A non-existent bias? A qualitative content analysis of the framing of the EU's ERA in the media

Hickey, Sebastian

A non-existent bias?

A qualitative content analysis of the framing of the EU's ERA in the media

Sebastian T. L. Hickey – s2472716

Leiden University

Political Science: International Relations and Organisations

BAP 13

The Welfare State in International Perspective

Dr. Ir. A. A. H. E. (Ellen) van Reuler

30th May 2022

Thesis – Wordcount: 7.776

Table of Contents

Introduction

The political knowledge and opinions of individuals rely, in parts, on the information conveyed by the media (Azrout et al., 2012; Vorderer et al., 2019). The reliance increases in cases where the distance of the information is greater, such as in the case of the European Union (EU) (Brosius et al., 2019; Vladisavljević, 2015). The media informs the public about the important and at times not-so-important activities of the EU. In so doing, it presents information in a certain manner that scholars have found to be linked with voters' attitudes toward the EU (Azrout et al., 2012; Menéndez Alarcón, 2010; Vliegenthart et al., 2008). Past studies found evidence suggesting the negative reporting of the EU to be strongly correlated with lower public support (Brosius et al., 2019; Vliegenthart et al., 2008). Additionally, separate studies found that media reporting can vary depending on the political alignment of the source (Carey & Burton, 2004; Castro-Herrero et al., 2016). Combining the two findings, research has attempted to find whether biased media differ in their framing of certain policies. Nevertheless, the population of literature within this niche field of research remains sparse. As such, this thesis sets out to identify the difference in the framing of an EU scientific program between left- and right-leaning newspapers.

The scientific program focused on is the European Research Area (ERA). The ERA was first proposed in 2000 with the ambition of levelling the playing field between the EU and the United States (U.S.) from a research and innovation perspective (Commission of the European Communities, 2000). By the turn of the century, the U.S. had greatly outperformed the EU in the field of research and innovation (R&I), as such the ERA was established to harmonise research between EU member states' scientific communities. The project was spearheaded by the former Belgian EU Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, Philipe Busquin. He saw the ERA as an additional step toward European integration, as it aimed to create a borderless market for R&I. The ERA was partly funded directly by the Union itself. The funding benefited European higher education and the R&I sector. Although established over two decades ago in 2000, the ERA continues to be a popular program at the EU level, receiving a renewed round of increased funding in 2018 (European Commission, 2021). More recently, during the Covid-19 pandemic, the Commission proposed the ERAvCorona action plan, coordinating research related to the outbreak.

Due to its now-established presence within the Union, the media may have changed its framing of the ERA over time. An analysis that not only looks at the framing of different media sources in EU member states of the ERA but also the evolution of the ERA's framing, can help researchers further improve their understanding of how policy is framed as well as how framing can evolve.

In pursuance of answering the question posed in the thesis, the existing academic literature focusing on the media and its effect on public support will be presented to better understand what scholars have theorised about the variables. Within the same chapter, a focus will be placed on attitudes towards welfare. The literature will pave the way for the research question. The following chapter, the theoretical framework, builds on the preceding section by presenting theories related to how the EU and certain policies have previously been framed within the media. Later on, the analytical approach to answering the research question is presented. The analysis and a general presentation of results are the two subsequent sections respectively. These are followed by an in-depth discussion and interpretation of the findings. Finally, the conclusion sums up the research finding. It states that left- and right-leaning media were observed to mostly frame the ERA similarly, that is to mean, in a neutral and informative frame.

Literature review

Public support and its influencers

An assumption about democracies dating to the days of Plato is that democracies rely on public support for survival. Over the previous century, empirical analysis put this assumption to the test, finding that it is in large parts true. Lipset (1959) found public support to be a requisite for democracies. Supporting this claim, Easton distinguishes between three elements that the public support differently. More recently, Claassen (2019) supports the Lipset-Easton theory, claiming their theories still hold in the Twenty-first-Century. The author included 135 countries in his analysis in which he concludes that democracies which enjoy public support are more stable and less likely to be affected by internal or external shocks. The opposite is true for democracies with low support, which suffer greater internal vulnerability at times of crisis (p. 118). Assuming support is a prerequisite for democracies, scholars have extended the assumption to include public

policy. Burstein (2003) conducted a review finding most scholars agree that public support influences policy, quite substantially even. The author furthermore adds findings mostly suggest public's support is amplified if the policy is salient (p. 37).

These findings have given rise to the question of what influences public support, and how can policy be made to be salient? Apart from an individual's predispositions, it has been argued, to the point that it is assumed, that public support is strongly influenced by the media Azrout et al., 2012; Vorderer et al., 2019). Other variables which have also been shown to influence attitudes, as well as predispositions, are the impacts of friends and family. The media, however, has been the focus of the news production theory which argues that the public's support can be influenced by the media as the latter can shape the former's political attitudes (Menéndez Alarcón, 2010). The influences have been explained according to various theories, although the most notable is the framing theory. This theory explains information relayed by the media can be presented in certain fashions which consequentially influence the media consumer's thinking process, as well as political perceptions (Saraisky, 2016). The framing theory will be further discussed in the following chapter as it has presented a multitude of findings relevant to the analysis carried out in this thesis.

The invention of the printing press and the emergence of the internet has enabled the media to influence a greater number of individuals, as it obtains a greater reach. With a greater reach, along with the aforementioned power to influence individuals, the media inherits the ability to make topics more salient in the public sphere (Brosius et al., 2019; Vladisavljević, 2015). The influence of media on public support can also be determined by the amount of information an individual is exposed to. For example, if the media is the only source of information for a specific topic, then it, in turn, acquires a form of monopoly on information. This monopoly can develop when topics are, literally or metaphorically, distant or too complicated for the average citizen to grasp, and the media is the sole provider of information (Azrout et al., 2012). In extreme cases, the media has the potential to use a monopoly of information to establish unity on topics (Tsfati & Walter, 2019).

Public attitudes towards the European Union

The existing literature has highlighted a positive relationship between the media's influence and a distant or complicated topic. The literature has shown, that as distance increases or understanding decreases the media becomes the predominant source of information, which can sway public support (Brosius et al., 2019; Vladisavljević, 2015). Building on this, further research has concluded the media does indeed influence public attitudes toward the distant and at times confusing EU (Azrout et al., 2012; Menéndez Alarcón, 2010; Vliegenthart et al., 2008). According to EU survey data from 2007, a majority of EU residents claimed to be informed about the EU through newspapers and television.

To test whether the media has influenced the European public concerning their support of the EU, Vliegenthart and his colleagues (2008) studied the coverage of EU integration by the European media. They found support for the argument, that in member states where the media portrayed the EU negatively, support was likely to be low too. They conclude that the way the EU is presented in the media is correlated to the support of the public. Within this positive-framing school of thought, Brosius (2019) found evidence that positive coverage of the EU in the media also increases trust in the Union. A study looking at the effect of the media on public attitudes towards the EU in the United Kingdom (U.K.) found it does, both negatively and positively (Carey & Burton, 2004). More precisely, the authors find a link between the political stance of a newspaper and its reporting on the EU. Right-wing newspapers were seen to have fewer supporting points on the EU. This resulted, they argue, in right-wing citizens showing fewer supporting attitudes toward the EU. The opposite is true for left-wing papers and left-wing individuals. Interestingly they further note individuals with strong national values were less supportive of the EU. Whilst some scholars have been able to find a plausible link between public support in the EU and the media, others have been unable to do so. De Vreese (2007) for example studied whether Eurosceptic attitudes amongst citizens in the EU can be traced back to Euroscepticism in the media. Ultimately, the study was unable to find sufficient evidence to fully support this claim.

The level of support towards the EU has not only been argued to be solely affected by the media. A study looking at public support for EU membership found evidence between a North- and

Southern-European divide in support (Hobolt & De Vries, 2016). Northern member states were found to be more supportive of EU membership compared to their Southern counterparts. Moreover, Northern member states which are part of the Eurozone sustained greater public EU support in contrast to non-Eurozone members.

Aside from strong arguments in past academic research about the public attitudes towards the EU. Survey data has also painted a general picture of EU support. More exactly, the European Parliament (EP) is the sole directly democratic institution within the EU. It holds elections every five years, yet since the 1999 elections, voter turnout has consistently remained under 50%. This only recently changed during the 2019 EP elections, although only by a negligible amount, with turnout reaching 50.66%. (European Parliament, 2019b).

Sequentially, existing literature points to the fact that the media can, to a certain extent, be a source of public support for the EU, and in turn should be a topic of interest for academics trying to understand European integration (De Vreese et al., 2006; Hobolt & De Vries, 2016).

Public attitudes towards welfare

The supportive attitudes of the public can vary depending on the different policy domains. In regards to welfare policies, Feldman and Zaller (1992) found the American public's attitudes to vary depending on their values and principles. Whilst more recently, Blekesaune and Quadagno (2003) studied the public's attitudes towards welfare policies in 24 countries. They found attitudes varied between states, claiming the variations depend on situational and ideological factors. They suggested individuals are likely to support social benefits for others when the cause for the need for benefits is out of the recipient's control, such as unemployment. Furthermore, they found evidence for a relationship between the increase in unemployment and the increase in support for welfare in states with universal welfare regimes. In contrast, all states, regardless of their welfare regime, showed similar support towards the sick and old, although this was comparatively lower than support for the unemployed. These findings are disputed by Van Oorschot, however, who finds the unemployed are perceived as the least deserving, whilst senior citizens are perceived as the most deserving followed by the sick and disabled (2006). The difference between both studies is the former investigated support from the nation-level whilst the latter

approached their analysis from the individual level. Importantly, in the case of welfare regimes, Neimanns (2021) found no empirical evidence suggesting universal regimes received the greatest amount of public support.

The state of a nation has also been shown to influence public support of welfare. For example, poorer states, as well as states with low unemployment and low trust in political institutions, have been linked with lower support (Van Oorschot, 2006). Attitudes towards welfare were less supportive in states facing these difficulties. Along those same lines, Lindvall and Rueda (2018) stress the fact that socio-economic dimensions are crucial factors for public support for welfare. On the one hand, welfare attitudes are affected by state-level factors such as unemployment. On the other hand, attitudes can also be affected at the individual level. Blekesaune and Quadagno (2003) found some evidence suggesting women were more supportive of welfare compared to their male peers. The age of an individual, however, according to Duffy and colleagues (2013) does not seem to influence welfare support. Although the authors did find evidence suggesting negative framing of social policy related to low support.

Another variable which has influenced attitudes toward welfare has been the rise of globalisation (Magni, 2022; Taylor-Gooby et al., 2017). Globalisation, and especially integration in the case of the EU, has led to several waves of migration. Migration specifically, has been shown to negatively influence welfare support, as native citizens feel migrants are less deserving of the benefits (Magni, 2022). This was arguably a predominant speaking point for Brexit (Khabaz, 2018; Taylor-Gooby et al., 2017). Increasing public anti-immigration sentiments have resulted in the emergence of welfare chauvinism. Welfare chauvinism develops as immigration increases, this is because immigration has been linked with economic pressure on welfare budgets. Additional variables placing pressure on welfare budgets are ageing populations and the evolution of markets along with the greater inclusion of women in the workforce. The pressures run the risk of stretching welfare budgets too thin, thus resulting in cuts in benefits or certain tax hikes.

Unrelated to welfare attitudes, and veering back to media. Contemporary media is generally tied to the normative expectation of being objective (Westerståhl, 1983). That is to mean, they are expected to convey political information to the public in a fair, neutral and balanced way (Castro-

Herrero et al., 2016, p. 573). Nonetheless, as stated before Carey and Burton (2004) found evidence of right-leaning newspapers having fewer supporting articles of the EU compared to their left-leaning counterparty. This in turn affected public attitudes with right-wing voters being less supportive of the EU. Along those same lines, Castro-Herrero and her peers argued bias media is present throughout the EU, although recognising greater imbalances in the founding states (2016, p. 583). Notably, signs of biased media were found in Italy and France along with Spain (Brüggemann et al., 2014). Nevertheless, empirical research focusing on media bias toward EU policy remains sparse.

Existing literature points to the relationship between the media and its influence on public support, which in turn can be manipulated through various frames. Furthermore, the influence varies depending on the policy the media reports on. Media bias has also been found to affect framing. Nevertheless, little research, as of yet, directly focuses on the media's bias in the framing of EU social policy. This leads to the raison d'être of this thesis. Considering the important role the media plays in forming the public's support for the EU and its social policy, the research question central to this thesis asks; *How does the reporting of EU policy differ between left- and right-leaning media?*

Theoretical framework

To answer the research question, the relevant variables will first be distinguished followed by the previous literature on what academics have theorised about the variables and their relationship. The following section will expand on what has been found in the field regarding the effect of the political alignment of media. Subsequently, several theories that explore how the media utilises different frames to diffuse information differently. Concluding with the theoretical assumptions of this thesis.

Media bias

Left- and right-leaning media is the independent variable of the research. Also referred to as media bias, the relationship between media bias and an individual's political beliefs continues to be a hotly argued debate. There are two main schools of thought within this debate, one which

argues bias in the media does influence the public, whilst the second believes this is not to be the case (Eberl, 2019; Lichter, 2014). Within the former school, most analyses have been carried out within the borders of the U.S. exclusively using American sources. Although the inclusion of non-American media sources in media bias analyses is increasingly becoming popular (Khabaz, 2018), the majority of the academic knowledge on media bias is still U.S.-centric. Media bias can help explain why attitudes towards certain policies differ within populations.

Between the two main schools of thought are theories which expect media bias to indeed influence the public, although not to the same extreme extent as in the first camp. Instead, evidence has been found suggesting media bias only influences its readers if the individual is unaware of the bias (Della Vigna & Kaplan, 2008). Brosius and her peers (2019) found evidence suggesting bias in the media only affects right-leaning individuals. More exactly, they found that if an individual identified themselves as right-leaning, they tended to revaluate their support towards the EU depending on the reporting. The most influential indicator they find for right-leaning individuals is their respective view on immigration, as the view becomes less supportive the individual's trust in the EU falls too. The findings suggest that right-leaning media can influence public support by framing the EU negatively. Bias within the media, when existent, has mostly been conceptualised as a negative effect (Lichter, 2014). This is in large part since media, from a normative standpoint, is expected to be neutral, solely focusing on relaying information to the masses (Castro-Herrero et al., 2016).

Alternatively, studies such as Berry, Garcia-Blanco and Moore's found no evidence for left- and right-leaning media sources representing the refugee crisis differently (2016). In their study, they examined the reporting of the EU's migrant crisis during the 2010s in five member states, concluding the reporting, regardless of the political alignment of the source, framed the topic along the same lines. In sum, the verdict is still out on whether the political alignment of news sources can act as an influencing variable on the public, although the lacking verdict should only act as an incentive to further investigate this quandary.

Framing theory

Returning to the framing theory mentioned in the literature review, as information relayed by the media can influence the consumer's opinions, framing theory has become a popular tool to understand the media influence's mechanisms. Essentially, framing theory allows for a better understanding of how ideas are firstly generated, then diffused and mobilised (Matthes, 2011; Saraisky, 2016). Frames are inherent to any information conveyed by the media, Khabaz claims they are unavoidable in any communication process (2018, p. 499). As such, the framing of the ERA is the dependent variable of this thesis.

Vladisavljević found the media traditionally frames information to convey the opinions of the elite (2015). The public is in that case exposed to unpolarised news forming a public consensus. This is unless the media perceives the elite to be in conflict, when this occurs the media has been noted to diverge from following the frames of the elite and resort to establishing their own frame. Conflict must not be violent in nature either, the EU has been characterised as suffering from internal conflict, this has notably been the case over the last two decades. Hooghe and Marks (2009) have defined this internal conflict as the end of the permissive consensus era and a shift to the constraining dissensus. Additionally, the EU notoriously suffers from a communication deficit, in which it fails to provide regular as well as clear and coherent information on the internal processes of the institution (De Vreese et al., 2006).

As the lack of consensus leads to internal conflict in addition to the communication deficit, the information individuals are exposed to concerning the EU is no longer homogenous. Instead, the media frames content according to their distinct desires. This effect, along with the idea that media influence support for the EU explains the emergence of research on media framing's influence on EU support (Azrout et al., 2012; Berry et al., 2016; Brosius et al., 2019; Carey & Burton, 2004; De Vreese, 2007; De Vreese et al., 2006; Menéndez Alarcón, 2010; Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000; Vliegenthart et al., 2008).

Semetko and Valkenburg (2000), for example, present five frames from analysing content framing in newspapers and televisions in the EU. They argue these frames are employed as a way for newspapers to increase viewership and stand out to attract new audiences. This is done via the

use of emotionally-loaded sentences, either within the articles but also simply within the headlines (p. 96).

The study carried out by De Vreese and his colleagues (2006) found the media frames the EU differently in their analysis of news coverage during the 2004 European elections. That is to say, some sources were found to paint the EU positively or negatively. They furthermore find evidence that depending on the frame employed, support can be manipulated. This is done in coordination with the attention placed on a certain topic, such as visibility and allotted air-time or text. They assert that the study of media framing regarding EU news is a prerequisite to being able to discern the views of the public on the Union. The increase in visibility, where readers are repeatedly exposed to content is defined as political socialisation by Khabaz (2018, p. 507).

Vliegenthart and his co-authors (2008) indicated that content which was portrayed as a domestic issue gathered more engagement, further suggesting the proximity of the topic of the narrative is an important factor in how framing is linked to support. This finding was similar to that of De Vreese and his colleagues (2006) who note the European nature of the article was influential. Furthermore, Vliegenthart and his compeers (2008) found evidence that the tone in which the EU was framed in the news coverage was influential. They categorised tone as either giving the information a negative, positive, or neutral spin. Moreover, they added the visibility of a story as being a vital variable, focusing on whether an article is given favourable placement within its paper. Although this form of visibility cannot be classified as a frame, visibility is also related to the textual visibility of a topic, which has been noted to be an influential frame related to establishing support. Menéndez Alarcón (2010) follows these same steps, finding tone and visibility to be significant frames employed by the media.

Finally, taking stock of the existing findings concerning the relationships between political alignments and media framing, as well as, the multitude of processes in which information can be framed. A theoretical expectation, connected to the theories and literature presented above along with the research question, can be formulated:

- Right-leaning media will frame the EU policy as a cost, whilst the left-leaning media will frame the policy as a benefit.

Having discussed the media at some length now, it would be useful to define what media is meant by within the context of this paper. Generally, media are sources involved with mass communications who store or deliver information. These can come in a multitude of forms, from newspaper, radio, and television, to advertisements and social forums on the internet. For reasons of simplicity and coherence, further mentions of media will solely refer to newspapers, unless stated otherwise. This is because the research conducted in the subsequent chapters places newspapers as the units of analysis. Newspapers will be the sole focus of this study as scholars such as Vladisavljević (2015) explains, that journalistic newspapers have been shown to have the greatest influence on an individual's political perception. As media is the independent variable it can be dichotomously distinguished between the values of left- or right-leaning. As such, newspapers will be divided between left and right papers. In the frame of the ERA, the dependent variables can be distinguished between the values good, bad and neutral.

Research design

In order to investigate the framing, and its potential variation, of EU policy between left- and right-leaning media sources, this thesis applies a comparative diverse case study. The comparison will be, as mentioned in the research question, between the two forms of media, but also between member states of the EU. These states include France, Germany, the United Kingdom (U.K.), Ireland and Austria. These five states can be categorised into three separate sets of welfare typologies. Both France and Germany are typical cases of conservative welfare regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990). The U.K. and Ireland are examples of liberal regimes, and Austria is an example of a socio-democratic regime. Briefly, Esping-Andersen (1990) defines conservative welfare regimes as systems which are primarily based on previous contributions by the beneficiary and a moderate level of decommodification. Liberal regimes are defined as having low levels of decommodification, and socio-democratic regimes have the greatest form of decommodification along with universal benefits. Decommodification is explained as the degree to which an individual is reliant on the market. Higher decommodification, therefore means an individual is less likely to rely on the market, as the government provides social assistance. This is a diverse case study to include cases from separate welfare regimes to not only understand the framing of

policy in a certain state but also how it compares to other states. Moreover, all five cases have been part of the EU since latest 1995. This means the media within these states will be more familiar with the EU as well as its audiences. France and Germany are two of the six 1951 founding members, whilst the U.K. and Ireland joined in 1973, and Austria was the last of the five to join the EU in 1995.

Diverse case selection is employed to investigate and analyse whether there is indeed a variation in the framing of policy across EU member states and, in turn, different welfare state regimes. The typology by Esping-Andersen, although arguably slowly becoming out of date, as well as being the recipient of much scholarly discussion, along with various alternative typologies (Bonoli, 1997; Ferrera, 1996). The typology is nevertheless still a useful contemporary tool for differentiating welfare regimes, especially in a heuristic fashion (Van Kersbergen & Vis, 2014).

As was briefly mentioned in the introduction, the EU social policy focused on in this thesis is the European Research Area. The ERA is a system established in 2000 through the Lisbon European Council. Its fundamental aim was to harmonise European research and innovation by enabling member states to cooperate within these two fields. Over time the EU Commission formulated targets for the system, such as the EU Research and Design (R&D) investment aim to reach 3% of EU GDP. A driver for this aim was to catch up to the United States (U.S.), which by the turn of the Twenty-first Century, was greatly outperforming the EU in R&D investments, and consequentially reaping its benefits. The goal of the ERA was to close this gap, and, with great optimism, surpass the U.S. Today, the ERA is still present and continuously receiving renewed attention, such as a recent augmentation in funding as of 2018 (European Commission, 2021).

Data selection

The data selected for the analysis are newspaper articles, specifically articles which explicitly mentioned the ERA. The articles were accessed through the *Dow Jones & Company*'s global news monitoring and search engine *Factiva*. The search engine allows for specific filtering in terms of keywords, sources, subjects, dates and regions. The keyword filtering allowed for searching documents which mentioned either *European Research Area* or *Espace Européen de la recherche* (French) or *Europäischer Forschungsraum* (German). The final search excluded

sources such as magazines, news agencies or state-owned broadcasters, whilst filtering for only *Political/General News*. This was to reduce the volume of sources as initial queries came back with several thousand hits. The filter nevertheless still allows for both domestic and international news. Additionally, the search ran from January 1st 2000 up until December 31st 2021, to fully capture the evolution of the framing of the ERA. The nature of the research analysis also meant the exclusion of sources originating from outside of the EU, such as the United States and Switzerland. Furthermore, several EU states other than the five cases selected, such as Cyprus, Luxembourg and Malta, were also present in the results. These states, however, had less than five sources throughout the query and thus were dropped from the analysis. This is because the lack of sources per country would make both a domestic comparison between the left- and right leaning-media as well as a state comparison invalid. Important to note, Factiva provides access to a wide array of sources according to different subscriptions. The subscription used to access the sources employed in the analysis carried out in this paper, although providing access to a plethora of newspapers, did restrict access to certain sources. Most notably, the French paper *Le Monde* and German paper *Die Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Both are predominant papers in each country, with wide national circulations. Their framing of EU social policy and the lack of their inclusion in the research can impact the domestic generalisability of the evidence. This is because as both papers are predominant, they may impact a far greater audience compared to some of the sources collected in the analysis.

Method of analysis

The recording unit, the material within the source which will be analysed, are articles within newspapers identified via Factiva for mentioned the ERA. To understand the framing of the social policy Qualitative Content Analysis (QCA) is the most suitable approach to take on. This is in part because QCA is a suitable tool for describing the meaning of qualitative data systematically, allowing for a flexible and unobtrusive interpretation of singled out data (Halperin & Heath, 2020; Schreier, 2012). QCA allows for an interpretation of the reality the content creates as it is, more exactly it will allow for an interpretation of policy preference within the public scope (Saraisky, 2016). Furthermore, QCA is a tool which can be replicated and in turn be used for verification processes.

