Financial, legal and administrative management of INCO-NET projects. Difficulties, solutions and recommendations for the future

Muñoz M., Siller C., Bossi M., Le Meur F., Pohl K.

in

Financial, legal and administrative management of INCO-NET projects
Difficulties, solutions and recommendations for the future

Macarena Muñoz[1], Carmen Siller[2], Monique Bossi[3], Fadhila Le Meur[4], Karlheinz Pohl[5]

[1] Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC, Spain
[2] Zentrum für Soziale Innovation/Centre for Social Innovation, ZSI, Austria
[3] Agenzia per la Promozione della Ricerca Europea, APRE, Italy
[4] Institut de Recherche pour le Développement, IRD, France
[5] Deutsches Zentrum fur Luft und Raumfahrt e.V., DLR, Germany

Abstract. Since 2008, International Science and Technology Cooperation has become one of the major focus areas of the 7th Framework Programme. FP7 has been broadly opened to the participation of third countries and is aimed to promote political cooperation, dialogue and trust and to exemplify the free circulation of knowledge at a global level – the "Fifth Freedom". However, although international cooperation has been strongly encouraged in the FP7 and many projects with an international component have been funded, the management of projects can become problematic if it is not sufficiently recognised and effectively supported. INCO-NET Projects include complex consortia where raising awareness of the FP7 management system is crucial; actually one of the main difficulties encountered in the management of these projects is directly linked to the existing differences within the European Commission's system to manage FP7 projects, and to the internal administrative system of each beneficiary. This article aims to reflect on the main distinctions between the different systems, while proposing solutions and recommendations that could be taken into account for future International ST Cooperation projects.

Keywords. Science – Technology – Cooperation – INCO-NET Projects – Management.

Gestion financière, juridique et administrative des projets INCO-NET. Difficultés, solutions et recommandations pour l´avenir
Résumé. *Depuis 2008, la Coopération Scientifique et Technologique Internationale est devenue l'un des axes principaux du 7ème Programme-Cadre. Le PC7 a été conçu pour s´ouvrir à la participation de pays tiers et a été proposé pour promouvoir la coopération politique, le dialogue et la confiance, et incarner également la libre circulation des connaissances au niveau mondial - la « Cinquième Liberté ». Cependant, bien que la coopération internationale dans le 7ème PC ait été fortement encouragée, et que de nombreux projets avec une composante internationale aient été financés, la gestion de projets peut devenir un problème majeur si son importance n'est pas suffisamment reconnue et le soutien qui lui est attaché se révèle insuffisant. Les projets INCO-NET comprennent des consortiums complexes où la sensibilisation au système de gestion du 7ème PC est cruciale, et l'une des raisons principales des difficultés rencontrées dans la gestion de ces projets est directement liée aux différences existant au sein de la Commission Européenne pour gérer ce type de projets, et aux systèmes administratifs internes de chaque bénéficiaire. Cet article propose une réflexion sur les principales distinctions entre les différents systèmes, ainsi que des solutions et des recommandations qui pourraient être prises en compte dans les futurs projets internationaux de Coopération Scientifique et Technologique Internationale.*

Mots-clés. *Science – Technologie – Coopération – Projets INCO-NET – Gestion.*

I – Background

International Science and Technology Cooperation has become one of the major focus areas of the 7th Framework Programme[1] (from now, FP7), which has been broadly opened to participation from third countries since 2008, when the "Ljubljana Process"[2] was launched and

five new initiatives, including "International Cooperation", were tabled by the Commission to begin implementing the European Research Area (ERA) Policy on concrete topics[3].

In this context, the "Strategic European Framework for International Science and Technology (from now, ST) Cooperation"[4] Communication proposed a new partnership to strengthen the international dimension of the ERA, improve the framework conditions for international ST cooperation and promote European technologies in the world. In this line, international cooperation in ST was proposed to promote political cooperation, dialogue and trust, and embody the 'Fifth Freedom', i.e. the free circulation of knowledge at a global level.

In this way, projects with an international component have been funded across different programmes of FP7. More specifically, the FP7 'Capacities' Programme – in which the INCO-NET instrument is included - has funded actions to support international ST cooperation policies and reinforce scientific relations with third countries. In this line, potential participants from and outside Europe have been encouraged to build new partnerships benefiting from the support of FP7 and third-countries' programmes.

