries (Poland, Romania and Turkey) indicated that they use the outcomes of these studies.

**Question 8: Elements to improve the work as the MSCA NCP?**

Responders were requested to rate how the following elements could improve their work as MSCA NCPs:

- More training activities
- More staff
- More supporting materials (presentations, guidelines, recommendations)
- More visibility
- Better cooperation with policy makers
- More cooperation with other networks (EURAXESS, EEN, MCAA)
- More national support/measures for proposal preparation
- Better circulation of expression of interests among other European countries

Out of 21 responders, 10 stated that more training activities could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 7 to a moderate extent and 4 to a small extent.
10 NCPs indicated that more staff could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 6 to a moderate extent and 5 to a small extent.

11 of them stated that more supporting materials (presentations, guidelines, recommendations) could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 5 to a moderate extent and 5 to a small extent.

12 countries find that more visibility could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 7 to a moderate extent and 2 to a small extent.
12 respondents stated that better cooperation with policy makers could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 3 to a moderate extent, 5 to a small extent and 1 not at all.

9 NCPs indicated that more cooperation with other networks (EURAXESS, EEN, MCAA) could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a moderate extent, 7 to a great extent, 2 to a small extent and 3 not at all.

9 NCPs indicated that more cooperation with other networks (EURAXESS, EEN, MCAA) could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a moderate extent, 7 to a great extent, 2 to a small extent and 3 not at all.
The vast majority of responders (17) stated that more national support/measures for proposal preparation could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great extent, 2 to a moderate extent, 1 to a small extent and 1 not at all.

7 NCPs find that better circulation of "expression of interests" among other European countries could improve their work as MSCA NCP to a great or moderate extent, 4 to a small extent and 2 not at all.

Amongst all these elements indicated in the survey, most are considered as ones greatly contributing to the improvement of NCPs’ work, however, more national support/measures for proposal preparation seems to be the most important aspect that could help the NCP work. It is interesting to note that more cooperation with other networks does not seem to play such an important role in this regard. The same is true for the better circulation of „expressions of interest” among other European countries.

5.3.2. Results of the Benchmarking Survey – Training in MSCA issues & Promotion of MSCA services (only for MSCA NCPs from Widening countries)

Number of officially nominated MSCA NCPs in Widening Countries

In the 22 Widening countries which filled in the questionnaire, in most of the countries (14) there is only 1 nominated MSCA NCP. There are 4 countries (Croatia, Montenegro, Portugal, Tunisia) where there are 2, 2 countries (Romania and Bulgaria) where there are 3 and 2 countries (Poland and Ukraine) with 4 NCPs.

Training in MSCA issues

Respondents were requested to rate their level of experience on a scale from poor (1) to excellent (5) in the following fields:

- Activities to target private sector in MSCA
  o Activities particularly designed to target the private sector for the purposes of the MSCA
  o Promoting new actors and SME’s involvement
- COFUND - Training in proper preparation of proposals and implementation of projects
- Consortium and Partnership Agreements
- Co-operation in the same country with other NCPs or other Commission networks (e.g. EEN)
- IPR
- MSCA audit/MSCA Legal and Financial Issues
- Proposal related issues
  - Proposal writing
  - Proposal submission
  - Proposal evaluation
- Project implementation related issues
  - Project implementation (assisting contractors)
  - Project reporting (Administrative Procedures)
- Communication
  - Traditional communication
  - Social media communication
  - Public engagement/outreach activities
- Skills
  - Presentation skills
  - Training skills

Activities to target private sector in MSCA

Out of the 28 respondents, 16 stated that they have average experience in carrying out activities targeting the private sector and 21 of them have either average (14) or satisfactory (7) experience in promoting new actors and SMEs involvement.
The majority of the MSCA NCPs (24) rate their level of experience as unsatisfactory (12) or average (12) regarding their experience in providing COFUND training in proper preparation of proposals and implementation of projects.

The level of experience of most (20) of the MSCA NCPs from Widening countries concerning consortium and partnership agreements is average (11) or satisfactory (9).
Co-operation with other NCPs or other Commission networks has been rated by 19 respondents out of 27 as either satisfactory (13) or excellent (6).

The level of experience of most (24) of the MSCA NCPs from Widening countries concerning IPR issues is average (13) or satisfactory (11).
MSCA audit and Financial Issues

Regarding MSCA audit and MSCA legal/financial issues, most of the respondents rated their experience as average (17 in case of MSCA audit and 11 in case of legal/financial issues) or satisfactory (8 and 9).

Proposal related issues

Most of the MSCA NCPs from Widening countries – based on the 28 replies – are well experienced in proposal related issues. Most of them have either average (8) or satisfactory (12) experience in proposal writing, either satisfactory (10) or excellent (9) experience in proposal submission and either average (7) or satisfactory (13) experience in proposal evaluation.
Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

Project implementation related issues

The level of experience of most of the respondents (20-21) in project implementation and reporting issues is either satisfactory (10) or average (10-11).

Communication

Based on the outcomes of the survey, it seems that most of the MSCA NCPs from Widening countries are good communicators: most of them have satisfactory experience in traditional (18), social media communication (13) or in public engagement/outreach activities (16).
The respondents have good skills in presentation and training: 22 of them rated his/her skills in presentation either as satisfactory (13) or as excellent (9), and 20 of them have either satisfactory (14) or excellent (6) training skills.

**Overall**, respondents state that their level of experience is average or satisfactory in most fields. Their experience is considered to be unsatisfactory in COFUND-training, but in case of proposal submission and presentation skills many MSCA NCPs from Widening countries have great experience rated as excellent.

### Training needs

MSCA NCPs from Widening countries have also been asked in survey to indicate whether they wish to be trainees or trainers in the above mentioned topics.

The results show that in all cases the majority of the respondents want to be trainees. There are some topics where a few NCPs (2-4) indicated that they could be trainers (e.g. MSCA legal and financial issues, project implementation, communication, proposal writing, proposal evaluation). There is only one topic where 7 out of 28 respondents indicated that they wish to be trainers: proposal submission. There are some topics where quite a substantial number of respondents have chosen the option N/A indicating that they are not so interested in that topic (e.g. public engagement).
Recommendations for Widening Countries’ MSCA NCPs

Promotion of MSCA services

Level of experience in promotion and visibility of MSCA in Widening countries

According to the survey, the level of experience of MSCA NCPs from Widening countries in promoting the MSCA is quite high: on a 1-5 scale 17 of the respondents indicated 4 (satisfactory) as the level of their experience.

Regarding visibility level of MSCA, 11 of the respondents indicated 4 (satisfactory) and the same number 3 (average) as the level of visibility of MSCA in their own countries.

Organisation of promotion events and types of events organised/ tools used

Based on the survey, out of the 28 respondents, 27 MSCA NCPs from Widening countries organise and participate in national, regional or local promotional activities. The most often used tools to promote MSCA are: information days, trainings and workshops (27), while webinars (6) and booklets/guides (7) seem to be the least used tools amongst these NCPs.