QCA analyses make use of coding the content within the material selected according to a coding frame (Schreier, 2012). The frame can vary between being concept- or data-driven. Bearing the literature from the literature review and theoretical framework in mind, the frame employed for this analysis is largely concept-driven. There are, however, some data-driven aspects. The employed frame contains five main categories; *visibility* (VIS), *tone* (TO), *proximity of issue* (PRO), *endorsement of policy* (END), and *language* (LAN). The coding frame along with the categories, descriptions, codes and references is shown in Table 1.

Coding frame			
Category	Description	Code	Reference
Visibility (VIS)	The number of words allotted to the article	VIS-BIG VIS-SML	(De Vreese et al., 2006; Khabaz, 2018; Menéndez Alarcón, 2010)
Tone (TO)	How is the policy presented, positively, negatively or neutrally? Conflict, impact or portrayal of EU individuals/institutions	TO-PO TO-NG TO-NE	(Menéndez Alarcón, 2010; Vliegenthart et al., 2008)
Proximity (PRO)	The closeness of the topic discussed in the article	PRO-DOM PRO-EU	(Berry et al., 2016; De Vreese et al., 2006; Vliegenthart et al., 2008)
Endorsement (END)	Does the paper endorse the policy/proposal or is it neutral?	END-YES END-NO END-NE	
Language (LAN)	Was the language used in the article informative, emotional or both	LAN-INFO LAN-EMO LAN-MIX	(Semetko & Valkenburg, 2000)

Table 1 Coding frame

The literature presented above-suggested articles which place importance on policy tend to generate greater public awareness and in turn support for a policy (De Vreese et al., 2006; Khabaz, 2018; Menéndez Alarcón, 2010). This is why the visibility of the articles was coded to identify whether they were lengthy, thus including more than 500 words (VIS-BIG), or less (VIS-SML).

The tone of an article will be coded along three categories positive (TO-PO), negative (TO-NG) or neutral (TO-NE). These codes are concept-driven, following the definition as the ones employed by Menéndez Alarcón. (2010). The positive code is attributed to articles which portray the EU, whether individuals associated with the EU, processes or institutions, positively. For example, texts in which the EU is presented as a necessary institution or EU accomplishments. This is the inverse for the negative code, which is attributed to texts if they portray EU-related personnel as in conflict with another, or the confusing multi-layered bureaucracy inherent to the EU. Neutral codes are given to articles which cannot satisfy either category.

The proximity of the issue, that is the distance in which the article is presented is coded as either domestic (PRO-DOM) or European (PRO-EU). The former means articles largely focus on the benefits or consequences of policy on the domestic population. The latter on the other hand is attributed to texts if they do not refer to the subject as being a national topic. This code is also concept-driven, as previous literature suggested media that present topics such as domestic concerns are more likely to resonate with the audience (Berry et al., 2016).

Endorsement is a data-driven code, which verifies whether the article explicitly supports (END-YES) the ERA or not (END-NE). There is a neutral code (END-NE), as some articles did refrain from making any endorsement. Although data-driven, the code can also be considered somewhat concept-driven as some previous literature has hinted at the fact that if the media is the only source of information regarding a certain topic, the media's stance on a topic will then be adopted by the reader (Tsfati & Walter, 2019). Within the context of this thesis, it would suggest if the media endorses or opposes the ERA, its readers are likely to have the same response.

A largely data-driven code was the language, as it became clear certain articles employed very different expressions. This is to mean, that articles were coded as either purely informational (LAN-INFO), as emotional with little concrete information (LAN-EMO) or containing elements of both information and emotion (LAN-MIX). Although Semetko and Valkenburg (2000) did suggest language frame is an appropriate frame.

Lastly, the political alignment of the media sources was labelled once all articles had been selected and coded. Left- and right-leaning media sources were coded according to their categorisation by the German state-funded *eurotopics.net*. The website publishes extensive reports on media sources both within and outside of the EU, roughly 500 sources across 30 states. These reports notably include information regarding the respective source's political profile (eurotopics, n.d.). The profile was used to code the data from each respective source as either left, right or centrist.

Analysis

Overall results

Due to the limitation of time, not all the desired data was able to be coded. In total, the number of articles coded was 68. Moreover, due to complications with Factiva, no data for France was collected. Nevertheless, there were 42 articles from Irish newspapers, 22 articles from British papers, and 6 from both Austrian and German papers. In regards to left- and right-leaning papers there were 57 articles from left newspapers whilst 9 from right papers.

On average, it was a relatively even balance between articles allocating more than 500 words to the ERA and less. Furthermore, the portrayal of the EU was largely framed neutral, with few critical nor supportive points in either set of articles. There was an equal balance between articles which framed the EU positively and negatively. Again, there an overwhelming majority of articles from both political aisles framed the ERA as a domestic concern. Importantly, just over half of the articles framed the ERA neutrally, whilst the lesser half framed explicitly endorsed the policy, and only two articles explicitly reject it. In terms of language employed, there was a balance between purely informational and a mixture of informational and emotional language.

Breaking down the results

To better understand the results, they will first be empirically presented in terms of the political alignment of the newspapers, followed by the general evolution of the framing between 2000 and 2015. There was no particular trend for left-leaning newspapers in terms of allotment of words per article, it largely varied between VIS-BIG and VIS-SML. In regards to tone, the articles exceedingly took on a neutral tone vis-à-vis the EU, with a small fraction balanced between positive and negative framing of the EU. The distance placed between the ERA and the reader was mostly short. Most articles in left-leaning papers framed the ERA as a domestic issue. Although empirical more left articles remained neutral towards the ERA, there was an almost equal amount which explicitly endorsed the ERA. Whilst 2 articles explicitly disapproved of the ERA. Lastly, the language employed in the articles of left-leaning newspapers was mostly informational, with a few articles adding some emotionally-laden sentences to the mix.

On the other side of the aisle, the articles from right-leaning newspapers followed the same trend as their counterpart, with a balance between VIS-BIG and VIS-SML. The framing of the EU was purely neutral through all of the articles from right-leaning newspaper articles. Furthermore, the policy was mostly framed as a domestic issue. The ERA was rarely explicitly endorsed and never explicitly rejected by the articles, as most articles remained neutral. Finally, the language employed in the articles was mostly a mixture of informational and emotionally laden sentences, with some articles purely informational.

The only apparent pattern which emerged over the 15-year analytical time frame is the fact that articles frame the ERA more favourably. That is to mean, articles explicitly endorsed the policy more as time went on. There was no clear evolution in the codes attributed to the articles for the other categories. The following chapter discusses the theoretical interpretations of the results, whilst relating the results to both the research question and the theoretical assumption. Additionally, within the Appendix, the data is presented along with each source's codes.

Interpretation

This thesis posed the question: How does the reporting of EU policy differ between left- and right-leaning media? The analysis suggests; not all that much. From afar it appears left- and right-leaning newspaper articles broadly framed the ERA along the same lines. On both aisles, the media generally allotted a lot of written attention to pieces on the ERA. Also, both left and right mostly framed the EU in a neutral tone, although positive framing of the EU was witnessed more from articles in the left-leaning newspapers. In terms of the distance at which the articles paint the ERA was slightly less similar between left and right papers. More right-leaning newspaper articles portrayed the topic discussed as a domestic issue instead of framing it as a distant story. On top of that, the analysis shows articles from right-leaning papers and left-leaning papers largely framed the ERA neutrally, abstaining from explicitly endorsing the policy. Although articles in left-leaning newspapers were seen to be more favourable towards the ERA. Moving on, the language employed in the two types of newspapers was mostly similar, that being informational. From a general glance, one can argue the framing of EU social policy does not greatly vary between left- and right-leaning media, apart from the domestication of the ERA employed by articles stemming from right-leaning papers.

The remainder of this section will look into the results of the individual states, comparing the states whilst also making use of quotations from the data. The final part of the section brings the analysis back to the research question and theoretical expectations.

Irish articles, whether left- or right-leaning, overall were observed to evenly spread the allotment of words with a slightly higher number being coded VIS-BIG. The greater allotment of words was oftentimes seen in articles which were detailed opinion pieces or interviews. Again, there was a similar spread between articles in left- and right-leaning newspapers regarding tone. Most articles simply presented the EU neutrally. Although some articles, such as *The Sunday Business Post* from September 2002, frame the EU as an active and successful instrument in the harmonisation of research. The proximity of the topic discussed in either set of articles was most domestic, as both articles in left- and right-leaning papers focused on the domestic impact of the ERA. Although most articles from both aisles refrain from explicitly endorsing or rejecting the ERA. Several articles from left-leaning newspapers did expressly support the ERA, especially *The*

Irish Times, which consistently supported the ERA. Lastly, the language was generally informational on both sides of the aisle, although articles from left-leaning newspapers did mix information and emotionally laded sentences. The latter articles also mostly endorsed the ERA, with a *The Irish Times* article from August 2004 rejecting the ERA.

The results for the U.K. in terms of visibility also broadly followed the pattern of Irish articles. Amongst articles in left-leaning newspapers, there was a balanced division between articles coded as VIS-BIG and VIS-SML. In contrast, more articles from right-leaning papers appeared to allot greater attention to the ERA. Articles from both left-leaning papers as well as right portrayed the EU neutrally. Interestingly no articles from right-leaning papers diverged from framing the EU neutrally, whilst on the other side of the aisle, there were more articles which framed the EU negatively than positively. *The Guardian* articles framed the EU as a messy and inefficient bureaucratic institution, in which funding related to the ERA is wasted. For both left and right, the ERA was similarly framed as a domestic or European topic. Articles from right-leaning newspapers were evenly spread across either being neutral towards the ERA or supporting it. Whilst left-leaning papers employed more neutral frames compared to positive frames. Notably, only one article explicitly rejected the ERA, namely *The Financial Times* from November 2002. Lastly, the language employed was evenly spread between purely informational and a combination of informational and emotional for both types of articles.

Articles in German newspapers were mostly coded as VIS-BIG for both articles from left- and right-leaning newspapers. The tone was also mostly neutral across the board, except for the *Frankfurter Rundschau* interview articles from September 2003, here again, the EU is framed as a slow and inefficient institution. Articles from left-leaning papers were evenly spread between framing the ERA as a domestic and European topic, whilst all articles from right-leaning papers framed it as a domestic concern. Most remained neutral towards the EU although one December 2009 article from the left-leaning *Der Tagesspiegel*, which framed the ERA as a necessary tool for improving the output of the Free University of Berlin. The language used by left-leaning papers was most informational. In contrast, the right-leaning papers were coded as LAN-MIX.

The final country analysed, Austria, saw most articles coded as VIS-SML on both sides of the aisle The framing of the EU was again mostly neutral on both sides of the aisle. Although the left-leaning *Der Standard* from November 2000, framed the EU negatively, pointing out its inefficiencies in the domain of R&D compared to the U.S. All Austrian articles framed the ERA as a domestic concern, as well as framed it neutrally. The exception here are two articles from right-leaning papers *Die Presse* and *Der Standard* from August 2001 and October 2004 respectively. Concluding, the language employed was a combination of pure information and a mixture of informational and emotional for both types of papers.

This case-by-case discussion has illustrated that European media, whether left-leaning or right-leaning tend to report on EU social policy by attributing a generous word count to their articles, however generally maintaining a neutral tone towards the EU as well as the social policy in question. Importantly articles often reported on the policy neutrally, if not, then positively. Very few articles overall explicitly opposed the social policy selected for this analysis, of the 68 only 2 were opposed. The two articles were from left-leaning papers from both the U.K and Germany. Concerning Esping-Andersen's (1990) welfare state typology it cannot be assumed that media in different welfare state regimes frame the EU's policy differently due to the variance in welfare, based on the results found in the analysis.

In relation to the theoretical assumptions formulated several chapters ago; *Right-leaning media will frame the EU policy as a cost, whilst the left-leaning media will frame the policy as a benefit*. There was no evidence to support this assumption. That is to mean, that no observed articles from right-leaning newspapers framed the ERA as a cost. Quite the opposite, the only articles which framed the ERA as a cost were articles from left-leaning papers. Moreover, articles from left-leaning papers did indeed frame the ERA as a benefit, although they did not do this exclusively, they also refrained from framing the ERA whatsoever, and a proportion was coded as END-NE. Articles from right-leaning articles also framed the ERA as a benefit.

Conclusion

To conclude, this thesis has found that the reporting of EU policy does not appear to show any evidence of variation between left- and right-leaning newspapers. Instead, framing was relatively similar between both sources. Furthermore, the theoretical assumption formulated could not be substantiated as the results indicated articles from right-leaning newspapers mostly portrayed the EU neutrally, as well as articles from left-leaning papers. The implications of the findings are two-fold. Firstly, the research adds to the ever-growing literature on media framing. The findings of this thesis, enable a greater understanding of how the media present information, specifically within the context of the EU and the ERA. Second, the findings suggest the ERA policy cannot be categorised along traditional left-right dimensions. This is because the framing was relatively similar to the two different political ideologies.

On the other hand, there are nevertheless limitations. These biases are acknowledged. The analytical focus on newspapers presents an elite bias as newspapers and their consequent readers are not fully representative of an entire population, thus the discussion regarding the results cannot be held as factual. This is because readers of newspapers are generally considered to be well educated, as well as middle class. They in turn may have more pre-existing knowledge regarding the EU, thus media influence is weaker. Secondly, newspapers are becoming the lesser popular form of journalistic media for many, as technology advances and the emergence of 24-hour news networks. This means newspapers may not be the ideal unit of analysis to represent contemporary predominant frames.

Finally, the ERA is a specific policy within the field of R&D, its results may not reflect the results of different EU policies in a similar analysis. Future research should aim to expand their recording unit for media sources to include newer forms of media, with greater inclusion of partisan media. To sum, future research should attempt to further the knowledge on media bias, but also the variation in framing according to different forms of EU policy.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Azrout, R., Van Spanje, J., & De Vreese, C. (2012). When news matters: Media effects on public support for European union enlargement in 21 countries. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, *50*(5), 691–708. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5965.2012.02255.x

Berry, M., Garcia-Blanco, I., & Moore, K. (2016). *Press coverage of the refugee and migrant crisis in the EU: A content analysis of five European countries*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/87078/

Blekesaune, M., & Quadagno, J. (2003). Public attitudes toward welfare state policies: A comparative analysis of 24 nations. *European Sociological Review*, *19*(5), 415–427. https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/19.5.415

Bonoli, G. (1997). Classifying welfare states: A two-dimension approach. *Journal of Social Policy*, *26*(3), 351–372. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047279497005059

Brosius, A., van Elsas, E. J., & de Vreese, C. H. (2019). How media shape political trust: News coverage of immigration and its effects on trust in the European Union. *European Union Politics*, *20*(3), 447–467. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116519841706

Brüggemann, M., Engesser, S., Büchel, F., Humprecht, E., & Castro, L. (2014). Hallin and Mancini revisited: Four empirical types of Western media systems. *Journal of Communication*, *64*(6), 1037–1065. https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12127

Burstein, P. (2003). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review and an agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, *56*(1), 29. https://doi.org/10.2307/3219881

Carey, S., & Burton, J. (2004). Research note: The influence of the press in shaping public opinion towards the European Union in Britain. *Political Studies*, *52*(3), 623–640. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2004.00499.x

Castro-Herrero, L., Hopmann, D. N., & Engesser, S. (2016). Parties, ideology, and news media in Central-Eastern and Western Europe. *East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures*, *30*(3), 571–593. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325415625090

Claassen, C. (2019). Does public support help democracy survive? *American Journal of Political Science*, *64*(1), 118–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12452

Commission of the European Communities. (2000). *Communication from the commission to the council, the European parliament, the economic and social committee and the committee of the regions: Towards a European research area*.

De Vreese, C. H. (2007). A spiral of euroscepticism: The media's fault? *Acta Politica*, *42*, 271–286. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.ap.5500186

De Vreese, C. H., Banducci, S. A., Semetko, H. A., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2006). The news coverage of the 2004 European parliamentary election campaign in 25 countries. *European Union Politics*, *7*(4), 477–504. https://doi.org/10.1177/1465116506069440

Della Vigna, S., & Kaplan, E. (2008). Information and public choice: From media markets to policy making. In R. Islam (Ed.), *Information and Public Choice: from Media Markets to Policy Making*. World Bank.

deutschland.de. (2020, March 26). *National newspapers in Germany*. Deutschland.de. https://www.deutschland.de/en/topic/knowledge/national-newspapers#:~:text=BILD,lot%20of%20hits%20each%20day.

Duffy, B., Hall, S., O'Leary, D., & Pope, S. (2013). *Generation Strains: a Demos and Ipsos MORI report on changing attitudes to welfare*. Demos.

Easton, D. (1965). *A systems analysis of political life*. John Wiley & Sons.

Eberl, J.-M. (2019). Lying press: Three levels of perceived media bias and their relationship with political preferences. *Communications*, *44*(1), 5–32. https://doi.org/10.1515/commun-2018-0002

Esping-Andersen, G. (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*. Princeton University Press.

ESS. (2016). *Welfare attitudes (ESS4 2008, ESS8 2016)*. European Social Survey. https://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/data/themes.html?t=welfare

European Commission. (2021). *European research area*. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/info/research-and-innovation/strategy/strategy-2020-2024/our-digital-future/era_en

European Parliament. (2019a, July 4). *Seats by political group and country: 2019-2024*. Europarl.europa.eu. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/election-results-2019/en/seats-political-group-country/2019-2024/

European Parliament. (2019b, October 22). *Turnout 2019: European election results. European Parliament*. Europarl.europa.eu. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/election-results-2019/en/turnout/

eurotopics. (n.d.). *European press roundup*. Eurotopics.net. Retrieved May 1, 2022, from https://www.eurotopics.net/en/149270/european-press-roundup

Feldman, S., & Zaller, J. (1992). The political culture of ambivalence: Ideological responses to the welfare state. *American Journal of Political Science*, *36*(1), 268. https://doi.org/10.2307/2111433

Ferrera, M. (1996). The "Southern model" of welfare in social Europe. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *6*(1), 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/095892879600600102

Halperin, S., & Heath, O. (2020). *Political research: Methods and practical skills* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Hobolt, S. B., & De Vries, C. E. (2016). Public support for European integration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *19*(1), 413–432. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-042214-044157

Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2009). A postfunctionalist theory of European integration: From permissive consensus to constraining dissensus. *British Journal of Political Science*, *39*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123408000409

Khabaz, D. (2018). Framing Brexit: The role, and the impact, of the national newspapers on the EU referendum. *Newspaper Research Journal*, *39*(4), 496–508. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739532918806871

Lichter, S. R. (2014). Theories of media bias. In K. Kenski & K. H. Jamieson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Communication*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199793471.013.44_update_001

Lindvall, J., & Rueda, D. (2018). Public opinion, party politics, and the welfare state. In *Welfare Democracies and Party Politics: Explaining Electoral Dynamics in Times of Changing Welfare Capitalism*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198807971.003.0004

Lipset, S. M. (1959). Some social requisites of democracy: Economic development and political legitimacy. *The American Political Science Review*, *53*(1), 69–105.

Magni, G. (2022). Replication data for: Boundaries of solidarity: Immigrants, economic contributions, and welfare attitudes. *American Journal of Political Science*, *Forthcoming*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/WMPXIW

Matthes, J. (2011). Framing politics: An integrative approach. *American Behavioral Scientist, 56*(3), 247–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211426324

Menéndez Alarcón, A. V. (2010). Media representation of the European Union: Comparing newspaper coverage in France, Spain and the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Communication, 4*, 398–415. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/730

Neimanns, E. (2021). Welfare states, media ownership and attitudes towards redistribution. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2021.1986117

OECD. (2020). *Social expenditure database*. OECD.org. https://www.oecd.org/social/expenditure.htm

RSF. (2022). *World press freedom index*. Rsf.org. https://rsf.org/en/index?year=2022

Saraisky, N. G. (2016). Analyzing public discourse: Using media content analysis to understand the policy process. *Current Issues in Comparative Education, 18*(1), 26–41. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1095584

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage.

Semetko, H. A., & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication, 50*(2), 93–109. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2000.tb02843.x

Statista. (2022a, February). *National daily newspaper: Most popular newspapers France 2021*. Statista.com. https://www.statista.com/statistics/784974/paid-circulation-volume-national-dailies-by-publication-france/#:~:text=In%202021%2C%20the%20newspaper%20Le

Statista. (2022b, February 22). *EU contributions by country*. Statista.com. https://www.statista.com/statistics/316691/eu-budget-contributions-by-country/

Taylor-Gooby, P., Leruth, B., & Chung, H. (2017). Liberalism, social investment, protectionism, and chauvinism. In *Oxford Scholarship Online*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198790266.003.0010

Toshkov, D. (2016). *Research design in political science*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Tsfati, Y., & Walter, N. (2019). The world of news and politics. In A. A. Raney, M. B. Oliver, & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. Routledge.

Van Kersbergen, K., & Vis, B. (2014). Welfare state regimes: Why did we get different worlds of welfare and do we still have them? In *Comparative Welfare State Politics: development, opportunities, and Reform* (pp. 53–77). Cambridge University Press.

Van Oorschot, W. (2006). Making the difference in social Europe: Deservingness perceptions among citizens of European welfare states. *Journal of European Social Policy*, *16*(1), 23–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0958928706059829

Vladisavljević, N. (2015, May). Media framing of political conflict: A review of the literature. *Media Conflict and Democratisation*. http://www.mecodem.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Vladisavljević-2015_Media-framing-of-political-conflict_-a-review-of-the-literature.pdf

Vliegenthart, R., Schuck, A. R. T., Boomgaarden, H. G., & De Vreese, C. H. (2008). News coverage and support for European integration, 1990-2006. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *20*(4), 415–439. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijpor/edn044

Vorderer, P., Park, D. W., & Lutz, S. (2019). A history of media effects research traditions. In A. A. Raney, M. B. Oliver, & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. Routledge.

Westerståhl, J. (1983). Objective news reporting: General premises. *Communication Research*, *10*(3), 403–424. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365083010003007

Secondary sources

Ahlstrom, D. (2001, February 8). Planning for European research area in plants. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2004, November 11). Calls for more EU funding of basic research. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2006, December 28). A big twinkle in the sky. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2009, December 4). A new renaissance. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2012a, June 26). Central body to oversee "biotanks" storing human tissue focus of report. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2012b, July 2). "Policy Day" will stimulate scientific dialogue. *The Irish Times*.

Ahlstrom, D. (2013, May 21). Investing to keep scientific expertise in Europe. *The Irish Times*.

Beesley, A. (2010, January 7). Europe-wide code of consumer rights and contracts rooted. *The Irish Times*.

Brüssel legt neues Forschungshandbuch vor. (2000, November 14). *Der Standard*.

Butterworth, J. (2013, May 20). Scientific Research and the European Union. *The Guardian*.

Cash call on brain drain. (2002, July 3). *The Times*.

Cookson, C. (2002a, November 14). EU launches plan to boost R&D spending. *The Financial Times*.

Cookson, C. (2002b, November 20). Warning over harmonisation of clinical trials. *The Financial Times*.

Cookson, C. (2009, October 8). EU research boost. *The Financial Times*.

Corbett, A. (2003, May 27). European universities are quietly forging new links to integrate qualifications. *The Guardian*.

Dooley, C. (2004, January 9). Harney pledges reforms to aid business. *The Irish Times*.

European fund for animal health research aims to tackle disease. (2011, April 14). *Irish Examiner*.

Floud, R. (2000, April 25). There are now more radios in... *The Guardian*.

Floud, R. (2003, March 25). UK universities are at the heart of Europe, but the government is putting that at risk. *The Guardian*.

Fontanella-Khan, J. (2012, July 17). EU plan for research to hit publishers. *The Financial Times*.