However, although international cooperation and the building of new international partnerships in the FP7 has been strongly encouraged, supported and even rewarded, and even though a range of funding instruments have been introduced to cover the specific needs of the cooperation between the EU and other regions[5], the management of these projects can become problematic if it is not sufficiently recognised and adequately supported.

The huge differences existing within the European Commission's (EC) system to manage FP7 projects, and the internal administrative system of each beneficiary are among the main reasons of the difficulties encountered in the management of projects.

This article is aimed to analyse the concrete case of the INCO-NET instrument[6], an FP7 initiative specifically designed to build, develop and reinforce large regional partnerships through its projects in the previously identified regions. In this way, we will try to reflect on the major features of different systems, while proposing solutions and recommendations that could be taken into account for future International ST Cooperation projects.

II – INCO-NET financial, legal and administrative management

INCO-NET projects[7] include complex consortia[8] where raising awareness of the FP7 management system is crucial. During the project's life, Project Managers devote a considerable amount of time and a strong effort to clarify the administrative rules and procedures, in order to fulfil some of the obligations – such as delivering an annual justification of the committed costs - agreed by the beneficiaries in the Grant Agreement. In most INCO-NET projects, there is the distinction between the scientific coordinator and the financial/administrative manager, due to this complexity.

However, fulfilling these obligations becomes complicated if we consider the difficulties related to the internal administrative systems of some beneficiaries as well as the Participant's Portal, which is the EC's tool to deal with the project administrative, financial and legal management of FP7. On one hand, some of the INCO-NET beneficiaries have no internal administrative systems adapted to the European context, so they do not apply/understand some of the EC's rules to participate in FP7 projects. The poor understanding of these rules may cause, in some cases, mistrust and a lack of confidence between the beneficiary and the project coordinator when the latter requests to apply the EC conditions in the management process. In this regard, and to illustrate this idea with some examples, most misunderstandings derive from issues such as choosing the most appropriate method for calculating indirect costs according to the kind of organization, charging personnel costs to the project, or recording every day the work-time dedicated to the project per person and per Work Package.

Furthermore, having a system that is unfit or unfamiliar with the management of international projects can cause more difficulties to the project's life, such as the lack of flexibility in having the use of the budget received from the coordinator. In this respect, due to their internal administrative procedures, some beneficiaries may need too much time to identify, allocate and use this budget, thus jeopardizing the correct development of project activities.

On the other hand, continuity in the management strategy of a project is essential for the coordinator to ensure consistency. In this way, the consortium will follow the same strategy over the entire life cycle of the project and, therefore, each progress report and financial statement will be easier, since all partners will be accustomed to the same process. In fact, for some beneficiaries that participate for the first time in a European project, this experience can be useful to understand the basic financial rules of the EU with a view to adapting, step by step, their internal administrative systems to the requirements of European projects.

However, to gain this continuity, the coordinator needs a unique reporting strategy established by the European Commission, which is the institution providing the guidelines and tools for project management and reporting.

In the case of FP7, the European Commission has implemented, over the last four years, a new system to manage and report projects step by step through the Participant Portal[9] - mainly SESAM and FORCE. This new system has modified important aspects on how to justify FP7 projects. However, its full implementation by the EC - that is still under way - and its understanding by the project coordinators and consortia, and even by EC officers, has taken too long and this has been detrimental to projects' life. For example, regular information provided, for example, by the coordinator and/or the beneficiaries to the Unique Registration Facility (URF) or the Research Executive Agency (REA) is not automatically updated in other relevant databases (FORCE, SESAM, and NEF). It is then up to the coordinator to detect such inconsistencies and make the EC involved officers aware of the situation.

In addition, the continuous improvements and changes to this system since 2009 have involved a transformation in the domestic management strategy of the project. This management has become more complicated in the sense that coordinators have not been able to present and maintain one justification protocol, and would rather have to adapt it to the continuous updating of the system. This would not be a problem if the consortia were fully aware and experienced in FP7 projects, but this is usually not the case for INCO-NET projects. Taking into account the complexity of the INCO-NET consortia, fulfilling all the EC requirements to correctly justify the projects, such as compiling all the information and documents needed to correctly prepare in time the yearly report of the project, as well as getting back to the partners even several times because of additional information requirements from the Financial Officer (FO), can be an arduous process, which can be jeopardized if only one beneficiary does not collaborate, or if his/her back office has problems to prepare the different data requested by the coordinator.