Gray, R. (2012, January 1). Telescope to be built in deep sea of the Mediterranean. *The Telegraph*.

Gurdgiev, C. (2004, August 28). State financing of research a waste of taxpayer's money. *The Irish Times*.

Heinemann, K.-H. (2003, September 10). Ein Abschied vom selbstverantwortlichen Studieren. *Frankfurter Rundschau*.

Hollinger, P. (2008, July 2). Minister blazes trail for greater research co-operation. *The Financial Times*.

Kane, A. (2002, September 10). Little-Irelanders make way for the EU science community. *The Sunday Business Post*.

Kuffner, A. (2009, April 15). Kommunikation im grünen Kraftwerk; Markus Teige koordiniert ein EU-weites Netzwerk zu Chloroplasten-Forschung. *Der Standard*.

Lee, Y.-C., & Wagner, C. (2004, August 25). The world should share its science. *The Financial Times*.

Leinen, J. (2005, January 13). A community of values and common goals. *Birmingham Post*.

Lepenies, W. (2007, December 12). Wird aus der Leopoldina unsere Nationalakademie? *Die Welt*.

Lipsett, A. M. (2003, April 15). The European Commission has a staggering £11bn on offer for research - to anyone with the determination and tenacity to tackle a Mont Blanc of red tape first. *The Guardian*.

Mehr Mittel aus Brüssel. (2014, January 22). *Die Presse*.

Mit hohen Zielen zu neuen Horizonten. (2014, January 22). *Der Standard*.

New €3.6m drive against liver fluke. (2006, April 16). *Irish Independent*.

Newing, R. (2002, September 18). Brussels seeks more bang for its bucks or euros. *The Financial Times*.

Ni Cheallaigh, G. (2001, March 29). Biotechnology plan criticised. *The Irish Times*.

Nordling, L. (2005, February 22). The European Union has launched an information network aimed at luring researchers back from the US. *The Guardian*.

Norman, P. (2000, March 22). Prodi upbeat on accords ahead of EU summit. *The Financial Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2010a, June 24). Not the time to relax efforts having reach the global R&D stage. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2010b, August 26). Ireland recognised by US as major competitor for researchers. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2011a, May 26). The future of funding is critical. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2011b, August 25). Bringing down the research barriers. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2012a, May 24). Research in a developing EU area. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2012b, October 25). Ireland is on the path to Open Access. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2013a, May 23). Research key area for job growth. *The Guardian*.

O'Carroll, C. (2013b, August 29). Mobility of researchers: how open is Europe? *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2013c, September 26). Employment prospects of PhD grads in sharp focus. *The Irish Times*.

O'Carroll, C. (2013d, November 28). EU puts research firmly on the Horizon. *The Irish Times*.

O'Mahony, B. (2002, July 13). €16bn scheme will lead to wide range of research. *Irish Examiner*.

Plan would allow EU researchers to move more easily. (2011, September 14). *Irish Examiner*.

Researching the research. (2000, November 21). *The Guardian*.

Rögener, W. (2002, November 19). Binnenmarkt des Wissens. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*.

Rose, H., & Rose, S. (2013, May 13). Stephen Hawking's boycott hits Israel where it hurts: science. *The Guardian*.

Schulze Berndt, M. (2000, March 25). Europas Schulen bis 2001 ans Netz. *Stuttgarter Zeitung*.

Siggins, L. (2004, May 10). International scientific conference for Galway. *The Irish Times*.

Siggins, L. (2005, April 29). Fisheries board chief sees fair wind for sector. *The Irish Times*.

Siggins, L. (2010, March 20). Geoghegan-Quinn outlines EU's top research priorities. *The Irish Times*.

Smith, M. (2000, January 18). Brussels sets out EU patent plan. *The Financial Times*.

Smyth, P. (2000a, March 17). Britain, Republic to submit joint paper. *The Irish Times*.

Smyth, P. (2000b, March 24). EU leaders back 10-year economic reform package. *The Irish Times*.

Tánaiste outlines priorities for EU Competitiveness Council. (2004, January 8). *Irish Examiner*.

Thompson, S. (2006, October 10). Growth of the golden years. *The Irish Times*.

UK researchers take grants overseas. (2005, June 17). *The Guardian*.

Ungerboeck, L. (2004, October 11). Hundert Partner, das ist ja viel zu groß! *Der Standard*.

Warnecke, T. (2008, May 19). Kleinstaaterei in der Wissenschaft: Wie die EU um eine einheitliche Forschungspolitik ringt. *Der Tagesspiegel*.

Webster, P., & Fletcher, M. (2000, March 24). French put brake on summit reforms: Lisbon summit. *The Times*.

Wette, C. (2009, December 19). Die Freie Universität Berlin ist als erste deutsche Universität mit einem eigenen Büro in Brüssel vertreten. *Der Tagesspiegel*.

Wir bauen Formel-1-Autors mit Holzreifen. (2001, August 25). *Die Presse*.

Wood, K. (2003, September 21). No opposition on stem research. *The Sunday Business Post*.

Appendix

Framework Programme 5

Title	Brussels sets out EU patent plan.	
Author	Mike Smith	
Newspaper company	The Financial times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	18 January 2000	
Word count	474	
Text	The European Commission will today signal its intention to create a "community patent" to protect invention as part of a programme to overhaul the European Union's policy for fostering research. The proposal for a patent to cover all EU territories will be welcomed by European businesses, which have long argued that the current system, based on national patents, is costly and stifles innovation. It is among a range of ideas aimed at forming a "European research area" better able to arrest the growing gap between EU spending on innovation and that of the US and Japan. Europe needs a market covering the demand and supply of knowledge and technologies, according to Philippe Busquin, research commissioner. In a document expected to be approved this morning by the Commission, he suggests measures to co-ordinate centres of excellence, stimulate mobility of researchers and transfer knowledge between communities. The EU is committed to spending Euros 15bn (#9.3bn) over four years to support research. But "it cannot be said that there is a European policy on research", said Mr Busquin. "We have 15 member states with big research programmes but they do not work well together.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	"We need to provide the catalyst to create critical mass, economies of scale and better allocation of resources." Mr Busquin will tell fellow commissioners today that last year, the EU spent 1.8 per cent of its gross domestic product on research and development compared with 2.8 per cent in the US and 2.9 per cent in Japan. Since 1994 the gap has been growing. Ideas for narrowing the gap include the identification and mapping of centres of excellence to ensure their expertise is well known outside their countries. A "council of high representatives" for research organisations could also be created. The Commission intends to increase mobility of researchers by promoting grants for people working outside their countries of origin and by encouraging greater traffic of scientists between the academic and business worlds. Mr Busquin also wants to introduce systematic "benchmarking" between member states centred on national plans, covering issues such as investment and fiscal incentives, all of which would be assessed regularly by the Commission. However the European business community is likely to focus initially on the Commission's efforts to create a European patent system. Although a European Patents Office already exists, the system it administers is based on national patents valid only in countries where they are issued. According to today's document, the cost of patents is a big obstacle to their widespread use in Europe. A European patent should be started up as soon as possible, the document says. "It must be readily affordable ... and efforts need to be made to reduce the costs of translation." Mr Busquin said the European Court of Justice should be the appeal court in patent disputes and this would require amending EU treaties	

Title	Britain, Republic to submit joint paper	
Author	Patrick Smyth	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	17 March 2000	
Word count	249	
Text	The paper concerns lighter regulation and easier access to venture capital for firms The British and Irish Governments have joined together to make a submission to next week's EU Lisbon summit. The summit will focus on enterprise, the Internet and social inclusion, and the joint paper highlights issues such as targets for access by schoolchildren to the Internet and lifelong learning. The two Governments welcome the Portuguese call for a 10-year reform strategy "to make the EU the world's most dynamic and competitive area based on innovation and knowledge with more and better jobs and better social cohesion". The paper calls for a charter for small businesses to set out how member states and the EU can help enterprise through lighter regulation and easier access to venture capital and technology. Both governments will support the development of a "European Research Area". They argue for the mainstreaming of social inclusion in education, training and employment programmes and targeted programmes to address particular problems of exclusion with a particular emphasis on child poverty. The Taoiseach, Mr Ahern, in a statement in New York also welcomed the news that, according to the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), Ireland is now the world's number one exporter of software. Noting that the report refers to Ireland as "an example of the success of national policies aimed at developing a world class high-tech industry", he said "this is a very welcome endorsement of the good news story we will be bringing to Lisbon".	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

Title	Prodi upbeat on accords ahead of EU summit	
Author	Peter Norman	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	22 March 2000	
Word count	511	
Text	European Union leaders have already reached broad agreement on creating an integrated EU venture capital market in 2003 and fully integrated financial services markets in 2005 as part of plans to boost competitiveness, Romano Prodi, European Commission president, said yesterday. Speaking ahead of tomorrow's start of the two-day EU summit in Lisbon, Mr Prodi said the meeting would differ from previous gatherings in being "much more productive, constructive and focused" with clear commitments and dead-lines. He said preparations for the summit had already yielded substantial agreement on a wide programme of action. The leaders would agree full employment was a realistic objective for the EU and that unemployment - currently affecting about 10 per cent of the work-force - was "the main enemy to fight". Denmark was already showing the way with an employment rate of 78.9 per cent compared with 74 per cent in the US. Mr Prodi said the summit would "focus on people" when deciding how to speed Europe's adaptation to the knowledge-based economy. There was already broad agreement that: * All schools in the EU should be connected with the internet by 2001 * All teachers should be trained to use the new information technologies (IT) by 2002 * All EU citizens should be able to cope with IT by 2005 * There should be a marked improvement in education and employment lev-els, including more female participation in the labour force, by 2010.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	The summit, he added, would boost investment in research with a "fast track from lab to market" to speed the process of turning ideas into economic products and activities. To support innovation, the member states agreed on: * A restructuring this year of EU financial instruments, such as those of the European Investment Bank, to support business start-ups and high-tech ventures * Creation of a "European research area" better to integrate and co-ordinate research and innovation by 2002 * Creation of a single European patent by 2005. The Commission originally wanted a community patent to be adopted by next year, but Mr Prodi said the project would take longer because of the need for legislation. Mr Prodi said the summit would also seek to improve the functioning of the EU's internal market to inject more dynamism into the economy. As well as the specific steps to boost capital markets, he predicted the summit would agree: * To cut the cost this year of access to the internet through ordering greater competition among local telecommications companies * A legislative framework for e-commerce, also this year * To cut red tape for starting new businesses by 2001 * Full liberalisation of EU energy markets, creation of a single European sky for aviation and the development of rail freight freeways by 2003. Mr Prodi said the summit was likely to decide other measures. He had only listed those he was sure would be agreed. He said France, which takes over the EU's rotating presidency in July, would carry forward the process of EU reform, focusing on the need to modernise Europe's social welfare systems and combat poverty.	

Title	EU leaders back 10-year economic reform package	
Author	Patrick Smyth	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	24 March 2000	
Word count	410	
Text	Taoiseach said a charter would free small business from bureaucracy and open access to venture capital EU leaders gave their backing yesterday to a detailed 10-year programme of economic reform that they insisted would prepare Europe for the Internet age and close the competitiveness gap with the US. The Taoiseach, Mr Ahern, welcoming the consensus among fellow leaders on a wide ranging list of targets - from lifelong learning to the liberalisation of sectoral markets - last night paid particular tribute to the vision of the President of the European Commission, Mr Romano Prodi, in "seeing Europe as part of the global economy and challenging leaders to look outwards". Speaking to journalists, he said Mr Prodi's paper for the summit critically highlighted "the European paradox - a world-class ability to create knowledge and a world-class inability to turn that into jobs". Mr Ahern, who is understood to feel strongly that Mr Prodi has faced unfair media criticism over his ambitious statements, insisted on a key element of the strategy, the setting of detailed targets and benchmarking based on best practise, that put pressure on governments. "If you do not set targets, then you never do it," he said. Asked what elements of the summit programme were particularly important to Ireland, the Taoiseach highlighted three: the suggestion by Ireland, in its submission to the summit, of a charter for small businesses to free them from bureaucracy and open up access to venture capital; enhanced programmes for life-long learning such as the Irish FIT programme which, he said, was successfully bringing those who had dropped	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	out of education back into the labour market; and the development of a common European research area. Mr Ahern also emphasised the need urgently to complete a legal framework for the development of e-commerce by the end of the year. He said Europe "must have a well-thought-out vision of the future if it is to work". With the US already recording Internet penetration of some 60 per cent, the EU had a long way to go, he said. "It is important that we seize the opportunity and do it in a credible way." It was also important, the Taoiseach said, referring to the other theme of the summit, to take account of the social consequences of the changes ahead. Despite some reservations by the French about aspects of the liberalisation targets, the meeting reflected an astonishing consensus on the basics of economic policy among the 15 members.	

Title	French put brake on summit reforms: Lisbon summit	
Author	Philip Webster and Martin Fletcher	
Newspaper company	The Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	24 March 2000	
Word count	563	
Text	Tony Blair and fellow European Union leaders were struggling last night to overcome stubborn French resistance to key parts of their economic reform programme designed to help the European economies to compete with the United States. At the two-day EU summit in Lisbon, Lionel Jospin, the French Prime Minister, firmly set his face against moves to free Europe's energy and transport markets, rejecting calls for setting firm deadlines. In a further blow to Mr Blair and other "reformers", he rejected demands for wholesale liberalisation of the European telecommunications market, which Mr Blair had described as the most important issue the summit was facing. M Jospin, fresh from his retreat this week at the hands of French public sector unions over pension reform and tax collection, struck a predictably cautious stance, which suggested that he was in no mood for a further confrontation with powerful state monopolies. Mr Blair told the summit, which he has called the most important since Labour took office in 1997, that Britain had to narrow the gap with the US on e-commerce. Seventy per cent of e-commerce took place in the US and only 20 per cent in Europe. He said: "We can send no better signal from this summit than to agree to an accelerated telecommunications liberalisation. We think that is the most important of the issues facing us." Mr Blair's stance is backed by the European Commission, which wants the summit today to agree to slash Internet access fees by the end of the year, connect all schools to the Internet by 2001 and have all its citizens IT-literate by 2005.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	M Jospin's spokesman said he was opposed to too dramatic a shake-up: "The liberalisation of telecommunications is in line with creating the conditions for a new economy, but it should not be done in too drastic a fashion." M Jospin also said that liberating the transport and energy industries should not be part of the economic programme being considered at this summit. He made clear that his preference was for the issue to be shelved and made part of a debate on "the evolution of public services in Europe". The French leader is against the idea that Europe should be trying to match best practice in the US. But Mr Blair praised US economic success and said European leaders could not ignore it. British officials admitted the French had "considerable difficulties". Despite M Jospin's doubts, British officials were optimistic of a successful outcome to the discussions. The Prime Minister's spokesman said; "A number of governments are singing from the same song-sheet. We feel this is shaping up in the way we had hoped." Mr Blair wants the summit to begin the process of changing public attitudes to Europe and said: "We believe this growing consensus on economic reform will help convince the financial markets that Europe is serious about reform, help to attract investments and promote the business confidence that is necessary for strong economic growth." Today's end-of-summit agreement will set a series of targets and deadlines for making Europe the most dynamic economic area in the world by 2010 through embracing information technology. It will propose fostering new technology companies by cutting red tape, improving access to venture capital and creating a pan-European research area. It will set dates for completing the single market, investing in training and education and achieving full employment by 2010.	

Title	Europas Schulen bis 2001 ans Netz	
Author	Mariele Schulze Berndt	
Newspaper company	Stuttgarter Zeitung	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 March 2000	
Word count	410	
Text	Internet wird für die EU zum zentralen Medium - Telekommunikation soll liberalisiert werden LISSABON. Der europäische Gipfel in Lissabon hat ein breites Bündel von Maßnahmen zur Förderung der modernen Informationsgesellschaft beschlossen. Doch nur ein Teil dieser Maßnahmen fällt auch in den Verantwortungsbereich der Europäischen Union. Von Mariele Schulze Berndt Für die wichtigsten Ziele des EU-Sondergipfels im Bereich der Bildungs-, Forschungs-und Beschäftigungspolitik sind die Mitgliedstaaten zuständig, in Deutschland sogar die Bundesländer. Insofern kann es geraume Zeit dauern, bis die zum Teil vorsichtig formulierten Ziele europaweit umgesetzt werden. Konkrete Arbeitsaufträge hat der Gipfel dem Rat der Außenminister erteilt. Sie sollen noch in diesem Jahr seit langem diskutierte Rechtsvorschriften für den elektronischen Handel beschließen. Diese betreffen Urheberrechte und verwandte Schutzrechte, elektronisches Geld und Regelungen für elektronische Finanzdienstleistungen. Die gerichtliche Zuständigkeit und die Vollstreckung von Urteilen sollen über das Internet geregelt werden. Außerdem wird die neue Ausfuhrkontrollregelung für Güter mit doppelter Verwendbarkeit, ziviler und militärischer, noch in diesem Jahr verabschiedet werden. Bis 2002 wird es neue Regeln für den Einkauf seitens staatlicher Stellen geben. Ein Jahr später sollen öffentliche Aufträge der Gemeinschaft und der Regierungen elektronisch abgewickelt werden können.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	Im Verantwortungsbereich der EU-Staaten liegt, dass bis 2001 der Telekommunikationsmarkt vollständig liberalisiert wird. Vor Ende 2000 sollen die Staaten einen größeren Wettbewerb bei Ortsanschlussnetzen einführen, um so die Kosten der Internet-Nutzung zu senken. Bis 2001 sollen alle Schulen in der EU Zugang zum Internet und zu Multimedia-Material haben. Lehrer werden entsprechend geschult. Die Mitgliedstaaten müssen den Zugang zu öffentlichen Diensten und zur öffentlichen Verwaltung übers Internet ermöglichen. Damit verbunden ist der Vorsatz, Hochgeschwindigkeitsnetze in Europa preiswert miteinander zu verbinden. Die Staats-und Regierungschefs haben vereinbart, die Zahl der 18-bis 24-Jährigen ohne weiterführende Schulbildung bis 2010 zu halbieren. Unter dem Motto "Lebenslanges Lernen" sollen Fremdsprachen, Computer-Fertigkeiten und soziale Fähigkeiten als "neue Grundfertigkeiten" festgelegt werden. Außerdem ist ein europäisches Muster für Lebensläufe geplant, um so die Mobilität zu fördern. Es soll freiwillig genutzt werden. Eine europaweite Datenbank für Arbeitsvermittlungsstellen ist überdies angedacht. Ein europäischer Forschungsraum würde dann ermöglichen, dass Programme aufeinander abgestimmt, private Forschungsinvestitionen erhöht werden und der Zugang zu Risikokapital verbessert wird. Bis 2001 soll ein EU-weiter Patentschutz einfach und kostengünstig zu erlangen sein. Die Regierungschefs haben sich weiter vorgenommen, die Bedingungen für kleinere und mittlere Unternehmen zu verbessern. Das gilt vor allem für den EU-weiten Zugang zu Investitionskapital. Bis Juni 2000 soll eine europäische Charta für kleine und mittlere Unternehmen verabschiedet werden, die die Mitgliedstaaten zur besonderen Förderung der kleinen Unternehmen verpflichten wird.	

Title	There are now more radios in…	
Author	Roderick Floud	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 April	
Word count	875	
Text	There are now more radios in the US, and possibly the UK, than the population has ears; cables thread the streets; and half the population uses mobile phones. Yet no one is satisfied with the quality of material sent down the line. If we are to reap the benefits of the knowledge economy, we need to switch attention from hardware to content. This is a hard lesson to learn. Until 1800, most people grew food. For the last 200 years, and to the great benefit of our standard of living, we have been making things. Now the very success of manufacturing means that fewer of us need to do it; more of us, by contrast, provide services, for business and for leisure. This is the content of the knowledge economy. Just as fundamental research underpinned technology in the 20th century, so it must support services in the 21st. It already does. BBC TV's stunning Walking with Dinosaurs depended on palaeobiology as much as on multimedia and animation. The derivatives traders of the City of London exploit basic mathematics. Tourism is being transformed by virtual museums and art galleries. That is why it is essential for Britain, and its universities, to seize a new opportunity. Last month in Lisbon, stimulated by Philippe Busquin, the Commissioner for Research, the European heads of government demanded urgent action to set up a European research area as a viable international competitor for the US. The first actions have to be planned by June and underway by the end of the year. Crucially, the presidents and prime ministers realised that we have to build up capacity for research across the board. They want action to attract and retain research talent.	VIS-BIG TO-PO PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

There is to be, by the end of 2001, a high-speed electronic network for universities, libraries and even schools. European and national research programmes are to be brought together. Barriers to mobility of staff
and students have to be removed. There is even to be a system for assessing, across Europe, research excellence and success in developing good researchers. All this gives Britain an opportunity to demonstrate its wide-ranging research strengths.

These new actions go far beyond the limited aims of the existing Framework programmes of the European Union. British universities have done well from Framework 5 and its predecessors, securing #143m from EU sources in 1997-98, part of the overall spending of about #2,000m. Britain has taken part in many more projects than any other European country. So it is crucial that higher education and the government together help to shape future activities.

It is particularly important to be imaginative. Britain is good at IT, the biosciences and engineering, all of which have figured largely in the Framework programmes. We have even done well in librarianship,
stimulated by digitisation. But whole areas of research in which Britain also excels have so far played little part.

Take the creative industries. They employ over one million people in Britain and generate about #60bn in revenues. Growing rapidly, they depend on art and design schools turning out tens of thousands of graduates, many of whom are finding jobs in the rest of Europe. Film, television and publishing depend on them to develop new techniques and products.

In other fields, research in ceramics at Staffordshire or in glass at Sunderland advance both artistic and industrial techniques. Yet research in art and design doesn't figure in EU programmes and is underfunded even in Britain.

Or take the social sciences. In the early Framework programmes, the social sciences had either no place or a subordinate role; they were there to help society cope with the consequences of scientific and technological change. At worst, they were there to persuade an unwilling public that there were no dangers from such change.

	Now, their role has to be much more positive. The European heads of government recognised the importance of research in achieving employment and social cohesion. Understanding social and economic problems is the first step to solving them. David Blunkett recently emphasised the need for British government policies to be underpinned by good social and economic research; now this needs to be done on a European scale. As one example, work at the Institute of Education and Essex University has shown the potential for the analysis of social exclusion of longitudinal data sets allied to new analysis techniques; these can be applied across Europe. Then there are the humanities. If there is one area of research that should be at the heart of the `knowledge economy', it is surely the accumulation of understanding of how people think and behave. What is the internet but a vast encyclopaedia - though without sufficient quality control? Historians and literary critics, with university libraries, should be at the forefront of providing learning resources with a quality seal. Science and technology remain vital to Europe, but they are not the whole story. Traditional areas of research have dominated Britain's response so far to Busquin's ideas, but it is in Britain's interest to think more imaginatively and to seize the full benefits of the knowledge economy. Now that the Prime Minister and David Blunkett have shown the way, will the Office of Science and Technology and then the European Commission be prepared to follow?	

Title	Brüssel legt neues Forschungshandbuch vor	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Der Standard	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	14 November 2000	
Word count	326	
Text	Brüssel - Wie sehr Ausbildungssystem, Forschung, Innovation und wirtschaftliche Leistung miteinander verknüpft sind, illustriert das soeben erschienene Statistikhandbuch der EU, "Key Figures", das zugleich Parallelen zu Japan und den USA zieht. Einige der Fakten: Bei dem Verhältnis von Leistung (gemessen an Wachstum, Beschäftigung und Konkurrenzfähigkeit) und Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation hat sich gezeigt, dass der Hochtechnologiesektor und die wissensintensiven Dienstleistungen 1999 in der EU deutlich am Wirtschafts-und Beschäftigungswachstum beteiligt waren. In diesen Sektoren arbeiten EU-weit nur etwa 20 Prozent aller Beschäftigten, doch der Beschäftigungszuwachs ist doppelt so hoch wie im produzierenden Sektor (Hightech plus 1,7 gegenüber 0,9 Prozent, hochkarätige Dienstleistungen: plus 6,4 gegenüber drei Prozent). F&E zu knapp dotiert Bei den Investitionen in Wissen (Forschung/Entwicklung, Bildung, Software) und in Risikokapital sieht es in der EU allerdings traurig aus: Während der für F&E ausgegebene BIP-Anteil zwischen 1994 und 1999 in Japan und den USA kontinuierlich gestiegen ist (Amerika derzeit 2,7, Japan 3,1 Prozent), ist er in Europa auf läppischen 1,8 Prozent stehen geblieben. Um die Humanressourcen in Wissenschaft und Technologie ist es nicht besser bestellt: In der EU sind nur 5,1 Prozent aller Beschäftigten Forscher, in den USA dagegen 7,4 und in Japan sogar 8,9 Prozent. Betrachtet man ausschließlich die Industrieforschung, ist der Unterschied noch größer. Plus 2,1 Prozent	VIS-SML TO-NG PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Der Vergleich des globalen wissenschaftlichen und innovativen Outputs brachte jedoch eine positive Überraschung: Der Anteil der EU an den Wissenschaftspublikationen und Zitationen steigt rasch, und zwar um 1,7 Prozent jährlich bei den Publikationen und um 2,1 bei den Zitationen. Insgesamt brachte es die EU 1998 auf 37,8 Prozent aller Publikationen (USA 32,9) und auf 38,2 Prozent aller Zitationen (USA 51 Prozent). Die USA dagegen lassen nach: minus 2,1 bzw. 0,9 Prozent pro Jahr. In puncto Kooperation zwischen Unternehmen wiederum hat Europa Aufholbedarf. Während es in Nordeuropa bereits gut funktioniert, ist die Kooperation in anderen Ländern noch unterentwickelt. Alle für das neue Handbuch eruierten "Schlüsseldaten" sollen dazu beitragen, auf dem Weg zur geplanten "European Research Area" (ERA) schneller voranzukommen.	

Title	Researching the research	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	21 November 2000	
Word count	282	
Text	Could things be more uncertain over the future direction of university research? The research community awaits the conclusion of no fewer than seven different reviews. And you don't have to be geneticist bioinformatician to spot the underlying theme. The topics cover: allocating money to researchers (government spending review); making sure it is properly spent by academics (transparency review); allocating money for research more efficiently in the future (funding council reviews, quinquennial review of research councils); making more money out of research (government science white paper and Foresight consultation); and, finally, making sure money isn't spent on duplicating research (European research area). New budgets for the government's six research councils will be unveiled tomorrow following the conclusions of the Whitehall spending review. And there will be good news for scientists from disciplines as diverse as astronomy and particle physics, medical research and engineering. Apart from healthy real-terms increases for most of the councils' core budgets, they will all get something from the #250m cross-cutting themes being announced. So the biotechnology and biological sciences and medical sciences will benefit from more money for genomic research. The particle physicists and environmental scientists will benefit from extra funding for e-science, and future powerful computing networks. The engineers will be able to build new detectors and instruments through extra support for basic technologies. And social scientists are getting some extra funds for business schools.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	And all this comes on the back of the surprise announcement last week that academic salaries will be boosted to the tune of #330m over the next three years. University heads next week have organised a conference partly to digest these new funding plans, but also to consider the future direction of research.	

Title	Planning for European research area in plants	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	8 February 2001	
Word count	467	
Text	Ireland has been the clearing house for 400 laboratories across the EU involved in plant biotechnology over the past year. Dick Ahlstrom examines its work If you want to learn about anything to do with plant biotechnology research in Europe then talk to the people at University College Dublin. The National Agricultural and Veterinary Biotechnology Centre there has spent the past 12 months in charge of the EU's European Plant Biotechnology Network. "The Network was launched to bring together 400 research labs that were involved in research under Framework Programme Four," explained Ms Ciara O'Shea who is based at UCD. It was designed to be a focus point for the great variety of research projects on plant biotech that have taken place since the Network was set up in June 1998. It was originally run from the University of Ghent in Belgium and the centre at UCD, a branch of BioResearch Ireland, took charge a year ago. Its three aims were to promote networking between the research centres and the dissemination of results; to improve the co-ordination of research activity; and to raise public awareness of what plant biotechnology involves, Ms O'Shea said. "The Network promoted communications between the research centres," she said. Ghent initiated a database that was added to throughout the life of the EPBN programme, which ended on December 31st. A web site was also started and although the Network programme has ended, the site and the database will remain in operation for another six months, Ms O'Shea said. The	VIS-SML TO-PO PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Network "achieved its aims", she said, and what it accomplished would now be carried forward into new bodies including the European Plant Science Organisation, TerraUK, the European network in agriculture and related bio-tech research, and the European Plant Industrial Platform. What was learned, however, will inform ongoing efforts by the Commission to establish a working "European Research Area", a network similar to the EPBN but encompassing all forms of research in the European Union. Plans for the European Research Area (ERA) were launched in January 2000 and a series of studies and assessments are showing what needs to be done to accomplish an ERA. The EU's main research funding is done under the Framework Programmes, with the current Framework Six worth E14bn, more than #11bn. Yet this represents just five per cent of what the Community spends collectively on research. The goal of the ERA is to coordinate this massive spend and to make the research findings available to others, much the same as the Network did for plant biotechnology. Progress should be rapid, given that science policy is now formally on the agenda of every EU summit - and the new Swedish presidency which began on January 1st has stated its intention to bring achievement of the ERA along as quickly as possible.	

Title	Biotechnology plan criticised	
Author	Gillian Ni Cheallaigh	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	29 March 2001	
Word count	404	
Text	An EU move to revitalise biotechnology and GM food development in Europe has been strongly criticised by Irish MEPs, who claimed a key report on the sector's future is heavily biased in favour of industry. Independent Ms Dana Rosemary Scallon and the Green Party's Ms Nuala Ahern claim the Purvis Report on the Future of the Biotechnology Industry in the EU was unduly influenced by the views of the main biotechnology companies. Ms Scallon said: "It reads like a wish-list for the industry," adding that it had dismissed organic farming and included an "almost unrestricted patenting system" which would eliminate national patenting controls. Ms Ahern alleged the report's "interventionist and unashamedly pro-biotech" tone was probably due to the input of pharmaceuticals giant Glaxo Smithkline in early drafting. Ms Ahern told The Irish Times. "I saw that with my own eyes." A spokesman for Glaxo Smithkline denied the company was heavily involved in writing the report, saying "we gave our views in the normal way" when it was approached for information - as often happened when reports were written. Ms Ahern said the report failed to address serious concerns such as ethics in biotechnology; public health; consumers' concerns regarding food; and the effects on the environment. In a series of recent decisions the EU has attempted to bring biotechnology back to centre stage of industrial development. The European Parliament has voted in favour of the report which calls for greater institutional and financial backing - essentially asking for more money to be spent on biotechnology initiatives and for them to be more easily facilitated.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	The EU heads of state at last weekend's Stockholm Summit strengthened this position, asking the Commission to develop a Bio-Europe Action Plan. The parliament's acceptance of the report further concretes the EU's commitment in the 2000 Lisbon Summit to a "European Research Area" aimed at bringing Europe level with the US in research and biotechnology innovations. The European Association for Bioindustries, EuropaBio, welcomed the EU's recent reaffirmations "that a competitive biotechnology industry will be a key requirement for Europe in the 21st century". The body's chairman, Dr Erik Tambuyzer, said: "We are pleased that the European Council sees biotechnology as an important part of the process of making Europe the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world." According to EuropaBio, the Purvis report calls for support from member-states for research into biotech applications offering clear social or environmental benefits.	

Title	Wir bauen Formel-1-Autors mit Holzreifen	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Die Presse	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	25 August 2001	
Word count	496	
Text	Wettbewerb. Forschung im kontinentalen Vergleich: ist Europa dem Wettbewerb mit Amerika und Japan gewachsen? ALPBACH. "Europa als Kulturraum zeichnet sich historisch durch seine Grundlagenwissenschaftlichkeit und durch die Fähigkeit der philosophischen Begründung und damit der tiefen Durchdringung von komplexen Sachverhalten aus." Dieser Meinung ist Günter Koch, wissenschaftlicher Leiter der Austrian Research Centers. Aber die oft genannte Rechnung - Amerika treibt die Technologien, Japan macht sie massenvermarktbar, Europa lebt seine Kultur - sei viel zu einfach. Denn nicht zuletzt durch die Globalisierung müsse man darüber nachdenken, ob "die territoriale Definition von Fähigkeitsräumen" als Identitätsstiftung noch haltbar sei. Koch zufolge liegen die aktuellen Schwächen Europas nicht bei den Humanressourcen oder bei der Ausbildung, sondern vielmehr im mangelnden Willen und der Bereitschaft, das reiche Wissen als Technologielösungen auf die Märkte zu bringen. "Aus eigener Erfahrung muß ich bestätigen, daß wir, bildlich gesprochen, die besten Formel-1-Rennwagen bauen, diese aber mit Holz-oder bestenfalls mit Vollgummirädern auf die Rennstrecke stellen", bringt Koch einen Vergleich. Oder kurz gesagt: "Unsere Chance liegt in der Steigerung der Technologiefähigkeit." Aus der Brille seines Faches, der Biotechnologie, sieht Hermann Katinger, Mikrobiologe an der Wiener Universität für Bodenkultur, die Probleme Europas. Auch er sieht eine große Stärke, die aber in der Praxis aus einer Vielzahl von Gründen dem Kontinent nichts bringt und den USA eine Übermacht verschafft. Er glaubt, daß in der Biotechnologie etwa 90 Prozent der grundsätzlich neuen Erkenntnisse aus Europa kommen.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	Aber mangelnde Organisation, ein zu schlechtes Patentwesen und zu wenig Kapital, um "überkritische Massen" zu erzeugen, lassen Europa nicht vorankommen. Katinger führt das zum Teil auf geschichtliche Entwicklungen zurück. Nach dem zweiten Weltkrieg habe man in Europa andere Sorgen gehabt, als sich der systematischen Pflege und Organisation der modernen Biologie zu widmen. Obwohl bis heute auch in Österreich zum Beispiel eine "hartnäckige Gruppe" von Antibiotikaproduzenten überlebt haben, sei die systematische Akkumulierung von technologiekritischen Potentialen vorwiegend in den USA erfolgt. In seinen historischen Betrachtungen konnte sich Katinger auch einen kleinen Seitenhieb auf die Politik nicht verkneifen: "Den Leuten ist es nach dem Krieg besser und besser gegangen. Die Leute haben geglaubt, der Kreisky hat das gemacht. Aber die Wirtschaft hat das gemacht." Unterdessen habe es das isolierte Japan mit fokussierter nationaler Förderung geschafft, ein paar biotechnologische Monopole aufzubauen. In Zukunft könnte die Situation für kleine Staaten noch schwieriger werden, fürchtet Katinger. Er sieht nämlich durch die immer größere Bedeutung der Informatik in der Genforschung das riesige Problem, daß der Kapitalbedarf, um eine kritische Größe erreichen zu können, immer mehr ansteigt. Aber trotz allem: Die Innovationslandschaft Europas ändert sich rasant, die ersten Ankündigungen zum sechsten EU-Rahmenprogramm haben zu einem großen Umdenken geführt. "Mit den nationalen Innovationssystemen war es schlagartig aus", meint etwa Koch. Das neue Leitbild sei ein europäischer Forschungsraum, der sich als ein Netzwerk von "Centers of Excellence" definiert. Umso wichtiger sei in dieser Situation für Österreich ein Benchmarking, also der Vergleich mit Standards anhand von Maßzahlen, an denen derzeit EU-weit - auch in Seibersdorf - gearbeitet wird. Koch sieht auch eine "bemerkenswerte Euphorie" in der Forschungslandschaft.	

Framework Programme 6

Title	Cash call on brain drain	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	The Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	3 July 2002	
Word count	208	
Text	THE European Commission is spending Euro 1.6 billion to help to fund a European Research Area. Readers will be aware that the 15 EU member states have committed themselves to creating the world's most dynamic economy by 2010. One inconvenient hurdle to overcome is thousands of clever Europeans disappearing into American universities, laboratories and high-tech companies, never to return. Almost two thirds of science graduates on US student visas are still working in the US five years later, the Commission says. How can this be? The obvious answer is that the Yanks pay better and there are more opportunities. This is sort of acknowledged by the European Council, which made a grand commitment in Barcelona to devote 3 per cent of GDP to research by 2010. Currently EU states spend only 1.9 per cent, while the US invests 2.6 per cent. The private sector is to provide two thirds of the investment, and therein lies the rub. In America, research hot-houses such as Stanford and MIT are commercial entities with professors juggling teaching with managing their businesses. Europe's academics tend to be shy of commercial attachment, but we will be lucky if Gordon Brown stumps up 1 per cent of GDP, never mind the entire 3 per cent.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

Title	€16bn scheme will lead to wide range of research	
Author	Brian O'Mahony	
Newspaper company	Irish Examiner	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	13 July 2002	
Word count	267	
Text	TÁNAISTE and Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment said the new 16 billion euro Sixth EU Framework Programme (FP6) will benefit a wide range of research in Ireland. It will facilitate the development of a knowledge-based economy by providing badly-needed funding for research and technological development. "The Government is determined that Ireland secures the maximum benefits from FP6 over the next four years. The Framework Programme will complement the Government's investment of the 2.5 billion in research, technological development and innovation through the National Development Programme," she said. In the past, EU framework programmes have been crucial in building the research base in the economy. This was particularly the case at Third Level, where significant results were achieved across a wide range of institutions. Research and all kinds of new knowledge are crucial to the continuing growth of the economy, Ms Harney said. This research has to be used to the mutual benefit of all and "this is the very basis on which the EU Framework Programmes has helped increase the knowledge base and credibility of the Irish research community." Richard Esquitt, director, DG Research, EU commission, addressing the conference in Dublin after the Tánaiste launched the research programme, said research and technological development was a top priority in Europe. And the latest programme represented a "quantum leap beyond simply funding projects and the programme has an important role in making a reality of the European Research Area.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	Forfás chief executive Martin Cronin said the latest launch of FP6 offered "substantial opportunities for researchers to participate with researchers in Europe and further afield in developing cutting-edge technology."	

Title	Little-Irelanders make way for the EU science community	
Author	Aidan Kane	
Newspaper company	The Sunday Business Post	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	10 September 2002	
Word count	940	
Text	The EU will soon launch one of its most important policy initiatives, but one that has received little public attention in Ireland. It is the latest in a series of funding programmes to support research and development in Europe, known in the jargon as the Sixth Framework Programme. The total budget will be €17.5 billion from now until 2006. Through this fund, the EU will support research across the range of scientific endeavour, and encourage cooperation across borders between universities, research institutes and industry. Preparatory work has been underway for a number of years, as policymakers drew on experiences in previous funding rounds, including some 11,500 submissions made by European researchers to influence the design of the programme. It is a remarkable initiative, significantly bigger than previous rounds, and directed towards the goal, endorsed by European leaders, of creating a dynamic knowledge-based European society. This funding programme is of potentially enormous significance to Ireland: in respect of the policy effort to embed and sustain high value-added activity and jobs, and because it exemplifies the benefits afforded by enlargement of the union, to us and to applicant countries. Ireland's positive record of participation in these EU programmes is not widely appreciated. It is all the more impressive because these funds are quite separate from the more familiar structural and cohesion funds. Irish researchers, in industry, academia and the public sector agencies, have succeeded in bidding for research funding in open, merit-based competitions.	VIS-BIG TO-PO PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	The Forfás agency has published a consultants' report evaluating Irish participation in a previous round, the Fourth Framework Programme, which ran between 1994 and 1998. Irish involvement embraced private firms, third-level researchers, state research organisations and semi-state companies, and attracted about €200 million of EU funding. A total of 467 Irish organisations, including 270 Irish-owned firms, took part in over 1,100 projects in the Fourth Framework. This was an impressive performance, disproportionate to the size of the research base in Ireland at the time. This funding played a vital role in ensuring the very existence of a scientific research capacity in Ireland. At the time, the level of state support for research and development was derisory (only about €6 million a year, in total, for basic research). Irish policymakers have recently recognised the importance of scientific and technological research, in sustaining long-run increases in living standards. That we have a base upon which to build is in large part due to the EU, and to the initiative of Irish researchers taking advantage of the opportunities it afforded us. The new Sixth Framework Programme is open to organisations in those countries seeking membership of the EU. This is not a matter of a 'concession', to be grudgingly given to applicant countries: it is a matter of mutual benefit for all concerned. It reflects the fact that scientific knowledge, and the problems that technology solves, do not recognise national borders. Participation for these countries is a vital component of their preparations for accession, as the applicant countries will be enthusiastic partners in the construction of a more innovative and knowledge-based Europe. These funding programmes place great emphasis on the importance of cooperation between researchers in different European countries. They demand that researchers construct networks of the scale and quality that world-class research demands.	

	Science and technology increasingly proceed by constructing such networks, cutting across traditional disciplinary boundaries, and drawing up the diversity of expertise available in large teams. Enlargement will be the capstone on this endeavour. It removes many national barriers to the mobility of researchers, who will then be able to contribute fully to the creation of what has been termed a 'European Research Area'. Increasing the mobility of highly skilled workers is of enormous concern to the Irish scientific and technological community. It rightly informs Ireland's stance that freedom of movement for new EU citizens should begin from day one of accession. There is a broader issue of rights here: the right of applicant countries to exercise their roles as full members of the European scientific and technological community. Their claims are underscored by the enormous historical contribution made, especially by scientists from central and eastern Europe, and the scientific capacity still extant, which even the Communist regimes could not entirely extinguish. A small symbol of this is the fact that one of the EU's key measures for funding researchers across Europe is named after Marie Curie, one of the most famous daughters of Poland, and of science. Some opponents of enlargement seem to think that the European inheritance is theirs to withhold or grant at whim, in line with their misguided, ugly and little-Irelander affectations. They are entirely ignorant of the centrality of applicant countries to the broader stream of European civilisation, including the scientific and intellectual patrimony that flourished long before this country could bear to face the outside world. At present, the United States is the dominant world economic and technological power. Instead of bemoaning that fact, Europe can learn from the dynamism and energy of a society that has more than any other, opened itself to the talent of the world.	

	In the last century Europe was consumed with crazy ideology and war; in the haven of the United States a vast wave of the most brilliant emigrés of central and eastern Europe sought and found refuge, and contributed their energies in full measure. It serves us ill to cavil at the primacy of American innovation, if we deny ourselves the political instruments to emulate that success. One of those instruments is enlargement, not merely of an economic or fiscal polity, but of an intellectual space to which our fellow Europeans have a compelling claim.	

Title	Brussels seeks more bang for its bucks or euros	
Author	Rod Newing	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	18 September 2002	
Word count	1036	
Text	In the past, the European Commission has concentrated its efforts on the riskier areas of research that the telecommunications sector may not have fully addressed. Although this has been in isolation from other research activities within Europe, it has nevertheless contributed significantly in areas such as asynchronous transfer mode (ATM) networks, third generation mobile, digital television and video compression. However, this approach resulted in fragmentation of resources between European, national and corporate projects. "Because support has been spread over small-scale projects, the impact has been much less than it might have been," says Ilse Vickers, director for research, Europe, at University College London. Now the commission's whole approach will change with its sixth so-called "framework programme", which will be launched by the end of 2002 to cover funding until 2006. The commission wants to create an integrated European Research Area (ERA), based on more effective collaboration between existing research at European, national and corporate level. "The sixth framework seeks to address not just fragmentation of resources but the lack of inter-governmental co-operation," says Dr Vickers. The total funds made available over the course of the programme for information technology and telecommunications will be Euros 3.8bn, which is 22 per cent of the total European Commission research budget of Euros 17.5bn and 5 per cent of all public and private sector investment in such research. These funds will contribute up to half of the cost of the research, so the total value of projects is expected to be Euros 7bn-8bn.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	The new programme will have much bigger instruments, no longer called projects, to achieve much greater impact. They are divided into networks of excellence and integrated projects. Networks of excellence must generate integration between related existing research and are expected to be co-ordinated by an academic institution. The objective of an integrated project is to increase knowledge, it is expected to be co-ordinated by a commercial organisation and will typically last from three to five years. Werner Mohr is vice president of pre-engineering at Siemens, the European electronics company which has been involved in EC projects since the early 1990s. "When you have bigger projects, major players are involved," he says. "so you get a much bigger impact into the standards bodies and into the global economy." According to Jean-Claude Delcroix, research director at Gartner, the analyst, there has been criticism about the effectiveness of European research since the end of the 1980s. "The commission has consistently created new programmes with new wording," he says, "but... in reality it doesn't change a lot. What changes is that it tends to fund larger projects with established organisations." He believes that this creates frustration among smaller technology start-up companies. Major new technologies are often developed by one or two people in a very small room, such as Hewlett-Packard starting in a garage. Although the commission encourages smaller enterprises, its definition is up to 50 people, whereas Mr Delcroix believes that innovation is most likely in companies with less than 15 people. Mr Mohr points out that whereas innovation may happen in small groups in the application area, infrastructure systems need bigger teams and systems are being developed by the big manufacturers. However, the telecommunications industry is global, and much of the infrastructure research is already being conducted in the US. This is particularly true of the technologies needed to increase the capacity of internet	

protocol (IP) equipment, which Mr Delcroix believes is one of the most important research areas.

Whereas Europe does have a major role to play in research into mobile applications, projects need to come to market within two years. However, it typically takes between nine and 12 months to prepare a proposal for the commission, have it evaluated and negotiate a research contract, so commission funding is not practical.

The framework programmes have an important role in bringing competitors together before a technology reaches the standards phase. "They provide us with a trusted legal environment for research and development partnerships," says Jan van den Biesen, vice-president at Philips Research, the electronics company that has participated in the framework programmes since their inception in the early 1980s.

Mr Mohr points out that research would otherwise be duplicated and would result in different incompatible proposals being submitted to the standard bodies, which would take a long time to harmonise. "We all learned lessons from the 3G mobile network standard," he says. "We had a lot of debate and struggle."

Alcatel, the telecommunications equipment manufacturer, has also participated in previous programmes. "They help us to have more advanced research, as opposed to research that is delivered direct to our business divisions, than we can do on our own," says Jacques Magen, a director of Alcatel Research and Innovation. "This is especially so now that conditions in the telecommunications industry are not so good."

Mr Delcroix believes that organisations considering participating will have to meet a number of unwritten criteria. They need to be large; have researchers with a good track record who are known in the commission; links to academics with the best ideas; and good partners.

"They also need good links to the commission; understand how it works; have some support in the evaluation panels; a lot of peers in Europe to support them; have been to lots of conferences; and know the right

	people," he says. "A good tip would be to use an organisation that specialises in preparing bids, because they know the tricks. If you are completely new, you would be better partnering with an existing winner and try to get sub-contract work." Alcatel, Philips and Siemens all warn that details of the sixth framework are yet to be finalised and that its eventual implementation will determine success. Mr Magen is especially concerned that the maximum project size appears to be decreasing. "We were hoping to carry out projects of up to Euros 100m each," he says. "It now it looks as if it is more likely to be a maximum of Euros 40m-50m." Nevertheless, Mr van den Biesen believes that the plans are likely to bring about some improvements. "These include less bureaucracy, shorter lead times, more flexibility and more autonomy for the participants," he says. "It will also further improve Europe's scientific networks."	