In this regard the Commission does not offer clear solutions to coordinators to avoid such situations, and excluding the justification to a "non-collaborative" partner that has not sent the information on time has been denied as an option for all INCO-NET projects. As a consequence, full submission of the progress and financial reporting could be extremely delayed so that the entire consortium would suffer from late reimbursement of costs, while another project could be unblocked thanks to a different solution provided by the Commission.

The reporting requirements should be the same, at least, for all INCO-NET projects. Taking into account that many INCO-NET projects "share" beneficiaries, since they involve two eligible regions (for example, Mediterranean and West Balkans, or Mediterranean and Africa) in the past they sometimes followed two different approaches when reporting to the individual projects. This shows a serious lack of consistency from the "European" side.

III – The INCO-NET Project Manager/Administrator Networking

To face the common difficulties in the management of INCO-NET projects, mainly associated with the EC's system to manage projects and report on them and with the complexity of the INCO-NET consortia, collaboration and experience-sharing among the project managers or administrators has proved to be a good solution.

Such collaboration helps project managers/administrators solve common problems through the exchange of experiences, keep updated with the latest innovations implemented by the EC concerning the FP7 electronic system to manage projects, share with the EC the difficulties and solutions concerning the management of projects and build on the EC mutual trust and continuous dialogue, which is not always obvious.

In the concrete case of the INCO-NET project managers/administrators, they started to collaborate in 2009 during the preparation of the first report of the projects, when the EC implemented FORCE, the new system to justify FP7 projects. By that time, FORCE had been tested internally by the EC but not with large consortia, as was the case for INCO-NET projects. Many difficulties and technical problems mainly emerged during the first year. This necessitated the establishment of the project network which, for the first time, made the legal, financial and administrative difficulties in managing this kind of project, visible to the EC. These difficulties would likely have gone unnoticed if FORCE and the new internal policy for the justification system had not been implemented. The daily collaboration of the network (via e-mail), the annual gatherings to share experiences and the meetings with the EC Financial Officers to discuss common difficulties and recommendations helped recognize management as an important issue in project development. This allowed some improvements to be introduced in project management: the EC allocated the same Financial Officer to CAAST-NET, MIRA, WBC-INCO.NET, SEA-EU.NET and EULARINET, the first INCO-NET projects approved in 2008. This made the preparation and correction of the subsequent justifications much easier, since the same criteria were imposed to all projects when reporting.

This network, currently composed of the project managers/administrators of WBC-INCO.NET, CAAST-NET, SEA-EU.NET, ENLACE, EULARINET, PACE-Net, INCO CA/SC, INCONET GCC, EUCARINET and MIRA, has also produced common documents about FP7 Projects' Financial, Legal and Administrative Management (subsequently submitted to the Commission) and other contributions (comments on Green Paper and the RESPOTNET and TRANSREG NCP workshop contributions), in order to facilitate the management of future INCO-NET and other FP7 projects.

As an example of the work developed together, we hereby list the main difficulties encountered in project management also shared with the EC after the first INCO-NET Project Managers' meeting held in 2009, aimed at improving the implementation of these cooperation projects:

a. **Unfamiliarity with EC procedures**. Many beneficiaries were involved for the first time in an EU project; so they were unfamiliar with EC jargon and guidelines. It proves to be difficult for the project coordinator to summarise the available information in an easy and understandable way.

b. **Seniority of Beneficiary Representatives.** As some beneficiaries' representatives are senior officials in their organizations, they do not prioritize the administrative or financial completion of the project nor do they understand the implications of a late submission for the whole Consortium. Due to their position in their organizations, this issue is not at the top of their agenda.

c. **Communication with the European Commission.** The European Commission has failed to understand that projects face particular difficulties in the reporting process. Communication was difficult for some beneficiaries in INCO-NET that could not rely on the same infrastructures as the European beneficiaries (for example, no Internet

access or inadequate phone system wiring). This created severe limitations on how and when the project coordinator could communicate with beneficiaries about reporting.