Title	EU launches plan to boost R&D spending	
Author	Clive Cookson	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	12 November 2002	
Word count	417	
Text	The European Union launched a Euros 17.5bn (£11.2bn) research programme yesterday with renewed commitments to create a unified "European Research Area" and to raise spending on research and development from 1.9 per cent of gross domestic product to 3per cent by 2010. Philippe Busquin, the research commissioner, inaugurated the programme, known as Framework Six, in front of 8,000 people who had gathered for the biggest research conference in EU history at Belgium's Heysel convention centre. His goal, he said, was for Europe to take a world lead in using the data cascading out of scientific fields from genomics to quantum computing. "I would like Europe to be the first to master the complexity, the first to exploit the innovation potential of the information avalanche," he said. Framework Six will run for four years to 2007. Its budget is 17 per cent more than the previous Framework Five programme and its funds will be concentrated on priority areas: life science and health, information technology, nanotechnology and aerospace. Embryonic stem cell research and therapeutic cloning are the most notable research fields left out of Framework Six. They were omitted, Mr Busquin said, "because there is no adequate consensus at European level to provide funding. We do not want to impose ethical rules on research but we do require a broad consensus". He said the issue of funding embryonic stem cell research would be re-examined next year.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	From the political point of view, Framework Six is leading the way for other EU activities. It is the first programme in which candidates for future EU membership are taking place as full partners - not only the nine countries included in the first round of enlargement but also Turkey, Bulgaria and Romania. Mr Busquin said he was under no illusion that the Framework programme on its own - representing just 5 per cent of national governments' research spending - could "make Europe progress from second to first rank as the world's scientific power". The Commission sees it as a catalyst for creating a European Research Area in which scientists can work anywhere without being obstructed by barriers such as nationality or residency requirements. But the biggest challenge is to increase total R&D spending in the EU from the present 1.9 per cent of GDP to 3 per cent to match the US and Japan. This would require a big increase in corporate R&D budgets - encouraged not only by more public research spending but also by tax incentives, Mr Busquin said.	

Title	Binnenmarkt des Wissens	
Author	Wiebke Rögener	
Newspaper company	Süddeutsche Zeitung	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	19 November 2002	
Word count	720	
Text	Es war wohl die größte Veranstaltung, die die europäische Wissenschaft je gesehen hat: Rund 9000 Forscher, Industriemanager und Regierungsbeamte versammelten sich in Brüssel zu einer Konferenz über die Forschungspolitik der EU. Anlass war der Start des 6. Forschungsrahmenprogramms (FRP), das die Prioritäten der EU-Förderung für die kommenden vier Jahre festlegt. Ehrgeizige Ziele hat Forschungskommissar Philippe Busquin formuliert: Statt der Verzettelung in nationalen Projekten soll ein gemeinsamer "Europäischer Forschungsraum" entstehen, von einem "Binnenmarkt des Wissens" ist die Rede. Von dem Zusammenwirken der EU-Staaten erhofft sich die EU-Kommission gar "Forschungsexzellenz hoch fünfzehn". Diese Schlagworte mit Inhalt zu füllen, wird indes mit den Mitteln des neuen Forschungsrahmenprogramms allein kaum gelingen. Der Etat von 17,5 Milliarden Euro ist zwar gegenüber dem Vorgänger-Programm um 17 Prozent angewachsen. Doch sind das gerade mal fünf Prozent dessen, was in den EU-Staaten an öffentlichem Geld für die Forschung aufgewandt wird. Um mit diesen vergleichsweise geringen Kräften etwas zu bewegen, hilft nur die Konzentration auf Schwerpunkte, betonte Busquin in Brüssel. Das freilich klingt nicht neu. Schon das 5. Rahmenprogramm zielte darauf ab, die EU-Forschungsförderung zu konzentrieren. Denn die Kritik einer Expertengruppe, die das 4. Programm bewertet hatte, war vernichtend ausgefallen: "Es hat keine klare Richtung und die Ergebnisse lassen zu wünschen übrig", hieß es seinerzeit. Auf ein solches unabhängiges Expertengremium wurde seither lieber verzichtet. Dafür legten Dienststellen der EU-Kommission im vergangenen Jahr eine eigene Halbzeitbewertung des 5. FRP vor. Es gäbe	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	zwar Verbesserungen, "die nach wie vor sehr vielfältigen Themen (...) sind jedoch noch nicht ausreichend stark gebündelt", heißt es in diesem Papier. "Das 5. Rahmenprogramm war ein erster Schritt, jetzt geht es darum, sich noch stärker auf bestimmte Themen zu konzentrieren", erläuterte jetzt Philippe Busquin. Hans-Olaf Henkel, Präsident der Wissenschaftsgemeinschaft Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, bezweifelte allerdings, dass das mit den nun vorgelegten sieben Forschungsprioritäten - von Informationstechnologie über Genomforschung, Luft-und Raumfahrt bis zur Lebensmittelsicherheit - gelungen ist. "Es gibt kaum einen Punkt, der fehlt", kritisierte er zum Auftakt in Brüssel. Schwerpunkte zu setzen, heiße eben auch zu sagen, was nicht finanziert wird. Kaum überraschend für einen ehemaligen IBM-Manager plädierte Henkel dafür, sich auf anwendungsorientierte und industrienahe Forschung zu konzentrieren. Nach dem Geschmack vieler Wissenschaftler ist das allerdings im neuen Rahmenprogramm bereits allzu gut gelungen. So kritisierte der Nobelpreisträger Erwin Neher: In der Diskussion um das 6. FRP sei die Grundlagenforschung immer mehr in den Hintergrund getreten. Den ersten Entwürfen zufolge sollten noch die so genannten Exzellenznetzwerke - also Verbünde hervorragender europäischer Forschungseinrichtungen - besonders gefördert werden, um eine Wissensbasis zu schaffen. Das zweite wichtige Förderinstrument des 6. FRP, als "Integrierte Projekte" bezeichnet, sollte eher anwendungsnahen Fragen vorbehalten sein. Inzwischen aber seien beide Instrumente auf kurzfristige Anwendungsmöglichkeiten ausgerichtet. Ein weiterer Kritikpunkt vieler Wissenschaftler: Das vorgelegte Rahmenprogramm ziele fast ausschließlich auf die Big Player in Forschung und Industrie. Weniger, dafür größere Forschungsverbünde sollen Geld aus Brüssel erhalten. Gab es im 5. FRP durchschnittlich um die zwei Millionen Euro für ein Forschungsprojekt, werden die Fördersummen künftig etwa sechsmal so hoch sein.	

	"Entscheidend ist nicht die Größe einer Forschergruppe, sondern die Exzellenz", betont zwar Philippe Busquin. Aber "schon die Anforderungen an die detaillierte Kostenrechnung in solchen Netzwerken führen dazu, dass kleinere universitäre Gruppen sich kaum beteiligen werden. Dieser Aufwand ist dort nicht zu leisten", stellt ein Vertreter einer großen deutschen Forschungseinrichtung fest. Doch wo es vor allem darum geht, mittels Wissenschaft und Forschung, die Wettbewerbsfähigkeit Europas in einer "wissensbasierten Ökonomie" zu verbessern, dürfen vor allem die mitspielen, deren Forschung eine rasche Umsetzung in wirtschaftlich interessante Ergebnisse verspricht. Im Bereich Gesundheit ist das in den Augen der Brüsseler Forschungspolitiker in erster Linie die Forschung am Genom. "Genomik und Biotechnologie im Dienste der Gesundheit" heißt die entsprechende Priorität. Dazu gehört zwar auch ein Förderschwerpunkt "Bekämpfung armutsbedingter Krankheiten" (Aids, Tuberkulose und Malaria). Doch stößt das Thema bei Forschern scheinbar auf wenig Interesse: Im Frühjahr 2002 forderte die EU-Kommission die Wissenschaftler Europas auf, ihre Interessen zu den Förderschwerpunkten zu bekunden. Rund 2000 Projektvorschläge gingen für den biowissenschaftlichen Bereich ein, davon mehr als 80 Prozent für die Genomforschung und 15 Prozent für die Krebsforschung. Gerade mal 3,5 Prozent der Vorschläge befasste sich mit den Seuchen, denen weltweit die meisten Menschen zum Opfer fallen. Erstaunlich ist diese Gewichtung nicht, findet Octavi Quintana-Trias, Direktor für Gesundheitsforschung in der EU-Generaldirektion Forschung. "Wir haben eben von Anfang an klar gemacht, dass Genomik unsere Top-Priorität ist", erläutert er. Und die Forscher haben verstanden.	

Title	Warning over harmonisation of clinical trials	
Author	Clive Cookson	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	20 November 2002	
Word count	320	
Text	Regulations to harmonise and facilitate clinical trials across Europe will have the opposite effect, creating additional costs and bureaucracy that could threaten research, the head of a leading European cancer organisation warned on Wednesday. Francoise Meunier, director-general of the European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer (EORTC), told a conference in Frankfurt that the EU Directive on Good Clinical Practice adopted in 2001 "may kill off a lot of academic research without improving patients' safety or the quality of science and cancer care." Prof Meunier estimated that the directive would increase the overall cost of clinical trials by 30 per cent and would double the workload involved in getting a study started. But she said a lot would depend on the way member states implement the directive. It is due to be incorporated in national law by May 2003 and take effect by May 2004. The problem, she said, is that the directive was intended primarily to harmonise clinical trials of new drugs by the pharmaceutical industry. It was not designed for non-commercial academic research comparing different treatments. Cancer research would be particularly hard-hit because it is more dependent than any other field of medicine on complex clinical trials across Europe. EORTC, based in Brussels, co-ordinates cancer research by 2,500 scientists in 32 countries.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NO LAN-MIX

	Prof Meunier said the directive failed to harmonise the very different insurance requirements for clinical trials across Europe. Each country has its own legal limit for compensation, ranging from EUR44,000 in Greece to EUR762,000 in France. The period of coverage required also differs, from one year after the study closes in Spain to five years afterwards in Germany. "The creation and strengthening of networks of excellence within the European research area will be seriously jeopardised, unless there are appropriate strategies to conduct pan-European clinical trials under an optimum legal framework that can collaborate with countries such as the USA as equal partners," said Prof Meunier.	

Title	UK universities are at the heart of Europe, but the government is putting that at risk	
Author	Roderick Floud	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 March 2003	
Word count	783	
Text	Britain's universities are perfectly placed to take a leading role in European higher education at a time of great change. Yet as delegates from all over the continent gather in Bristol this week for a meeting of the European University Association, they may well be asking why the UK government is so indifferent. In 1999, when Tessa Blackstone was minister for higher education, the UK was one of the four founders of the Bologna process. This project, since joined by over 30 countries, aims to harmonise degree structures across Europe, to promote student and staff mobility and to make Europe's university system more competitive, worldwide and in particular with that of the US. Its main effect has been to make the systems of other countries more like that of the UK. Radical and hotly contested changes in Italy, France, Germany and other countries have produced the familiar pattern of a three-or four-year bachelor's degree, a one-or two-year masters degree and a PhD like that in Britain. The UK is a magnet for students from the rest of Europe, attracted by our language and high reputation for teaching. British universities are much respected for their research strength, their relative autonomy from government, and even their entrepreneurial spirit. The Bologna process will create the European Higher Education Area, across which students may move freely, accumulating credits towards a degree in one or more countries, with their achievement recorded in a common form, the diploma supplement. Other qualifications, such as the European Computer Driving Licence, are developing rapidly.	VIS-BIG TO-NG PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Our universities and firms have also been one of the main beneficiaries of the European Union's expanding funding programmes for research – the framework programmes - gaining much more than they have paid or UK plc has contributed. The Sixth Framework is the largest EU programme after agriculture and the structural funds, spending about 18bn euros (£12bn) during the next three years. Concentrating on seven areas of new technology, it will operate through European networks of universities and business to create the European Research Area (ERA), the topic of this week's conference. The prime minister claimed much credit for the boost to European research spending agreed at the Lisbon summit last year. So how does the government react? Was the recent white paper seen as an opportunity to assist UK universities to play their full part in Europe? Not a bit of it. There are two references to European research programmes and one acknowledgment that students from other EU countries will have to benefit from the end of upfront fees. They will, of course, have to pay back the fees later, like UK students; Gordon Brown is no doubt beginning to study how to recover English university fees through the Lithuanian tax system. Otherwise, nothing. Pursuing the holy grail of making British universities like the US Ivy League, ministers seem to see European universities as inferior competitors who can be ignored, rather than partners in a common enterprise. It gets worse. Britain has had to fight hard to persuade Europe that our three-year bachelor and one-year masters degrees are rigorous enough. What does the white paper recommend? Not only foundation degrees, which may be acceptable as being at sub-degree level, but two-year honours degrees, which definitely will not. In the process of argument, we may lose the one-year masters or the four-year MEng and similar qualifications. Other proposals strike at the heart of the European university system. While ministers seek to separate research from teaching, at almost the same time the European commission has stressed how they need to be linked in the creation of a "Europe of knowledge". Creating teaching-only universities, even with	

	the laudable aim of enhancing the status of teaching, will reduce the reputation of UK higher education. What can be done? The UK government must take seriously its responsibilities under the Bologna process if it is to be taken seriously in Europe. In Berlin this autumn, it is likely that PhD study will be brought within Bologna; we must make sure that British PhDs of the future are not disadvantaged by the application of rigid approval processes. UK universities also need government support to head off moves to establish a European accreditation agency, with powers of approval over all our degree courses. Help is also needed in research to ensure that the UK creates and sustains networks within the Sixth Framework. If not, we risk being marginalised within the European research area. Above all, we must behave as if, in Tony Blair's words, we are at the heart of Europe. Universities are one area where that boast is actually true. It would be tragic if, through ignorance or disdain, it ceased to be so.	

Title	The European Commission has a staggering £11bn on offer for research - to anyone with the determination and tenacity to tackle a Mont Blanc of red tape first	
Author	Anthea M. Lipsett	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	15 April 2003	
Word count	1396	
Text	Gordon Brown may be scuppering attempts to join the euro, and the diplomatic rift between Britain and its European partners may be wider than for years, but quietly the strings binding UK universities to the continent are tightening. While the British government is fixated by the Ivy League across the Atlantic, Brussels is spending billions on trying to create a European research area in which scientists will travel freely and build a research powerhouse to rival the US. That means big collaborative projects across the EU and the candidate countries of eastern Europe (poor, but strong in science). It also means trying to eliminate duplication. There is even talk of a European research council to supplement this activity - viewed with grave suspicion by the research councils in the UK, which naturally are not keen to lose influence or funding. But the Dutch, who take over the EU presidency in the latter half of 2004, are said to be very keen to push the idea. Even if British scientists couldn't care less about the dreams of the Belgian research commissioner, Philippe Busquin, some are genuinely inspired by the possibilities of international collaboration in their field. Others simply know a juicy research grant when they see one, even hidden in the thickets of eurojargon. Currently on offer from the commission is a staggering euros 16bn (£11bn) - the EU's largest internal project. For Professor Colin Lambert, it all began in December 2001, as he listened to a presentation on Framework Programme 6 (FP6), as the commission's latest initiative to finance research is called. Inspired, the theoretical physicist at	VIS-BIG TO-NG PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

Lancaster University decided to explore the possibility of setting up a large network of nanoelectronics researchers.

Today, the result is a network of over 800 scientists in 118 institutions across Europe, the former Soviet Union, Japan and the United States, who have staked a claim for money from the commission's coffers. But it has been a lengthy and arduous process, Lambert says. "My advice would be not to do it."

Fellow physicist Professor Peter Littlewood, of Cambridge University, is also keenly aware of the heavy bureaucratic burden involved. "You just have to learn to live with it," he says. He advises getting someone else to do the donkey work, such as smaller countries that depend more heavily on FP6 for funding and have a vested interest in learning how to deal with the bureaucracy.

"I find my collaborators there, and one always has good collaborators in distant countries. You let them run with it and learn the system and then you join their research projects." But it should not be forced, he warns. "If you're doing it just for the money and you have to find the right set of collaborators in the right set of EU countries with the right political connections, then it tends to be a rather unhappy marriage, even if it's successful."

A new framework for funding scientific research and development in the EU is created every five years. The sixth of these rolling programmes, laying down exactly how and where EU research and development will be allotted, marks a leap in European ambitions.

Launched in November 2002, after much wrangling between member states as to exactly how much would be earmarked for each area of research, and the way it would be allocated, the programme has large sums specifically for setting up Busquin's proposed research area. It also has a much greater role for social scientists in future projects - perhaps a sign of the cultural and political significance of the plans.

Littlewood thinks FP6 is more outward looking than in the past, in that projects can involve participants outside the EU. "Now central and eastern

	European countries can be full participants, and I think this is very positive. There's a tradition of very strong science in central and eastern Europe and we don't want to lose it." Europe cannot hope to compete with the US or Japan in all fields, however, and has attempted to concentrate and streamline research. Science ministers entered negotiations more than two years ago, determined to limit the breadth of research funded at a European level. Although not altogether successful - Mediterranean countries refused to exclude marine research, for one - ministers managed to whittle the number of research areas eligible for EU money down to eight. The European commission also had researchers send in their ideas, or "expressions of interest", for potential research projects in FP6 last year, in an effort to home in on their needs and modify the calls for proposals accordingly. FP6 will act as a test bed as the commission tries to create large-scale, long-term collaborations in European research. A key new feature is greater management autonomy for a consortium setting up a project – a university and an industrial partner, for instance. Rather than the commission taking the lead on projects in FP6, a consortium will be able to expand to take on new partners, revise its work plan on an annual basis, and issue its own calls for proposals to bring in new organisations or sub-projects. In theory this should mean less red tape. In addition, one massive project, a collaboration between all member states to set up a clinical trials programme in collaboration with African countries to combat Aids, tuberculosis and malaria, has been mooted, but is going through the EU's lengthy approval process. "The EU is principally engaged in social engineering and its goal is to support research, which cuts across disciplinary borders but also real borders. They want to move people around, they want to move ideas around and I think it's a fairly laudable exercise," says Littlewood.	

	"It's not entirely consonant with a straightforward research goal. But it's hard to imagine someone running a first-class research programme who doesn't already have four or five strong contacts at the major European groups in their field. If they don't, they're not running a first-class research programme." FP6 is not a substitute for the straightforward home-grown, bread-and-butter research funding, Littlewood points out. "It's different, and I think as long as one looks at it that way, it can work successfully." New calls to apply for FP6 funding will go out before the summer and then again in the autumn. The time is ripe to get involved. European commission: www.europa.eu.int/comm/ research/index-en.html UK Research Office: www.ukro.ac.uk (a one-stop shop for researchers interested in EU funding) The commission's research information service: www.cordis.lu EducationGuardian.co.uk/higher/ research Anthea M Lipsett is a reporter on Research Fortnight Framework programme six (FP6) includes the 15 EU member countries, plus Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway, plus candidate countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey. Total budget for FP6 is euros 16.27bn, (£11bn) running from 2002 to 2006, but even those successful in the first round won't actually get their hands on the money for some time. The budget is split between three main sub-programmes: euros 11.285bn (£7.6bn) for focusing and integrating community research; euros 320m (£220m) for strengthening the foundations of the ERA; and a further euros 2.605bn (£1.8bn) towards structuring the ERA. There are eight broad areas: * Life sciences, genomics and biotechnology for health: euros 2,200m (£1,500m). * Information society technologies: euros 3,600m (£2,500m). * Nanotechnologies, multifunctional materials and new production processes: euros 1,300m (£900). * Aeronautics and space: euros 1,075m (£741m).	

	* Food quality and safety: euros 685m (£472). * Sustainable development, global change and ecosystems, including energy and transport: euros 2,120m (£1,460m). * citizens and governance in the knowledge society: euros 225m (£155m). *The eighth priority was more widely known as the "black box" during negotiations between member states over FP6, owing to confusion as to its purpose. It is supposed to anticipate the EU's science and technology needs and provide funding for them and developing policy, with euros 555m (£380m) set aside in the budget. It also covers small and medium-sized enterprises' research activities, for which euros 430m (£300m) has been earmarked, and international scientific cooperation, particularly with Mediterranean and former USSR countries, which has euros 315m (£217m). Professor Colin Lambert, theoretical physicist at Lancaster University, managed to set up a network of 800 nanoelectronics researchers across Europe, but applying for the funding was lengthy and arduous: 'My advice would be not to do it.'	

Title	European universities are quietly forging new links to integrate qualifications	
Author	Anne Corbett	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	27 May 2003	
Word count	968	
Text	While the tabloids thunder about the "tyranny" of Europe, closer university integration on a European scale is already quietly under way. There is a project to create a European higher education area (EHEA) by 2010, supported by 38 countries. They have agreed to institute such important features as a common pattern that distinguishes undergraduate and postgraduate courses - not the case at the moment; systems of credit and credit transfer; diploma supplements that make every qualification "readable" in other parts of the EHEA; a structure for quality assurance and such European features as joint degrees and integrated programmes of training and research. On Thursday, in the latest stage of the process, the Austrian university city of Graz will host the third convention to be organised by the representative body of European university leaders, the European University Association (EUA). Alongside the university presidents and rectors from the greater Europe of the EHEA - the EU countries, the remaining European Free Trade Association (Efta) countries, the EU accession states and five Balkan nations - will be a strong delegation of British vice-chancellors. Suggesting a historic dimension to the occasion, Diana Warwick, chief executive of Universities UK, says the British have "for the first time produced a sector-wide position and it represents our positive response to the process". The aim of Graz is to make it possible to prepare a policy statement for a summit declaration in September in Berlin by the 38 ministers of education. The theme is convergence in research and quality assessment. The EUA position - unlike the British white paper - takes research as an intrinsic element of the European university, enabling it to fulfil a role of disciplined enquiry.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	But there are also concrete questions. Can there be a common line on the nature, structure and optimal duration of the PhD in the developing knowledge economy, cooperation and promotion of joint doctorates, strategies for reducing barriers to doctoral and postdoctoral mobility? And how can universities better exploit their role of disseminating knowledge at regional level? On quality assessment the convention members intend to frame recommendations, such as one on avoiding a burdensome quality assurance bureaucracy (the British will no doubt have something to say). Berlin will thus take its place in a collective university process, unprecedented in modern times, that started at Bologna in 1999. That summit advocated most of the structural criteria for convergence. The Prague summit of 2001 added a new element by formally recognising universities' public service role, and included for the first time the EU commission and student bodies as participants. The intriguing question, given Europe's universities' jealously guarded autonomy and traditions and national sensitivities, is how have universities got to this principled acceptance of convergence, and persuaded governments to back them? You could say that Bologna matches an idea and action with a situation, and does so much more effectively than other institutions that favour international collaboration - the EU, the Council of Europe and the OECD. Bologna started with a powerful idea from the French minister of education, Claude Allegre, in 1998. He argued that European universities should, in collaboration, be able to play their part in the international scene as effectively as the top American universities. The precondition was that European universities should be recognisable by their structure, and by the quality of their research and scholarship. It is significant that Allegre was not only a minister but also a world-class scientist and university professor. He knew first-hand that researchers have to compete on an international stage. He identified with the university as part of a community serving the public interest, and which shares thinking and work. He was able to argue with	

	conviction for a strategy that saw the traditional university aims of emulation in the context of cooperation and collaboration on a European scale, in the arts as much as in the sciences The Bologna activity that followed makes universities the setters of the agenda. As such they are a more powerful driving force than ministers, who when they meet intergovernmentally are more diplomats than policy entrepreneurs. Furthermore, the Bologna steering groups have been flexible about EU institutions and the commission in particular. Though the ebullient Allegre was determined to keep the commission at bay, later leadership has recognisedthe EU commission's value as expert in cooperation through the Erasmus programme, for example, and as a provider of incentive funding. The commission now gives important financial support to Bologna development on quality assurance and diploma supplements. It has invented a new programme, Erasmus Mundus, to spread the Erasmus programme model worldwide. Having got over its initial huff at being excluded, it has recognised this opportunity to develop Knowledge Europe, a major strategic goal of the EU for its research and development policies and opportunities to develop the EU's European Research Area in parallel with the EHEA. The fact is - though the tabloids and half the quality press don't believe it - most European integration processes in public policy, both EU and intergovernmental, are collaborative. As political scientists realised long ago, the view that policy implementation is a "top down" process does not reflect the reality. What happens is much more akin to networking. Common concerns about international and national competition, or the threat on the horizon of a possible World Trade Organisation ruling on higher education as a service subject to the General Agreement on Trade and Services - not to mention contentious elements of national policy - look less threatening viewed in a European perspective. At this stage of the process in higher education, European unity looks as if it could be turning a threat into an opportunity.	