d. **Unclear Guidance.** The information provided by the European Commission was found to be unclear and limited. The key documents for project reporting ("Guide to Financial Issues relating to FP7 Indirect Actions" and "Project Reporting Notes") were not easily comprehensible and limited in their guidance. This was especially the case for the Project Reporting Guidance Notes that have no explanation on how to complete the Form C – Financial Statement.

e. **Contradictory Help and Advice from EC Financial Officers (FO).** Much of the assistance provided by the Financial Officers at the European Commission has been contradictory and limited. Frequently when further clarification was sought on already available guidance, the EC Financial Officers referred back to the guidance notes and did not provide extra help.

f. **EC Databases**. The problems faced with the mix-up of information about organizations and non-partners induced changes in the EC databases, resulting in a cumbersome and time-consuming process, in particular if they were discovered too late during the reporting period, as the tracking and correction of such mistakes needs a lot of time.

g. **FORCE and SESAM** are highly appreciated and they have been improved a lot since their launch. However, less duplication of necessary information would be highly appreciated.

IV – Conclusions and recommendations

As presented above, the management of INCO-NET projects is a complex process that needs specific attention from the beginning.

Establishing the same justification protocol for all INCO-NET projects will provide the INCO-NET Programme with consistency and will also help their consortia adapt their individual administrative systems to the "European" mode, when participating in European projects. In addition to this, more pro-active communication and information from the EC towards the INCO-NETs would be appreciated with regard, for example, to the changes in the EC databases and online tools such as FORCE.

Regarding the two systems – FORCE and SESAM – to report and justify costs through the Participant Portal, the process must be simplified if the European Commission wishes to extend their use beyond the project coordinators. It would be very difficult for some INCO-NET beneficiaries to use SESAM effectively due to infrastructure problems. A low-tech alternative must still be available or greater flexibility must be allowed on how documentation is submitted.

Furthermore, the 60-day deadline has proved to be very tight for project reporting. The poor and slow communication between beneficiaries and with the project coordinator makes the project coordinators unable to submit a full report to the European Commission before the deadline. The EC may wish to consider greater flexibility with its deadlines, especially if project coordinators inform in advance that they may not be able to submit their report on time.

To ensure the awareness of the project management strategy, there should be a meeting for the administrative representatives of beneficiaries (representatives from the back-office) in parallel to the kick-off meeting. Such a meeting, involving if possible the Financial Officer of the project, would give much more importance to the issue of administrative and financial management than a time slot in the presentation of the project management in the regular kick-off meeting, where

participants are usually scientific representatives of the beneficiaries and are not familiar with administrative and financial issues.

In this respect, the presence of an EC FO at the kick-off meetings would help establish procedures and allow the coordinator to address questions more authoritatively. It is important to tackle financial/legal issues during these meetings and dedicate quite some time in a specific session that will be of interest for most beneficiaries and for the coordinator to make it clear since the start that the cost statements will have to be prepared in time.

Furthermore, if the EC FO announces from the beginning of the project or of the reporting period what is the level of detail required in the justification, this would help the consortium better understand the rules and save precious time when justifying.

Finally, a workshop on financial issues and reporting should be organised about 4-6 weeks before the end of the first reporting period, with a view to providing the latest available information and updating the starting one. Although generating additional costs, this would improve the reporting that may be more precise and smoother if the rules and regulations are correctly understood by all persons involved. The full support and involvement of a National Contact Point in this event on legal and financial Issues, or the participation of a second-level auditor, aware of the management of INCO-NET projects, could be helpful to remove all doubt from the project partners.

Notes

[1] The "7th Framework Programme of the European Community for Research, Technological Development and Demonstration Activities" (from now, FP7) is the funding instrument for scientific research sponsored by the European Union, and covers the 2007-2013 period. The broad objectives of FP7 have been grouped into four categories: Cooperation, Ideas, People and Capacities. For each type of objective, there is a specific programme corresponding to the main areas of EU research policy.

[2] Agreed by the Competitiveness Council of 29-30 May 2008, the Ljubljana Process aimed at getting enhanced governance based on a long-term vision on ERA developed in partnership by Member States and the Commission with broad support from stakeholders and citizens.

[3] The topics were: Researchers, Knowledge Transfer, Joint Programming, Research Infrastructures and International Cooperation.