	There's a well-researched argument which concludes that the process of European integration has rescued nation states from decline. Closer European integration could well do the same for universities.	

Title	Interview: Ein Abschied vom selbstverantwortlichen Studieren	
Author	Karl-Heinz Heinemann	
Newspaper company	Frankfurter Rundschau	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	10 September 2003	
Word count	761	
Text	Peter Gaehtgens, Präsident der Rektorenkonferenz, über die Europa-Tauglichkeit der deutschen Hochschulen Frankfurter Rundschau: Herr Gaehtgens, welche Interessen bringen die deutschen Hochschulen in die Bologna-Folgekonferenz in Berlin ein? Peter Gaehtgens: Ich meine, dass der europäische Hochschulraum nicht ausschließlich als ein Thema der Bildungspolitik gesehen werden darf. Die Finanzminister müssen einbezogen werden, damit die notwendigen finanziellen Rahmenbedingungen geschaffen werden. Denn je mehr Aufgaben die Hochschulen übernehmen und je weniger Geld sie bekommen, desto schwieriger wird die Umsetzung. Und auch die Innenminister müssen dazukommen. Denn wenn wir Mobilität in Europa fördern wollen, müssen bürokratische Hindernisse abgebaut werden. Insofern denke ich über Berlin hinaus. Als die EU-Kommission vor einigen Jahren versuchte, in der Bildungspolitik mehr Vorgaben zu machen, gab es große Widerstände. Jetzt wollen 33 Staaten den einheitlichen europäischen Hochschulraum gestalten. Ein Gesinnungswandel? Es ist auch eine Frage der Wortwahl. Wir wollen nicht Vereinheitlichung, sondern die wechselseitige Anerkennung von Abschlüssen und Studienleistungen. An diesem Ziel müssen wir übrigens auch noch innerhalb der Bundesrepublik arbeiten. Nun werden ja die Studienstrukturen nach dem Zwei-Zyklenmodell, also Bachelor und Master, vereinheitlicht. Wenn wir keinen Einheitsbrei schaffen wollen, wie Sie sagen - wo bleibt da das spezifisch deutsche Studienprofil?	VIS-BIG TO-NG PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Das ist eine schwierige Frage, die sich auf die Inhalte der Studiengänge richtet. In der Vergangenheit haben wir unsere Besonderheit an der Studienstruktur und den damit verbundenen Graden Magister und Diplom festgemacht, weniger an einer spezifischen Mischung der Inhalte. Was nun die Reform schwierig macht, ist der Abschied von einem Grundkonzept der deutschen Hochschulausbildung, das aus dem 19. Jahrhundert stammt. Bisher gehen wir davon aus, dass jemand, der das Gymnasium absolviert hat, damit nicht nur eine Hochschulzugangsberechtigung hat, sondern ein Zeugnis der Reife. Der-oder diejenige soll eine Person sein, die in selbstständiger Verantwortung ihr Studium gestalten kann. Davon nehmen wir in Grenzen Abschied mit dem zweistufigen Modell, in dem sehr viel mehr vorgegeben wird. Auf dem Papier stehen über 1500 neue Studiengänge. Aber die Realität sieht anders aus. Das hat der Stifterverband festgestellt, der unter diesen Studiengängen nicht einmal fünf fand, deren Konzept einer Prämierung würdig gewesen wäre. Sie haben Recht. Die inhaltliche Neugestaltung wurde noch nicht überall verstanden. Dass also diese Reform sehr viel mehr verlangt als eine technische Umstellung des Studienrhythmus, dass das Curriculum neu durchdacht werden muss, das ist noch nicht überall angekommen. Halten Sie es für gerechtfertigt, wenn angesichts dieser Unsicherheit jetzt verlangt wird, die alten Studiengänge ganz zu streichen? Ist es zu verantworten, Studierende in die neuen Studiengänge zu zwingen, die noch gar nicht ausgereift sind? Das ist doch eher als eine Art Warnung zu verstehen. Deren Sinn besteht darin, alle Beteiligten, nicht nur die Hochschulen, auf die Ernsthaftigkeit dieses Prozesses zu verweisen. Vor allem die Arbeitgeber, einschließlich des öffentlichen Dienstes, müssen sich damit auseinander setzen, ob sie bereit und in der Lage sind, einen Bachelor, der nach drei Jahren aus der Hochschule kommt, auch einzusetzen. Ich kann gut verstehen, dass einige sagen, wir müssen ein Datum setzen und Strukturen gesetzlich vorgeben.	

	Von den zwei Zyklen zu den drei Zyklen: Es ist viel die Rede davon, das Promotionsstudium neu zu regeln. Im Entwurf für das Abschlusskommuniqué der Berliner Konferenz wird die Promoti onsphase als dritter Studienzyklus deklariert. Ich finde es richtig, dass man die Promotionsstufe mit in den Blick nimmt. Allerdings ist sie für mein Verständnis kein Bestandteil des Studiums. Die Minister nehmen offensichtlich wahr, dass man die Bildung und Ausbildung an den Hochschulen nicht reformieren kann, ohne gleichzeitig den Blick auf die Forschung zu lenken. Sie sagen nun, "european higher education area" und "european research area" gehören zusammen. Und die Promotion steht ja gewissermaßen dazwischen. Man muss gut darüber nachdenken, ob man im Zuge der Umstellung auf Bachelor/Master das Promotionswesen als "Third Cycle" bezeichnen soll und damit von Regierungsseite einen Bereich definiert, der eigentlich ganz in der akademischen Zuständigkeit der Hochschule liegt. Im Vorfeld der Konferenz gab es schon viele Debatten um die europaweite Anerkennung von Studiengängen und Institutionen, um Akkreditierungs-und Evaluationsverfahren. Es sollen gemeinsame Kriterien entwickelt werden ... Das ist die entscheidende Frage: Auf welchem Qualitätsniveau spielt sich das Ganze ab? Ich halte es für absolut zwingend, mit der Umstellung der Studienstruktur ein Qualitätssicherungsverfahren einzuführen. Ein Akkreditierungssystem, wie wir es in Deutschland gerade - wenn auch mühsam - etablieren, auf die europäische Ebene zu heben, wäre angemessen. Also einen europäischen Akkreditierungsrat schaffen? Der Vorschlag, einen europäischen Akkreditierungsrat zu bilden, der dann die nationalen Akkreditierungsagenturen seinerseits akkreditiert und diesen sein Gütesiegel gibt, ist der weitestgehende, den ich bisher gehört habe. Ich kann dem viel Sympathie abgewinnen. Wir müssten nur vermeiden, damit eine neue Brüsseler Technokratie auf den Weg zu bringen. Wir wollen keine zusätzliche Bürokratie.	

Title	No opposition on stem research	
Author	Kieron Wood	
Newspaper company	The Sunday Business Post	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	21 September 2003	
Word count	373	
Text	Ireland will not oppose proposals for funding embryonic stem cell research at an EU meeting in Brussels tomorrow. The European Union's sixth framework programme is providing more than €16 billion in research funding for such areas as genomics, biotechnology, information society technologies, food safety and global change. The aim of the programme is to help develop a European Research Area, which would compete effectively with research efforts in the US and Japan. The programme is offering €300,000 for research into human stem cells, which will be harvested from unwanted embryos produced for in vitro fertilisation. The issue has caused controversy every time it has arisen. Last September, the Competitiveness Council refused to agree to EU support for human reproductive cloning and the creation of human embryos solely for the purpose of research or stem cell procurement. The Council decided that research which was forbidden in any member state would not be supported by Community funding in that state. But Italy, Germany and Austria objected to any funding for stem cell research, so a moratorium was imposed to allow for further consideration of the issue. The moratorium expires at the end of this year. A Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment briefing note dated September 11 said research involving stem cells was a promising area of biotechnology which offered the prospect of developing new ways of treating serious chronic diseases.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-MIX

	"However, stem cell research raises ethical questions in those cases where the cells in question are derived from human embryos," it added. The briefing note said that Ireland did not consider it appropriate to object to such research being carried out in member states "where it is deemed to be both legal and ethical". But Ireland's position was condemned by UCD philosophy lecturer Fr Brendan Purcell, who spoke earlier this year at a Dublin conference organised by the Commission on Assisted Human Reproduction. "If Ireland does not consider it appropriate to object to this horrendous act of killing these already rejected tiny human beings,what would it consider appropriate to object to?" he asked. MEP Dana Rosemary Scallon said this was the first time that the European Union had attempted to fund research into an area which was illegal or unconstitutional in any member state.	

Title	Tánaiste outlines priorities for EU Competitiveness Council	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Irish Examiner	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	8 January 2004	
Word count	69	
Text	The Tánaiste Mary Harney has said her department will focus on promoting enterprise, competitiveness, research and development during Ireland’s presidency of the EU. Ms Harney said she hoped to use the six-month presidency to establish a European research area and to make progress on the enforcement of intellectual property rights. The targets are set out in a priorities paper for the EU Competitiveness Council published by the Tánaiste today.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

Title	Harney pledges reforms to aid business	
Author	Chris Dooley	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	9 January 2004	
Word count	352	
Text	Regulatory reform to reduce restrictions on business would be one of her main priorities during the EU presidency, the Tánaiste, Ms Harney, said yesterday, writes Chris Dooley, Industry and Employment Correspondent. Outlining the presidency programme of the Department of Enterprise, Trade and Employment, of which she is Minister, Ms Harney said regulatory reform was required "above all". "We need fewer, not more, prescriptive proposals from Europe," she said. Since a 10-year economic competitiveness strategy had been agreed at the Lisbon EU summit of 2000, the growth gap between the Union and the US had widened. This was "not because the US is smarter intellectually, but because they're better at getting things done". Ms Harney said a key goal of the Irish presidency would be to reinvigorate this so-called Lisbon agenda, and prioritise certain key policy decisions that needed to be taken. It was her intention that the input from the Competitiveness Council to the EU spring summit would be devoted to economic reform and the Lisbon agenda. The council, which Ms Harney will chair during the Irish presidency, was set up in 2002 to strengthen competitiveness in the EU. She said it would concentrate on a limited set of actions over the next six months, setting targets and deadlines for member-states and the EU Commission. "In particular, we intend to make tangible progress on the proposed creation of the European Research Area. The conclusions of an international conference on this issue, to be held in Dublin in February, will be on the agenda of the formal Competitiveness Council meeting in Brussels on March 11th.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	"The Union can assist in this by underpinning the principle of free movement of researchers and the science community, with provisions that enable mobility between member-states and from third countries." Ms Harney also said was committed to reaching the Lisbon target of increasing investment in research to 3 per cent of GDP. "I want to see an environment develop throughout Europe which is genuinely conducive to research and innovation. If we are to encourage innovation, we must give the innovators the capacity to protect their ideas and inventions."	

Title	International scientific conference for Galway	
Author	Lorna Siggins	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	10 May 2004	
Word count	335	
Text	The risk of "freak waves" to international shipping, protection of the marine environment in the event of accidents, and research on maritime security are among the issues for discussion at an international scientific conference which opens in Galway tonight. The conference, entitled Eurocean 2004, is being hosted by the Marine Institute as part of Ireland's EU presidency. Scientists, policy-makers and planners from the EU, Norway, Romania and the US are contributing to the three-day programme, which will be addressed on Thursday by the Minister for Communications, Marine and Natural Resources, Mr Dermot Ahern. The conference will focus on the fact that over 50 per cent of the European research area is underwater, comprising the exclusive economic zones of EU member-states and associates, and extended continental shelves stretching from the Arctic through the Baltic, Atlantic, Mediterranean and Black Sea. The Minister has said that governments and scientists have a responsibility to "better understand" the maritime environment, given that living resources are finite, and he says that Eurocean 2004 will review the input of marine research and development, supported under the EU's fifth framework programme. The conference will also address sustainable marine resource management and development issues. It is the fifth in a series of international EU conferences. Tomorrow's programme will focus on the role of ecoysystem and biodiversity research in the conservation of natural reserves and marine resources; maritime transport security; and a review of the European research area. The first	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	address by Mr Clive Cookson, science editor of the Financial Times, will focus on communicating science. In a separate development, Mr Ahern, who is also TD for Louth, has approved extra funding for the Louth fishing port of Clogherhead. Mr Ahern has sanctioned an extra €1.5 million for upgrading the port, in addition to €6.5 million approved in March. The approved development will provide up to 158 metres of quay face and serve to meet the needs of the Clogherhead fishing fleet, the Minister said. The safe berthage had been long awaited by local fishermen.	

Title	The world should share its science	
Author	Yee-Cheong Lee & Caroline Wagner	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 August 2004	
Word count	742	
Text	Four decades ago, the "space race" between the US and the Soviet Union was in full swing. The costly competition pitted scientists from the two countries against each other just like soldiers on the battlefield, each working to defeat the other, duplicating research and keeping key information secret to win the cold war competition to be the first to land a man on the Moon. Dominance in science was a key part of the push for political dominance. In the years since America won the race to the Moon, landing its astronauts in 1969, competition has been replaced by co-operation in space. Astronauts and cosmonauts from the US, Russia and other nations work side by side as partners on joint projects. They live together and learn together in space, expanding human knowledge. Yet back on Earth, some still see the quest for scientific advancement and technological innovation as a race between nations. A recent report by the National Science Board of the US raised questions about whether America is at risk of losing its role as the world's centre of science and technology innovation. This is the wrong question to ask in the 21st century. Today science has become a global phenomenon. Nations are part of an expanding knowledge network that has no borders. In the 21st century, security requires sharing rather than protecting knowledge. No country can work at the frontiers of all fields of science. The expanding knowledge frontier means that co-operation is the means of knowledge creation. Boosted by the steady expansion of the internet and the hyper-mobility of knowledge, the US has been joined in global science and technology circles by	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-YES LAN-INFO

new knowledge producers that should be viewed as resources - not competitors - in scientific and technological discovery.

The question for the US and other countries should be where and how to link into the global network – not where they stack up in terms of the quantity of scientific patents or articles they are producing. In fact, the percentage of internationally co-authored articles in scientific journals doubled in the 10 years between 1990 and 2000, and the number of countries actively participating in that network rose from 37 to 54. "New knowledge" has grown exponentially. Although science output is still attributed to countries, knowledge does not really honour national boundaries. The new kind of knowledge networks are instead found within a global network of colleagues sharing resources, ideas and creativity.

The ability to link to others in a "small world" of knowledge producers is the defining factor of success, and this ability to form linkages depends on one's attractiveness as a partner. For any nation that sees science and technology as a way to build national strength, the knowledge available from the global network is an asset that can be utilised, added to and exploited locally.

The ability to see opportunities, no matter where they originate, and to turn them into products is what will define scientific and technical power in this century.

Funding for science is a key ingredient, of course, but so is the ability to know what is happening in many research locations. To achieve such goals, policymakers need to look beyond their borders and drop notions of national dominance to find ways to use networked knowledge. This also means including scientists from developing countries as equals in collaborative science, forging technology alliances and channelling at least part of research budgets on issues such as poverty.

The US needs to break out of the "dominance" box of the last century and think beyond a national model of scientific or technological capacity. Robust participation in knowledge networks will mark the most vibrant economies in 21st century science, as the European Union is showing by creating and now

	expanding its European Research Area. This model integrates researchers and scientists across countries to draw together their knowledge. America stands to benefit more from knowledge and ideas flowing through a networked world than from a world in which countries are competing against each other. That is why encouraging broader knowledge creation and sharing the results could be the best antidote to underdevelopment, poverty and, ultimately, political instability. It could also be the knowledge pool from which new ideas flow into the US economy and technology revolutions emerge. Astronauts and cosmonauts have shown us that scientific co-operation works out of this world. We will all benefit if scientists, engineers and policymakers can take the same course here on Earth.	

Title	State financing of research a waste of taxpayer’s money	
Author	Constantin Gurdgiev	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	28 August 2004	
Word count	913	
Text	Summer - the days of newsroom doldrums and silent Oireachtas chambers. "Silly season," says a former cabinet minister, "all the journalists are on vacation", implying that August scribes are not worth reading. I almost agree. On tranquil sunny days it is easy to miss the real point of summer politics - the subtle buzz of reviews quietly setting the stage for budget submissions in September. Since the end of July two documents outlined a taxpayer-sponsored Great Leap Forward to bring Ireland into a brave new world of research-driven success. First was the Committee on Science, Technology and Innovation (CSTI) report titled "Building Ireland's Knowledge Economy". CSTI promised to deliver a "national pro-innovation culture supportive of invention, risk-taking and entrepreneurship" by, among other things, more than doubling Government spending on research and development from €422 million in 2001 to €1.1 billion by 2010. The authors said: "The Government should continue to strengthen support for R&D in the higher education and public research sectors." The second report came from the Higher Education Authority (HEA). "The Programme for Research in Third-Level Institutions" also calls for a "consistent and sustained investment [inscience\] by the Government" through the year 2016. Both reports cover an array of policies to foster growth in private sector R&D expenditure. Yet, it is clear that the HEA and the CSTI see State involvement in scientific and applied research as central to Ireland's economic progress. The problem with all of this is simple - public financing for R&D is largely a waste of taxpayers' money. A recent Organisation for Economic Co-operation	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NO LAN-MIX

	and Development (OECD) report on sources of economic growth finds no evidence to support the assertion that publicly financed research is productive. More than that, the report states that public research and development spending "crowds out resources that could be alternatively used by the private sector". Two other documents confirm the mythical nature of the claim that science is a public good that can be effectively supported by State funding - the EU Commission documents "Towards a European Research Area (2003)" and the "Innovation in Europe" (Eurostat, 2004). Only 3 per cent of European enterprises view government and non-profit research facilities as being an important source of support for innovation. Since 1988 only 30 per cent of research-intensive EU enterprises were recipients of public R&D funding. Considering that large enterprises, many of which represent the state sector, get 48 per cent of public funding, the EU-wide effectiveness of public expenditure on R&D in the private sector falls below 2 per cent, or 2 cent for every €1 spent. Within the OECD the leaders in R&D investment and the most research-intensive countries, namely Sweden, Switzerland, Japan, Israel, the US, Belgium and Finland, all have a higher proportion of business investment and lower share of government spending in total than Ireland. Although Irish public R&D budgets grew at an average rate of 12.3 per cent a year between 1997 and 2003, the leading countries' average growth rates were 3.7 per cent a year. Relative to Ireland, all research economies had a lower proportion of scientists employed by the government. Compared to our successful competitors, Ireland has a high expenditure per Government-employed researcher, low expenditure for the private sector researchers and a similar level of expenditure for those in higher education. As a result we have relatively low productivity in the R&D sector. We are sixth in terms of the growth of publicly employed scientists and 15th in terms of the R&D intensity of our economy.	

	Adding insult to injury, our position continues to deteriorate - of 15 EU countries, Ireland shows the steepest decline in the average annual growth rates in R&D intensity from 1997 through 2001. In other words, we invest more like a research-poor country than a science-rich one. Why? For years Irish supporters of State-run education and research nurtured a firm conviction that science is a public good, arguing that the market should not be entrusted with incentives for investment in either education or research. Yet, economists knew all along that this is simply not true. Over the centuries people living under the spell of totalitarian regimes invested in knowledge - the most private form of property that no state can take away from the owner. Nobel Prize winning Gary S. Becker, Robert W. Fogel and Theodore W. Schultz, alongside R&D guru Edwin Mansfield, supplied extensive research documenting the high costs of transferring scientific knowledge from the individual to society. These costs make it unprofitable for companies to copy others' inventions. Precisely for this reason, competition in the marketplace is more effective in producing incentives for investment in R&D and science. At €1.1 billion a year, the cost of Government involvement in R&D funding to the Irish taxpayer may be relatively trivial, but the potential damage to our society from the continued adherence to the idea of State-sponsored science is not. Government spending on these activities crowds out private investment, centralises research and reduces the competitive nature of scientific discovery to a cartel-like setting of plans, programmes and directives. It also, deceptively, gives the impression of activity, erecting barriers to R&D entrepreneurship. Increasing Government spending does not address such issues as creating proper price-incentives for science and education, or creating the regulatory and immigration climate to support research. For example, over €25 million in taxpayers' money has been sunk into Media Lab Europe. What are the chances of any return on this "investment"? Something to ponder over during this "silly season".	

Title	Hundert Partner, das ist ja viel zu groß!	
Author	Luise Ungerboeck	
Newspaper company	Der Standard	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	11 October 2004	
Word count	607	
Text	Fast zur Hälfte umgesetzt, stößt das sechste EU-Rahmenprogramm für Forschung auf Kritik: zu viel Bürokratie, für die Wirtschaft unattraktiv. Österreich profitiert trotzdem enorm, sagt Technologieexperte und BIT-Chef Manfred Horvat zu Luise Ungerboeck. Standard: Das sechste EU-Rahmenprogramm (RP6) für Forschung ist vor zwei Jahren angelaufen und wird allseits heftig kritisiert. Was läuft schief? Manfred Horvat: Ein Fehler war sicher, dass das neue Programm auf wenige und nur große Forschungsnetzwerke abzielte. Hundert Partner, das ist ja viel zu groß! Allein was Vorbereitung, Umsetzung und Management einer solchen Partnerschaft betrifft. Dahinter stand offenbar der Glaube, dass der Impact eines solchen Milliardenprogramms bei wenigen großen Gruppen größer ist als bei vielen kleinen. Standard: Wie konnte das passieren? Es geht immerhin um 17,5 Milliarden Euro, die bis Ende 2006 ausgeschüttet werden. Horvat: Man darf nicht vergessen: Die dem Programm zugrunde liegende Idee war sehr positiv und ambitioniert: ein europäischer Forschungsraum, der alle Organisationen und Einrichtungen erfasst und integriert. Lissabon und Barcelona, wo Forschung, Entwicklung und Innovation dann plötzlich auf Ebene der Regierungschefs diskutiert wurden, kamen ja erst nachher. Das Ziel waren virtuelle Netze, in denen alle Schwerpunkte und Spezialisten austauschen. Damit sollte Europa als ein großer Forschungsraum Realität werden. Standard: Es braucht dafür bei den Projekten aber doch eine kritische Masse. Hat nun die Kleinkrämerei gesiegt?	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	Horvat: Nein. Was sich aber klar gezeigt hat: Ein Projekt ist ab einer gewissen Zahl an Partnern nur mehr mit einem Aufwand und Kosten zu managen, die im Missverhältnis zum Ergebnis stehen. Auch die Urheber- und Patentrechtsproblematik ist groß. Standard: Die Industrie beklagt außerdem, dass mit dem Zwang zu großen Netzwerken der Industriespionage Tür und Tor geöffnet wird. Sehen Sie diese Gefahr auch? Horvat: Ja, sie ist gegeben. Deshalb sind vor allem jene Netzwerke erfolgreich, bei denen die Partner komplementäre Kompetenzen einbringen und sie so voneinander profitieren. Oder wie beim Netzwerk von Magna, wo alle beteiligten Autokonzerne dasselbe Ziel haben, nämlich eine neue, bahnbrechende Technologie. Sonst ist die interne Konkurrenz viel zu groß und es braucht Heerscharen von Anwälten. Standard: Der Anteil der Wirtschaft am sechsten EU-Rahmenprogramm ist europaweit alarmierend rückläufig. Ist das Programm reformierbar, bevor es ausläuft? Horvat: Ich glaube schon. Die EU-Kommission ist da außergewöhnlich offen und sehr transparent. Es wurde eine Taskforce eingerichtet, die bereits 25 Problembereiche identifiziert hat. Ziel ist die Vereinfachung und Beschleunigung der Abläufe, der Antragstellung, der Bewilligung. Bisher waren die Projekte zu groß, die Vorbereitung zu kompliziert und die Erfolgquote zu gering. Von April 2003 bis Oktober 2004 gab es keinen einzigen Vertrag, das ist doch Wahnsinn! Wirklich exzellent ist dafür die Evaluierung der Projektanträge, da können wir was dazulernen. Standard: Wird sich Österreich beim sechsten Programm wieder so viel Geld zurückholen können, wie es davor eingezahlt hat? Horvat: Es sind erst 40 Prozent umgesetzt, aber es läuft sehr gut für uns - weil auch die Vorbereitung ausgezeichnet war. Beim fünften Rahmenprogramm war Österreich bereits wesentlich erfolgreicher, als wir erwartet haben. Der Mittelrückfluss betrug 295 Millionen Euro oder hundert Prozent. Wir hatten nur 80 Prozent erwartet.	