[4] COM (2008) 588

[5] The regions covered are Pacific, South-East Asia, Latin America, Sub-Saharan Africa, Central Asia and South Caucasus, Eastern Europe, Middle East, Mediterranean and Western Balkans. Please see "List of regions affected by the INCO-NET instrument and websites of the INCO-NET projects" in Annex I at the end of this article.

[6] Through the INCO-NET instrument, the FP7 "Capacities" Programme funds actions to support international Science and Technology cooperation policies and reinforce scientific relations with Third Countries.

[7] The INCO-NET projects establish balanced partnerships, by grouping multiple international stakeholders (partners from research, industry, government and civil society) for research actions. They aim at supporting bi-regional dialogues in order to: 1/ Promote and structure the participation of third countries in the activities of FP7; 2/ Promote regional integration as well as identification and prioritization of common research areas of mutual interest and benefit; 3/ Facilitate the uptake and use of common identified research areas and the monitoring of performance and impacts of international ST cooperation across the Specific Programmes of FP7.

[8] Please see some examples of INCO-NET Project Consortia in Annex II at the end of this article. For complete information, please visit each website already included at the end of this document.

[9] The Participant Portal (http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home) is the entry point for electronic administration of EU-funded research and innovation projects, and it also hosts the services for managing proposals and projects throughout their lifecycle.

References

Doddoli R., 2002. The co-ordination of a RTD project at European level: difficulties and traps by the different steps. In: *Biomolecular Engineering*, 19. pp. 37-41.

EU Commission, 2009. *The European Research Area Partnership - 2008 Initiatives*. Research EU. European Commission. Directorate-General for Research - Communication Unit.
http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/docs/en/era-partnership-european-commission-2008-initiatives-en.pdf

EU Commission, 2012. *Investing in European success – Euro-Mediterranean Cooperation in research and innovation*. European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. doi: 10.2777/8084

EU Commission, 2012. *Projects in support of international research and innovation cooperation. International cooperation activities of the FP7 capacities programme*. European Commission. Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. doi:10.2777/72146

EU Council, 2008. *Council conclusions on the launch of the "Ljubljana Process" - towards full realization of ERA*. Competitiveness Council of 29-30 May 2008. 10231/08 RECH 200 COMPET 216.
http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/08/st10/st10231.en08.pdf

Annexes

Annex I - List of regions affected by the INCO-NET instrument and websites of the INCO-NET projects

- **Mediterranean - MIRA** Project: http://www.miraproject.eu/

- **West Balkan Countries - WBC-INCO.NET** Project: http://wbc-inco.net/

- **Africa - CAAST-NET** Project: http://www.caast-net.org/xwiki/bin/view/Main/

- **South East Asia - SEA-EU.NET** Project: http://www.sea-eu.net/

- **ENLACE** Project: http://www.enlace-project.eu/

- **Latin America - EULARINET** Project: http://www.eularinet.eu/

- **PACE-Net** Project: http://www.pacenet.eu/

- **INCO CA/SC** Project: http://www.inco-casc.net/

- **INCONET GCC** Project: http://www.inconet-gcc.eu/

- **EUCARINET** Project : http://www.eucarinet.eu/

- **INCO-NET EECA** Project : http://www.inco-eeca.net/

Other websites:

- FP7 Participant Portal :

  http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home

Annex II – Some examples of INCO-NET Consortia

A. CAAST-NET Consortium

CAAST-NET Consortium

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION
Botswana	Department of Research, Science and Technology
South Africa	Department of Science and Technology
Cape Verde	Direção Geral de Ensino Superior e Ciência
Senegal	Ministère de la Recherche Scientifique
Rwanda	Ministry of Education
Egypt	Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Kenya	Ministry of Higher Education, Science and Technology
Madagascar	Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research
Cameroon	Ministry of Scientific Research and Innovation
Nigeria	National Office of Technology Acquisition and Promotion
South Africa	ResearchResearch (Africa) (Pty.) Ltd
Ghana	ST Policy Research Institute, Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
Uganda	Ugandan National Council for Science and Technology
Turkey	Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey
United Kingdom	Africa Unit, Association of Commonwealth Universities (on behalf of the UK Department of Universities, Innovation and Skills)
France	Centre de Coopération Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement
Portugal	Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia
France	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement
Germany	International Bureau and National Contact Point Life Sciences of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research
Spain	Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness
Sweden	Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems
Norway	The Research Council of Norway, Division for Strategic Priorities
Finland	University of Jyväskylä/ Finnish Universities' Partnership for International Development (on behalf of the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs)

WBC-INCO.NET Consortium

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION
Austria	Zentrum für Soziale Innovation/Centre for Social Innovation
Albania	Ministry of Education and Science - Albania
Albania	Ministry of Economy, Trade and Energy - Albania
Albania	Agency for Research, Technology and Innovation
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ministry of Civil Affairs - Bosnia and Herzegovina
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Foundation for Higher Education World University Service
Croatia	Ministry of Science, Education and Sports - Croatia
Croatia	Ivo Pilar Institute of Social Sciences
FYROM	Ministry of Education and Science - FYRo Macedonia
FYROM	Ministry of Economy - FYR of Macedonia
Montenegro	Ministry of Science
Montenegro	Directorate for Development of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises
Serbia	Ministry of Education and Science
Serbia	Mihajlo Pupin Institute
Kosovo	Kosova Education Center
Austria	Federal Ministry of Science and Research
Austria	Austrian Research Promotion Agency
Belgium	Slovenian Business and Research Association
Belgium	Turkish Research & Business Organizations Public & Private Partnership
Bulgaria	Ministry of Education, Youth and Science
Germany	Federal Ministry of Education and Research
Germany	International Bureau of the Federal Ministry of Education and Research at the German Aerospace Centre
Greece	Ministry of Education, Lifelong Learning and Religious Affairs
Greece	South-East European Research Centre
Italy	Agency for the Promotion of European Research
Netherlands	United Nations University MERIT- Maastricht Economic and Social Research and Training Centre on Innovation and Technology
Belgium	European Commission - Joint Research Centre - IPTS
Slovenia	Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport
Turkey	Scientific and Technological Research Council

C. MIRA Consortium

MIRA CONSORTIUM

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION
Spain	Agencia Estatal Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
Morocco	Ministère de l'Education Supérieure, de la Formation des Cadres et de la Recherche Scientifique, Direction de la Technologie
France	Institut de Recherche pour le Développement
Tunisia	Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur, de la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique
Egypt	Ministry of Higher Education and State for Scientific Research
Germany	International Bureau of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research
Italy	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche
Greece	National Hellenic Research Foundation
Algeria	Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche Scientifique
Turkey	Turkish Academy of Sciences
Malta	Malta Council for Science and Technology
Jordan	Higher Council for Science and Technology
Italy	Centre International de Hautes Etudes Agronomiques Méditerranéennes
France	Euro-Mediterranean Universities Network
Germany	WIP GmbH und Co.
Algeria	Centre de Développement des Energies Renouvelables
Israel	Israel-Europe R&D Directorate
Egypt	Academy of Scientific Research & Technology
Lebanon	Conseil National de la Recherche Scientifique
Cyprus	Planning Bureau
Spain	MADRI+D
Lebanon	Arab Open University
Turkey	The Scientific & Technological Research Council of Turkey
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ministry of Civil Affairs
Palestine	Directorate General of Development & Scientific Research
Morocco	National Centre for Scientific and Technological Research
Montenegro	Ministarsstvo Prosvjete i Nauka
United Kingdom	British Council
Portugal	Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia
Spain	Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad

D. ENLACE Consortium

ENLACE Consortium

COUNTRY	ORGANIZATION
Italy	APRE, Agenzia per la Promozione della Ricerca Europea
Spain	UPC Universitat Politecnica de Catalunya
Greece	HELP-FORWARD Hellenic Project for Wider Application of R&D
Austria	LAI The Austrian Latin America Institute
Belgium	MENON Research and Innovation network
Hungary	BZN Bay Zoltán
Costa Rica	UCR Universidad de Costa Rica
Nicaragua	CONICYT Nicaraguan Council of Science and Technology
Guatemala	USAC Dirección General de Investigación de la Universidad de San Carlos de Guatemala
Honduras	UPNFM Universidad Pedagogica Nacional Francisco Morazan
Panama	UNACHI Universidad Autonoma de Chiriquì
Mexico	ECOSUR El Colegio de la Frontera Sur
Guatemala	CSUCA Central American University Superior Council
Guatemala	FECAICA Federation of Industry Chambers of Central America