	Standard: Das BIT ist seit Anfang September Teil der neuen Forschungsförderungsgesellschaft FFG. Fühlen Sie sich als einziger Nichtfördertopf als Fremdkörper? Horvat: Nein, Fremdkörper nicht. In gewissem Sinne fördern wir die Unternehmen, Universitäten, Organisationen und Forschungsinstituten ja auch: Wir beraten, erbringen kostenlose Services und Dienstleistungen, für die Österreich übrigens sehr gelobt wird in den Partnerländern und die laut EU-Kommission Beispiel für "Best Practice" ist. Standard: Was bringt das BIT für die FFG? Horvat: Exzellente internationale Kontakte, gebündeltes Wissen über sämtliche internationale Forschungsund Technologieprogramme und -förderungen (EUREKA etc.) - insbesondere in den neuen EU-Staaten und den Beitrittskandidatenländern. Wir raten übrigens vielen Unternehmen ab von EU-Programmen, weil der FFF oder andere Einrichtungen die besseren Förderinstrumente haben.	

Title	Calls for more EU funding of basic research	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	11 November 2004	
Word count	626	
Text	Former EU science adviser Patrick Cunningham says Europe has work to do to avoid falling further behind the US and Japan in basic research, writes Dick Ahlstrom The EU countries are punching considerably below their weight when it comes to basic research. Europe's failure to keep up with advances being made in the US and Japan will leave it struggling economically, according to a leading Irish scientist. Prof Patrick Cunningham of Trinity College's department of genetics argues strongly in favour of a new approach in support of European research. He backs the creation of a European Research Council, a body that would in particular channel funding towards basic research. Such a body may come about as the Commission tries to agree the EU's next big science budget, Framework Programme 7 (FP7), which covers the period from 2006 to 2010. The outgoing science commissioner, Philippe Busquin, agreed to recommendations that the budget of almost €20 billion, covering the period from 2002 to 2006 (FP6) should be doubled for FP7. He also agreed that a new body should be created within FP7 along the lines of a European Research Council (ERC). The outgoing Commission accepted both of these recommendations, although the shape of the proposed body has yet to be decided, says Cunningham. He welcomes the new funding that will put something like €8 billion a year into European research, but he wants the new body to ensure that funding for basic research is protected.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	"A good deal of [the budget] should be spent under a new rubric based on quality science and longer-term results, an investment in the knowledge capital of the European research area for the long term," says Cunningham. Until September, he served as one of 15 prominent scientists advising Busquin as a member of the European Group on Life Sciences, so he speaks on research policy with some authority. "The intention is that it will be significant in scale, independent in operation, open and competitive in nature and driven solely by quality of science in the search for new knowledge," says Cunningham. "It is a confident declaration of faith in the proposition that the knowledge generated will create benefits for society." The nascent ERC would be funded under the proposed larger budget, but would have separate management structures along the lines of the US National Science Foundation, says Cunningham. It would fund "great science", be peer reviewed, grant larger funding tranches and have longer-term objectives, using perhaps €2 billion a year of the total proposed budget. Unusually, it would open up direct competition between research centres as they bid for ERC support. This would not be a disadvantage for Irish laboratories, he believes. "Those who are already strong will be the strongest competitors in this thing." A few years ago such a programme would have meant very little funding for the Republic, but things have changed since the introduction of SFI and the Programme for Research in Third Level Institutions, he says. "The fact that we have a couple of years of SFI underneath us is a help. I would expect us to do well, better than we would have done a few years ago." The previous framework programmes had a bias towards short-term returns on the back of "applied, often adaptive research", says Cunningham, something he believes "tends to dilute its scientific drive". He calls instead for a "more purposeful approach towards generating new knowledge". Much new knowledge comes from the US and Japan.	

	"Europe is not contributing proportionately and so it is not gaining proportionately," he says. "It is an investment in the future," he adds. "It is an investment in the knowledge base for European industry. The output of it will be useful in medicine, energy, the environment and other areas."	

Title	A community of values and common goals	
Author	Jo Leinen	
Newspaper company	Birmingham Post	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	13 January 2005	
Word count	740	
Text	MEPs yesterday threw their weight behind a new European Constitution. Jo Leinen, chairman of the European Parliament"s Committee on Constitutional Affairs, explains what it means for us The European Constitution is a historic a blueprint for cooperation among the 25 peoples and States of the European Union. Its winners are the citizens of Europe. This fundamental treaty will substantially enhance direct and indirect public participation in European politics. The Constitution makes clear that the European Union is not simply a big market; it is also a community of values in which the people of Europe share common goals and interests. The European Constitution will lend greater democracy, transparency and efficiency to European politics. The European Parliament, like the national parliaments, will be more closely involved in the shaping of European legislation. In the future it will elect the President of the Commission. Consequently, the votes cast by EU citizens at European elections will carry even greater weight. The Constitution seeks to make possible participatory democracy in European politics. Local and regional authorities will have a bigger say in European programmes. The Constitution enshrines not only a social dialogue with the social partners but also a civil dialogue with non-governmental organisations. All parts of our society should have the opportunity to learn about European policies in good time and, by means of consultation, to make their wishes known in the decision-making process.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	The Constitution even introduces an instrument for direct democracy at EU level: with one million signatures from people in several Member States the EU"s citizens can require the European institutions to include a political issue on the agenda and to take a decision on it. The incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights in the Constitution provides EU citizens with additional rights and freedoms. There are therefore many good reasons to adopt this Constitution, whether by parliamentary decision or by referendum. The European Constitution will also reinforce Europe"s role in the wider world. The EU accounts for 25 per cent of global trade and finances 50 per cent of all aid worldwide. Yet despite this Europe has often found itself powerless, unable to assert its values and goals. The Constitution will consolidate Member States" common ground in foreign and security policy. In the future a European foreign minister will represent Europeans" opinions in the world at large with a single voice. By means of a "mutual assistance clause" Member States will be committed to solidarity in the event of external aggression or unforeseen disaster. The Constitution will enable security for the people of Europe, both internally and externally, to be improved. Cooperation in the fight against serious crime, including terrorism and trafficking in drugs and people, will be enhanced. States that have the will and the capability will also be able to coordinate their military capacities within the European Union, thus avoiding a duplication of work, and hence a duplication of costs, and increasing the effectiveness of the European security system. The Constitution also provides ideas and suggestions for asserting the European social model. One of the goals of European policy is to push ahead jointly with major research and innovation projects. The European Research Area should make Europe attractive to the world"s brightest minds. The Constitution also commits Europe to the fight against poverty and exclusion, to a policy of social equilibrium and to full employment.	

	Economic competition in the EU"s huge internal market will be linked to social and environmental criteria. The declared aim of the Constitution is to achieve sustainable development of our societies based on economic, environmental and social equilibrium. The European Constitution represents a compromise of the ideas and aspirations of 25 European countries. None of its provisions retreat from the EU"s most recent treaty (Nice). On the contrary, advances have been made in many areas towards a democratic and progressive Europe, in both economic and social terms. The European Constitution now needs the support of the people in the 25 Member States. After more than 50 years of unification policy Europeans are now enjoying the realisation of two dreams: peace and freedom reign, within the European Union, to an extent never before known. The task now is to ensure prosperity and security for more than 450 million people. The European Constitution provides both a framework and a basis with which, together, we can pursue policies for the inhabitants of our continent and also for cooperation with people in other parts of the world.	

Title	The European Union has launched an information network aimed at luring researchers back from the US	
Author	Linda Nordling	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	22 February 2005	
Word count	451	
Text	Hundreds, if not thousands, of Europeans take up research positions in the US each year, and it is not hard to see why. You get paid more, there is more funding, the facilities are top notch and, last but not least, the weather is generally better. Lately the regular squabble over whether this constitutes a "brain drain" has given way to a more pragmatic discussion about how to make Europe more attractive to researchers. The European Union has ploughed lots of money into bolstering member states' attractiveness as a place to do research via its framework programmes. Unfortunately, it seems that this has passed expat researchers by. A survey published by the European commission revealed that less than a fifth of the 2,000 European researchers working in the US who participated in the study had heard of the European Research Area (ERA) - the umbrella term for EU research-supporting initiatives. And only a quarter were members of EU science networks. Almost all, however, expressed an interest in collaborating with researchers at home in the future. So last Friday the commission launched an information network aimed at networking US-based European researchers with EU funding. The ERA-Link project will send out email alerts for calls for proposals, fellowships and jobs. It will also disseminate information on conferences and courses. All this begs the question of whether the EU should not work equally hard to alert its own researchers to funding available to them from outside its borders.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Naturally, it is not in its interest to flag up schemes that would see researchers leave. But many grants offered by funding bodies in the US and elsewhere can be sought by EU researchers who stay put. A search for US grants open to UK researchers with deadlines in March returned 350 hits. The funders range from public to private to charitable, tiny to huge. One of the biggest, the National Institutes of Health (NIH), doles out a breathtaking $27bn (pounds 15bn) for research each year. Next month, NIH grants open to UK researchers include ones on anorexia, diabetes, osteoporosis and HIV. The list is surprising in places. For example, the US air force is offering grants of $200,000 (pounds 111,000) to $2m for research aimed at developing innovative technology for its fighter jets. A more peaceful grant with the same March 1 deadline is the Fichter research grant from the Association for the Sociology of Religion. Awards will be for projects on gender issues or race and ethnicity. In addition, Japanese food company Ajinomoto is inviting applications under its amino acid research programme. Grants of up to pounds 150,000 a year will be given to researchers who can make the March 15 deadline for pre-applications.	

Title	Fisheries board chief sees fair wind for sector	
Author	Lorna Siggins	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	29 April 2005	
Word count	1191	
Text	As chill winds blow for commercial fishing, innovation and research in the industry are vital, Marine Institute's Peter Heffernan tells Lorna Siggins, Marine Correspondent When Dr Peter Heffernan looks at the proverbial emptying glass, he only sees it half-full - with pristine, resource-rich sea water. Now marking over a decade as head of the Government's Marine Institute, he is as enthusiastic, optimistic and determined as he was when first appointed. He has good reason to be. Over 10 years ago, when the Marine Institute was initiated, the Mayo-born scientist and returned emigrant had a handful of staff and start-up funding of about €400,000. Turnover is now about €34 million, the institute has two research ships, and Irish scientists head up five working groups under the aegis of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES). What's more, Heffernan and his 190 colleagues are preparing to move from temporary premises in Galway and a permanent base in Dublin into a purpose-built €50 million headquarters at Rinville Point on the south end of Galway bay. They are also looking forward to yet more EU funds for marine research under the European Commission's seventh framework programme for research and technological development. The elliptical shape of the new building's main office, designed by Ciarán O'Connor of the Office of Public Works, embraces the Atlantic. There's an element of serendipity, for the site is close to Ireland's first shellfish laboratory, set up by a former chief inspector of Irish fisheries, Ernest Holt, at Ardfry in 1905. "Start a winkle farm!" Holt is said to have instructed a young	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

assistant, noting that it might prove to be of "some economic value", apart from its scientific benefits.

A century later, Irish shellfish production is outstripping finfish farming in terms of economic success, and is part of a marine sector worth €3 billion annually. An 80-year infrastructural deficit has been bridged, Heffernan says.

"And that €3 billion translates into employing 40,000 people - 50 per cent directly. Service sectors such as shipping take up the greatest proportion of this, but marine resources, including fishing, fish processing, aquaculture, renewable energies and seaweed, are worth over €850 million annually," he points out.

What's unquantifiable is their impact on the fabric of peripheral and "less well-developed" parts of the 7,000-kilometre coastline.

The EU recently announced that it was working on a new maritime policy for the community. Some 20 European states have coasts stretching to almost 70,000 kilometres. Almost half of the EU population live less than 50 kilometres from the coast, and 63 per cent of the Irish population live within 10 miles of the coast, according to the Central Statistics Office.

Maritime regions of the 15 member states already account for over 40 per cent of the GNP with shipbuilding, ports, fisheries and related services industries employing 2.5 million people.

Chill winds have been blowing,however, particularly in commercial fishing.

"Marine resource interests are going to need research and innovation to compete, and there are significant new opportunities for Ireland in renewable ocean energy, marine biotechnology, environmental and aquaculture technology," Heffernan says.

An invaluable "roadmap" has been the national seabed survey, run by the Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI) in conjunction with the Marine Institute. "It has discovered living organisms on every acre of some 220 million out there, and the inventory of this material is going to prove vital."

The seabed database will "serve Ireland for a century and more", he predicts, and other EU member states have "marvelled at our foresight in carrying this

out", he says. But is it not a database that can be sold off to the highest bidder - as with information on potential oil and gas resources, and commercial fish stocks.

For even as Heffernan speaks, there's a reminder of this coastline's value to our European neighbours. A Portuguese gillnetter has been escorted into Galway docks by the Naval Service patrol ship, LE Eithne. On board are about 120 tonnes of monkfish - multiples of the Irish annual quota for this species. The vessel has been under surveillance, without detention, in these waters for close on nine years.

"Knowledge is power," Heffernan replies, adept at steering clear of political debates. "The sort of information gathered during the seabed survey will empower Ireland to make the right choices, and it is better to face the challenges with it than without it. The market for seafood is insatiable, but the consumer is making the call. The consumer will be asking, more and more frequently, if fish sold is sustainably caught - and that is coming down on us like a freight train."

He cites the Irish Box - now reduced in size, and with fewer restrictions on Spanish activity - as an example. “Ireland would never have retained any of the Irish Box without the scientific information we had and it was that science that supported our negotiating team. The fishing industry appreciates this, but good science doesn't always mean more fish."

The Marine Institute's main lobbying focus over the past year relates to further EU funding, under the new framework programme for research and technological development for 2007 to 2013. It has also been preparing its own five-year development plan for 2006 to 2012, hosting foresight group meetings for stakeholders. Ireland, Norway and Portugal have been to the forefront in terms of trying to influence policy in the European Research Area (ERA), he says, and all three states produced a joint submission on the issue last December.

Earlier this month, a draft position paper was published by the EU which clearly reflected Irish influence in relation to marine science.

	"Our own mission statement, published by the Government in late 2002, refers to the need for a thriving maritime economy in harmony with the ecosystem and supported by the delivery of excellence in our services," Heffernan says. The new EU commissioner for fisheries, Mr Joe Borg, recently spoke of his vision for "a thriving marine economy in harmony with the environment, supported by scientific excellence in the ERA". Ireland is well placed to play this "leadership role", he says, and last year's Eurocean conference, hosted by the Marine Institute in Galway as part of the EU presidency, copperfastened this State's position, he believes "We already have the nursery grounds for fish, we have world-class fishery scientists leading scientific teams on an international scale, and the fact that we are so small has to be one of our greatest competitive advantages. Once we have made a decision, our rate of implementation has to be faster than anywhere else in Europe. The distance between the industry voice here and a Government decision is very, very short." Yet if there's interest in Brussels, is there anyone listening in Leinster House? Heffernan has served under many ministers in his time. Now they don't sit at the Cabinet table anymore. "That's market forces," Heffernan says. "Nothing ever stays static - the ability to adapt is vital, and Government policy still states that it wants to establish Ireland as a world-class centre for excellence for scientific research. We have made sure, and will continue to ensure, that marine science has its place."	

Title	UK researchers take grants overseas	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	17 June 2005	
Word count	515	
Text	About £900,000 in UK research grants have been transferred to Germany in the past four years, the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council revealed today. But the council insisted that the "trade" in grants was two-way. About £900,000 in UK research grants have been transferred to Germany in the past four years, the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) revealed today. But the council insisted that the "trade" in grants was two-way and would benefit the UK as well. A little noticed agreement between the council and its German counterpart has been in place since 2001 in an attempt to promote mobility among researchers and build a European research area that could become a global player. But this week, Graham Richards, the chairman of Oxford University's chemistry department, warned that the UK was being naive about the scheme and risked losing millions of pounds worth of grants. Movement from British universities to Germany was more likely than in the other direction, he told the Times Higher Education Supplement. He was angered by the departure of one of his key researchers to a German university "taking £650,000 of UK taxpayers' money with him as a generous dowry", he said. Today, Stuart Ward, the research council's director of resources, said that since the agreement with its German equivalent, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), five UK researchers had taken their research council grants to Germany and five German academics had brought their grants to the UK. He said that in the cases of the five UK academics, £800,000 of research was undertaken in the UK before transfer, and the value of the grants transferred	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	was approximately £900,000. The council was unable to give a total for the amount of German grants "imported". Mr Ward said the transfer of the grants only takes place with the explicit approval of the UK and German universities involved. "The agreement was set up in order to allow academics moving from Germany to the UK and vice versa to continue their research. Projects funded by EPSRC in the UK and DFG in Germany could then be finished in the other country rather than being terminated before completion. "The link is designed to ensure continuity when academics in either of the countries move to the other. It is very much in the spirit of the European research area concept launched by Philippe Busquin during his time as EU research commissioner," he added. The Oxford complaint was the only one in four years, said Mr Ward. He added: "The introduction of full economic costs from April 2006 might possibly make UK academics more attractive for recruitment by institutions overseas, but it will also make sure that the UK has a well-funded, sustainable research environment that will make it a very attractive place to do leading edge research." Prof Richards told the THES that UK academics were attractive to continental universities. "They would only have to offer a generous salary, with us providing the research funding." This would become more serious as research councils increased grants to pay the full economic costs of research, he argued.	

Title	New €3.6m drive against liver fluke	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Irish Independent	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	18 April 2006	
Word count	341	
Text	UCD has been awarded €400,000 by the European Commission to develop control strategies against liver fluke. A total of €3.59m has been allocated to a consortium which includes University College Dublin, Queen's University Belfast and the Agri-food and Biosciences Institute in Northern Ireland. The consortium, known as DELIVER (Develop Effective and sustainable control strategies for LIVER fluke), aims to develop new environmentally-friendly methods to control liver fluke disease in livestock, particularly cattle and sheep. Liver fluke is estimated to cause annual losses of €60m to livestock production and the food industry in Ireland. This is set to rise given the experience of other EU countries who have recently recorded a dramatic 12-fold increase in the occurrence of the parasite. UCD scientists Professor Grace Mulcahy, Dr Theo de Waal and Dr Jane Irwin aim to develop vaccines against fluke, improve methods of forecasting fluke disease and gain a greater insight into the mechanisms by which drugs act on the parasite. Dublin City University's Dr Sandra O'Neill and researchers from Queen's University and the Agrifood and Biosciences Institute in Northern Ireland will also contribute to this research, the ultimate goal of which is to enhance the quality and safety of meat and dairy products. Prof Mulcahy said the European-funded consortium would allow the consortium to deliver real benefits to consumers in terms of improving food safety, to producers in providing new tools for rearing healthy animals,	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	and to the European research area in terms of innovation. Currently, the problem of liver fluke disease is being tackled using pesticides and anti-parasitic drugs. However, such control measures are becoming both ineffective and undesirable as the fluke develop resistance to these drugs and environmental concerns question the safety of pesticides. Existing anti-parasitic treatments are accompanied by risks of chemical residues in foodstuffs. The result of the DELIVER project will be made available through a dedicated website and online educational material. This will allow interested farmers and others working in the agri-food industry to track project progress and keep up to date with results as they emerge.	

Title	Growth of the golden years	
Author	Sylvia Thompson	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	10 October 2006	
Word count	982	
Text	One in four people in Ireland will be over 65 in about 25 years. Put simply, many people in their 40s now (who, incidentally, were also an interesting statistic in the 1980s when one in two Irish people were under 25) will be living with a much larger number of their peers than in the past. Internationally, figures are similar. In Germany, for instance, more than 20 per cent of the population will be over 65 by 2050. In Spain and Austria, it is predicted that 40 per cent of the population will be over 65 by 2050. When these figures are bandied about, the first concerns are always related to pensions and healthcare. How will governments and private companies afford to pay pensions to such a large segment of the population? How will healthcare systems cope with the increasing number of chronic and acute illnesses that will inevitably come with an ageing population? And how will economies remain buoyant if large numbers of these older people become poor and can't maintain the standard of living they have become accustomed to? A conference in Switzerland recently opted to look more broadly at how we should adapt to such a demographic shift. Focusing on how this generation of older people will differ from its predecessors, the second annual conference of the World Demographic Society viewed the scenario both at a societal level and an individual level. Of course, pensions and healthcare issues were discussed, but so too were the concepts of active or successful ageing, lifelong learning, flexible work models for older, experienced employees, volunteering, age-friendly cities and primary health clinics.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	The need for cities to make public spaces more age-friendly was highlighted by Alexandre Kalache, head of the ageing and life course programme at the World Health Organisation (WHO) in Geneva, Switzerland. He spoke about the WHO age-friendly cities initiative in South America, in which older people are consulted about what changes would make it easier for them to get around. "We've concentrated on urban areas because over 50 per cent of the world's population now lives in cities. We are also sensitising police forces to help them understand age-related disabilities so that people can continue to live in their communities for as long as possible," he told The Irish Times. The WHO has also developed a model for age-friendly primary care centres with older people working as monitors of the accessibility of the physical environment and increased training for staff on the needs of older people. "Healthcare centres know lots about mothers and babies but often not very much about the needs of older people," said Kalache. Speaking by satellite connection from Berlin, the German minister for family affairs, senior citizens, women and youth, Ursula Von Der Leyen, expressed her fears and hopes for an ageing population. She emphasised the need for countries such as Germany to develop family-friendly working conditions and good childcare services to allow women to combine work and family commitments. She also spoke of how demographic change will be the focus of the German presidency of the European Union next year. Themes such as "experience is the future" will emphasise the value of older workers. Another initiative promised is the "Houses of Generations" project which will offer people of all ages opportunities to take part in social and learning activities at local level. A speaker from the not-for-profit organisation, the American Elder Hostel, echoed these sentiments in his talk on the current educational programme throughout the world for older and young people.	

What constitutes quality of life for older people received a lot of discussion at the conference. "What is most striking is that older people rate social relationships and friendships above income in terms of important quality of life indicators," said Alan Walker, director of the European Research Area on Ageing and professor of social policy and social gerontology at the University of Sheffield in England.

Walker added that other significant predictors of quality of life in old age include how much personal control people have over their living environment, their perception of their economic security and the social dimension of their physical activities. One area which he believed required more attention is better design of information communications technology and domestic and public equipment to accommodate an ageing population.

Throughout the conference, there was a prevailing view that the perception of older people will have to change as more older people will be healthier than ever before. Older people will also be more active in work, political and social activities.

The need for inter-generational solidarity and for solidarity between the developed and developing world was expressed. However, to foster better health in old age, academics, health professionals and policymakers agreed that national healthcare agencies must commit themselves to a life-span approach to physical and mental health, nutrition and social activities.

The changing patterns of chronic and infectious diseases were the focus of some attention. Also discussed was the fact that many of our healthcare systems are still organised around the treatment of acute conditions and not the management of chronic conditions.

The expected rise in cancers, heart disease, stroke, depression and HIV/Aids is matched by an expected decline in perinatal conditions, respiratory diseases and other infectious diseases, according to Jeffery Sturchio, vice-president of external affairs at Merck pharmaceutical company in the US.

"This will require government policy and patients as partners in their healthcare. As people live longer, the increasing numbers of people with

	chronic disease and disability will put a strain on health budgets," he added. He and others suggested that there wasn't enough investment in prevention and health promotion by national governments. According to Sturchio, active, informed patients are the natural partners in preventing and managing chronic disease more efficiently, and that only by putting in place policies now will we be able to celebrate the new demographic profile of our populations in 2050.	

Title	A big twinkle in the sky	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	28 December 2006	
Word count	828	
Text	Europe's astronomers have embarked on a remarkable new adventure - to build the world's largest ground-based telescope. This €800 million monster would have a light-collecting mirror almost as big as half a football pitch. Unfortunately, Ireland may be left behind in the development of the European Extremely Large Telescope (EELT) because we are one of the few western European countries who are not members of the European Southern Observatory (ESO), the body behind the telescope. "If you want to be part of the adventure, which this really is, you have to be a member," stated the ESO's head of public affairs and new entrant negotiator, Claus Madsen. Madsen was in Dublin earlier this month speaking at the annual Astro-Expo and meeting astronomers and scientists. The key topic under discussion was Irish membership of ESO. The Georgia Tech report on Irish membership of science bodies was published several years ago and recommended that Ireland join ESO and several other bodies such as the European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL) and the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility (ESRF). We are now members of EMBL but await a decision on ESO. Madsen had no meetings with officials but did talk to Irish astronomers anxious to join ESO. "My understanding is the discussions are up again," he says. There are a number of reasons why Ireland would benefit from membership, he believes. "The issue really is the full and complete integration of Irish science and astronomy into the European Research Area," he suggests. "It builds a lot of prospects for European science."	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

But this can't happen if some EU members remain outside certain aspects of the research area, be believes. "Ireland should definitely play its role and harvest the benefits of membership."

Not least among these are the commercial opportunities that open up to Irish science and industry given membership of ESO. "This is a completely different league of science you can take part in. These instruments are large machines and very technically advanced. They are built by national institutes in collaboration with industry partners."

This allows much technology transfer between participants across ESO, he says. "This is a way to integrate national programmes into a big international programme."

These industrial linkages, which represent income and jobs for Irish participants, help offset the cost of membership, he says. It would cost us between €14 million and €15 million to join, with an annual cost of about €1.5 million.

Just as important and more difficult to quantify, however, is the impact on society generally. "Astronomy as a science exerts a strong attraction for the public at large and especially among young people," says Madsen. "Astronomy has been very good at raising an interest in science."

This serves the Government's aim to get more students to take science subjects at Leaving Cert and Third Level. ESO also opens up many career opportunities for those who do embrace science as a subject.

"ESO has evolved to become the leading force for ground-based astronomy in Europe and probably in the world," Madsen says. "ESO has a very strong technical record in the design and development of research infrastructure for astronomy."

They don't get much bigger than the EELT, a huge project that hopes to deliver the most sensitive ground-based optical and infrared telescope yet devised by 2017. The ESO council gave the green light for a detailed €57 million study of the EELT on December 11th. This will make it possible to begin construction of the instrument, probably within three years.

	The challenge is to produce reflective mirrors that can overcome the difficulty faced by all terrestrial observatories, the fuzziness of stellar images caused as the light passes through the atmosphere. The planned instrument would overcome this "twinkle" by using a set of five different mirrors to capture and clean the faint light coming from the edges of the universe. The EELT would have a primary mirror some 42m across. It will be more than 100 times more sensitive than the current largest ground-based telescopes such as the 10m Keck telescopes or the 8.2m instruments. "A telescope of this size could not be built without a complete rethinking of the way we make telescopes," says ESO director general, Catherine Cesarsky. This big a reflective surface is only possible because the primary mirror is actually made of 906 hexagonal segments each 1.45 metres in size. The light captured by the primary mirror is reflected to a second six metre mirror and then a third of 4.2m. From here the light would be relayed to an "adaptive optics system" involving two mirrors. One is a 2.5m mirror supported by 5,000 actuators able to distort the mirror's surface 1,000 times per second. This will iron out the twinkle effect caused by the atmosphere. This adjusted light would then reach the fifth and final 2.7m mirror that would make the final image corrections prior to observation. "This is really the beginning of a new era for optical and infrared astronomy," says Cesarsky.	

Framework Programme 7

Title	Wird aus der Leopoldina unsere Nationalakademie?	
Author	Wolf Lepenies	
Newspaper company	Die Welt	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	12 December 2007	
Word count	1430	
Text	Der Vorschlag von Bildungsministerin Schavan kommt spät, aber noch rechtzeitig genug Im kommenden Februar wird die GWK, die Gemeinsame Wissenschaftskommission von Bund und Ländern, über den Vorschlag von Annette Schavan entscheiden, die Hallenser Leopoldina zur Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu erklären. Damit könnte eine mühsame, Jahrzehnte dauernde Diskussion darüber, ob die föderal verfasste Bundesrepublik tatsächlich eine Nationalakademie nötig hat, an ihr Ende kommen. Der Vorstoß der Ministerin überraschte alle Beteiligten. Kaum überraschend war es, dass sich der Protest in Grenzen hielt. Die Beförderung der "Deutschen Akademie der Naturforscher Leopoldina" zur Nationalakademie würde die Lösung eines Problems bedeuten, dessen Dringlichkeit im Laufe der Zeit schwächer geworden ist. Der Soziologe Helmuth Plessner kommentierte einmal: "Man kommt immer noch früh genug zu spät". Als Reichsakademie wurde die Leopoldina 1652 in Schweinfurt gegründet. Seit 1878 hat sie ihren Sitz in Halle. Aufgrund ihrer Mitgliederstruktur blieb die Leopoldina auch zur Zeit der Teilung stets eine gesamtdeutsche Institution. Sie hätte nach der Wende mit Aussicht auf Erfolg den Anspruch erheben können, zu einer nationalen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu werden - wenn sie nicht "nur" eine der Naturforscher gewesen wäre. Erst in den letzten Jahren	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	hat sich die Leopoldina zu den Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften geöffnet. Jetzt steht ihrer nationalen Promotion nichts mehr im Wege. Massive Stolpersteine auf dem Weg zu dieser Gründung waren lange Zeit die deutschen Regional-Akademien. Nicht zuletzt unter bayerischer Führung wurde aus diesen Stolpersteinen im Laufe der Zeit ein Abwehrwall, der jedem Zentralisierungsbemühen trotzte. Der Regionalegoismus, die Abwehr aller Versuche, Kräfte zu zentralisieren und zu bündeln, sah mit Nostalgie auf das 19. Jahrhundert zurück, als das deutsche Wissenschaftssystem von der politischen Zersplitterung des Landes durchaus profitierte. Es war damals in der Tat weniger die Zentrale Berlin, es waren die in Konkurrenz zueinander stehenden deutschen Wissenschaftsregionen, die Deutschland einen Spitzenplatz in Forschung und Lehre verschafften. Wir sind aber nicht mehr im 19. Jahrhundert. Auch in der Wissenschaftspolitik ist Brüssel zur Hauptstadt Europas geworden. Eine Nationalakademie kommt da gerade noch rechtzeitig zu spät. Die nationalen Akademien sind noch wirksam, verlieren aber zunehmend an Bedeutung. Wird zum Beispiel die Politikberatung als zentrale Aufgabe einer Akademie genannt, unterschlägt man damit, dass entscheidende wissenschaftspolitische Weichenstellungen - etwa in der Gentechnik - längst in Brüssel getroffen werden. Dort muss - weit stärker als bisher - die Wissenschaftslobby tätig werden. In Zukunft wird dabei das in Gründung befindliche European Research Area Board eine zentrale Rolle spielen. In ihm werden Politiker, Wissenschaftler und Repräsentanten der Wirtschaft zusammenarbeiten und dem für Forschung zuständigen Kommissar direkt verantwortlich sein. Immer noch aktuell ist das Argument, die deutsche Wissenschaft müsse im Ausland mit einer Stimme sprechen. In der Tat könnte eine nationale Akademie die internationale Repräsentanz der deutschen Wissenschaft stärken. Stets werden dabei in Deutschland von den Befürwortern einer nationalen Akademie nicht ohne Nostalgie und mit einer gehörigen Portion Neid die Zentralakademien anderer europäischer Länder, vor allem die Académie Française, die Royal Society in London oder die Königliche	

	Schwedische Akademie als Vorbilder genannt. Mit einem Seitenblick auf die europäischen Nachbarn aber lässt sich das Plädoyer für die Einrichtung einer nationalen Akademie in Deutschland kaum stärken. Die Bedeutung der beneideten ausländischen Nationalakademien wird in der Regel überschätzt. Ihre Funktion wird verkannt. 1. In Schweden gibt es mehrere Königliche Akademien. Es sind im wesentlichen Honoratiorenvereine, die sich vor allem dem ausländischen Mitglied gegenüber vorbildlich verhalten: man wird gewählt, erhält eine scheußliche Krawatte mit dem Nordsternorden und wird hinfort in Ruhe gelassen. Mit zwei Ausnahmen: Regelmäßig wird man mit einem Jahrbuch in einer fremden Sprache beschenkt, in der man nur den eigenen Namen entziffern kann, und in jedem Jahr erhält man Vordrucke, auf denen Vorschläge zur Vergabe der Nobelpreise in Physik, Chemie und Wirtschaftswissenschaften gemacht werden können. Die Vorschläge sind stets willkommen und regelmäßig unwirksam, da über die Vergabe der Preise letztlich in kleinen, oft innerschwedischen Zirkeln entschieden wird. Erst wenn man die Vergabepraxis der Akademie kritisiert, merkt man, dass die Akademie lebt: der Präsident versichert, dass alles seine Ordnung habe. Noblesse oblige: Es ist kaum vorstellbar, dass die Königliche Akademie der Geschichte und der Altertümer ohne weiteres einen Alleinvertretungsanspruch der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften akzeptieren würde. Und für die Politikberatung sind in der Heimat Alfred Nobels ganz andere Gremien von Bedeutung: In diesem Zusammenhang spielt beispielsweise die Stiftung der Schwedischen Reichsbank eine erheblich größere Rolle. 2. In England ist die Führungsrolle der Royal Society unbestritten - das Kürzel FRS ("Fellow of the Royal Society") hinter dem Namen ist für den Wissenschaftler immer noch ein Ritterschlag. Im Prestigegefälle zwischen der Royal Society und der 1902 ebenfalls durch Royal Charter gegründeten British Academy wird zugleich das unterschiedliche Ansehen deutlich, über	

	das die Naturwissenschaften auf der einen, die Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaften auf der anderen Seite verfügen. Die jüngere der Akademien versucht immerhin, den Traditionsvorsprung der älteren durch die Produktion eigener Kuriositäten ein wenig aufzuholen. Man hat kaum Chancen, FBA zu werden, wenn man nicht weiß, dass einem beim Jahrestreffen der Akademie mit dem "Toast on the Queen" ein Bericht über die Akademie, mit dem "Toast on the Academy" hingegen ein Bericht über die Welt und ihre Probleme erwartet. Eine exklusive Außenvertretung der englischen Wissenschaft kann die Royal Society nicht in Anspruch nehmen. Eine wirksame Politikberatung erfolgt in der Regel in anderen Zirkeln als in von der Akademie eingesetzten Gremien. Hier spielen die in England ausgesprochen originellen, zum Teil sehr kleinen "Think Tanks" eine wichtige Rolle. 3. Für Frankreich gilt ähnliches. Die Wirkung der Académie Française besteht - abgesehen von ihrer Arbeit am "Dictionnaire" und ihrer in der Tat zentralen Rolle in der Sprachpolitik - vor allem darin, dass jeder, der nicht Mitglied ist, sie verspottet, und sich zugleich nichts sehnlicher wünscht, als ihr anzugehören. Dies gilt fast ebenso entschieden für den Verbund der Akademien, die im Institut de France zusammengeschlossen sind. Nicht so sehr als Institutionen wirken die Akademien nach außen, sondern indirekt - durch ihre Mitglieder. Ein Buch, dessen Autor hinter seinen Namen die Worte "De l'Académie Française" setzen kann, ein Artikel in "Le Monde", dessen Verfasser "De l'Institut" ist, dürfen auf eine erhöhte Aufmerksamkeit rechnen. Von dieser Aufmerksamkeitspräferenz profitieren die Akademien: Ein Reputationszirkel, der sich in Jahrhunderten eingespielt hat. Die Politikberatung im engeren - und in vielen Fällen durchaus wirkungsvollen - Sinn erfolgt in der Regel nicht durch die Akademien und auch nicht unter ihrer Leitung. Als Stimme der französischen Wissenschaft gelten eher das CNRS, das Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, oder im medizinischen Bereich INSERM, das Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale. Institutionen wie die inzwischen nach Straßburg	

verlagerte Ecole Normale d'Administration (ENA) oder das Pariser Institut für Politische Wissenschaften ("Sciences Po") verbinden Politik, Verwaltung, Wirtschaft und Wissenschaft miteinander. In dieser Gemengelage macht es kaum Sinn, von Politikberatung zu sprechen.

Von großer Bedeutung und öffentlicher Sichtbarkeit sind in Frankreich ad-hoc Kommissionen, die der Fachminister, der Premier oder der Staatspräsident einsetzt. Als sich die Franzosen vor einigen Jahren um ihr Schulsystem sorgten - sie brauchten dazu keine PISA-Studie -, bildete der Ministerpräsident eine Kommission, die sogenannte "Kommission Fauroux". Ihr gehörten Wissenschaftler, Manager und Politiker an. Der Vorsitzende der Kommission, Roger Fauroux, von Hause Germanist, war Vorstandsvorsitzender des Industrieriesen Saint-Gobain, Direktor der ENA, Industrieminister im Kabinett Rocard und Bürgermeister einer kleinen Gemeinde in Südwestfrankreich gewesen. Politikberatung? Fauroux hätte sich nur selbst beraten können.

In einem Land, das die Durchlässigkeit seiner Eliten fast spielerisch erprobt und wo "Nation" und "Republik" Schlüsselvokabeln des politischen Diskurses geblieben sind, würden Zweifel an der Notwendigkeit einer nationalen Akademie der Wissenschaften als absurd empfunden werden. Die nationalen Institutionen existieren - auch wenn sie nicht wie selbstverständlich für die ganze Nation sprechen. Es gibt natürlich auch noch die Académie des Sciences - aber sie spielt bei weitem nicht die Rolle, die ihr viele deutsche Verfechter einer Nationalakademie unterstellen und braucht sie auch nicht zu spielen.

Die deutschen Regionalakademien befürchten von der Gründung einer nationalen, Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften einen beträchtlichen Rückgang ihres eigenen Einflusses. Man kann sie beruhigen. Im historischen Rückblick zeigt das französische Beispiel, wie sich Regional- gegenüber Zentralakademien behaupten können: durch Einfall und Zufall. Wer sich beispielsweise mit der Wirkung französischer Akademien im 18. Jahrhundert beschäftigt, denkt weder an die Académie Française noch an die Académie

	des Sciences, sondern an die Académie de Dijon, die gleich zwei vorzügliche Einfälle hatte - nämlich 1750 nach der Rolle der Künste und Wissenschaften in der Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechtes und 1755 nach dem Ursprung der Ungleichheit unter den Menschen zu fragen. Für ihre guten Einfälle wurde sie mit dem Zufall belohnt, dass auf beide Fragen ein gewisser Rousseau antwortete und damit nicht nur die europäische Geistesgeschichte, sondern auch das politische Schicksal unseres Kontinents nachhaltig beeinflusste. Die deutschen Akademien fürchten die Gründung einer nationalen Akademie	

Title	Kleinstaaterei in der Wissenschaft: Wie die EU um eine einheitliche Forschungspolitik ringt	
Author	Tilmann Warnecke	
Newspaper company	Der Tagesspiegel	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	19 May 2008	
Word count	788	
Text	Wie europäische Forschungspolitik funktioniert, zeigte sich nach dem Ausbruch der Vogelgrippe. Um sich über die Gefahren der Epidemie zu informieren, schickte jedes EU-Land Wissenschaftler in die Krisenregion Asien: Erst kamen die Deutschen, dann die Engländer und Franzosen, gefolgt von den Forschern der anderen Länder. Aus jedem der 27 Mitgliedsstaaten eine Delegation, und dazu eine, die im Namen der EU sprach. "Total verwirrend" sei das für die Asiaten gewesen, heißt es in der EU-Forschungsdirektion in Brüssel. "Die wussten überhaupt nicht, wer ihr Ansprechpartner war." Für Europa wäre ein einheitliches, konzertiertes Vorgehen effektiver gewesen - und zudem deutlich billiger. Viele Grenzen mögen in der Europäischen Union gefallen sein: Die meisten EU-Bürger bezahlen mit der gleichen Währung, Unternehmen operieren dank des europäischen Binnenmarkts zu den gleichen Bedingungen. Doch in der Forschung, die wie die Wirtschaft längst globalisiert ist, handeln die EU-Mitgliedsstaaten immer noch weitgehend "nationalistisch", wie es in Brüssel heißt. Mit schwerwiegenden Folgen, sagt Robert Jan Smits aus der EU-Generaldirektion Forschung: Im weltweiten Wettbewerb um die besten Forscher - in dem neben den USA auch viele asiatische Staaten mit Europa konkurrieren - hätten die EU-Länder oft das Nachsehen. Die kritische Masse für eine weltweit gewichtige Forschung werde zu selten erreicht. So fehle es oft schlicht an genügend Geld. Doch jetzt will Brüssel den gemeinsamen Europäischen Forschungsraum - die "European Research Area" besteht auf dem Papier seit dem Jahr 2000 - besser ausgestalten. "Die EU, die in der Wissenschaft von den Mitgliedsstaaten	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	bisher vor allem als Geldverteilungsagentur benutzt wurde, muss Forschungspolitik endlich auch gestalten", fordert EU-Forschungskommissar Janez Potocnik. Beispiele, wie sich Europa durch die Kleinstaaterei in der Wissenschaft schwächt, gibt es aus Brüsseler Sicht genug. Etwa in der Medizin: In 2000 nationalen Programmen versuchen Wissenschaftler in den EU-Mitgliedsstaaten zu erkunden, wie man genetisch bedingte, seltene Krankheiten besser therapieren könnte. Eine "absurde Vielfalt", heißt es in Brüssel. Denn für so viele Programme gebe es gar nicht genug Patienten, die an diesen seltenen Krankheiten leiden. Ein anderes Beispiel ist die große Flotte von Forschungsschiffen: Gut 200 Schiffe fahren unter der Flagge verschiedener EU-Länder - "statt weniger neuer, exzellent ausgerüsteter Schiffen leistet man sich viele ältere, die mit denen der Amerikaner nicht mithalten können." Letzteres soll sich ändern: Die Nordseeanrainer bauen derzeit gemeinsam das Polarschiff "Aurora Borealis", das das modernste seiner Art werden soll. Die Aurora gehört zu 35 Forschungsinfrastruktur-Projekten, bei denen sich die Europäer zusammen tun, um an der Weltspitze mitspielen zu können. Als Vorbild dient das "Cern" in Genf, das größte Zentrum für Teilchenphysik der Welt, das 20 europäische Staaten betreiben. So sollen Forschungsflugzeuge konstruiert werden, oder ein Riesenteleskop (European Extremely Large Teleskop), mit dem man schwarze Löcher erkunden will. Der Aufbau von Datenbanken ist geplant, die Forscher in den Sozialwissenschaften zur Verfügung stehen. Knapp 14 Milliarden Euro sind für die Vorhaben veranschlagt. Die Wissenschaftler monieren derweil immer noch große Mobilitätshindernisse. So beklagen sie, dass sie ihre Pensionsrechte und Sozialversicherungen nicht von einem Land ins andere mitnehmen können. Das will die EU bald vereinfachen, heißt es bei der Forschungsdirektion. Auch soll ein einheitliches Auftreten gegenüber anderen Ländern intensiviert werden. Gemeinsame Forschungsprogramme will die EU ebenso vorantreiben.	

	Wäre in diesem Rahmen eine aus EU-Mitteln finanzierte Spitzenuni möglich, die auch in finanzieller Hinsicht den US-Eliteunis das Wasser reichen kann? Dass die Mitgliedsstaaten gegen eine radikale Konzentration der Kräfte rebellieren, zeigt das Beispiel des European Institute of Technology (EIT). Das sollte nach dem Wunsch von EU-Kommissionspräsident Manuel Barroso als Konkurrenz zum weltberühmten MIT entstehen: Ein Ort, an dem die besten Forscher aus Europa zusammengezogen werden. Doch das war nicht durchsetzbar, jetzt soll das EIT soll nur als Netzwerk bestehender Institute fungieren. Leichter einigen konnte man sich dagegen auf den Europäischen Forschungsrat (ERC), der nach dem Vorbild der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft Mittel an ausgewählte Vorhaben verteilt. Er ist zum Vorzeigeprojekt einer neuen EU-Forschungspolitik avanciert und habe "eine große Zukunft" vor sich, lobt EU-Kommissar Potocnik. Das liegt wohl auch daran, dass sich prinzipiell alle EU-Mitglieder Geld vom ERC erhoffen können - auch wenn die Mittel allein nach Exzellenzkriterien vergeben werden, wie der deutsche Generalsekretär Ernst-Ludwig Winnacker betont. Die Wende weg vom Proporz- und hin zum Leistungsgedanken sei geschafft. Dass die EU es ernst meine, zeige sich für ihn auch darin, dass die Mitgliedsstaaten ohne Murren das Ergebnis der ersten Vergaberunde vor einigen Monaten schluckten. Denn sechs Ländern sind dabei ganz leer ausgegangen. In einigen Staaten wie Deutschland werden weniger Vorhaben finanziert, als ihnen bei einer Verteilung nach Proporz zugestanden hätte, in anderen wie Großbritannien mehr. Könnte nach und nach das gesamte EU-Forschungsbudget allein nach Leistungskriterien verteilt und der Forschungsrat deutlich gestärkt werden? Kommissar Potocnik wiegelt ab. Man dürfe bei aller Begeisterung nicht vergessen, dass der ERC eine "besondere Aufgabe" habe. Der große Rest der Gelder solle wie bisher unter der Voraussetzung verteilt werden, dass mehrere Länder bei Forschungsprojekten kooperieren.	

Title	Minister blazes trail for greater research co-operation	
Author	Peggy Hollinger	
Newspaper company	Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	2 July 2008	
Word count	192	
Text	France hopes to create a group of pioneer countries to blaze the trail for the greater co-ordination of European research in the sectors of energy, health, food and communications during its European Union presidency, according to research minister Valérie Pécresse, writes Peggy Hollinger in Paris . Ms Pécresse said she hoped to win agreement from a number of member states to pool resources for research in these four areas. Paris was drawing up proposals to accelerate the development of a European research area, which would be based on a series of meetings throughout the year with member states. "Only 15 per cent of research spending in European states is co-ordinated," Ms Pécresse said, compared with 85 per cent in the US. She added: "We need better co-ordination and we need to identify the issues facing society where there are real research challenges." Ms Pécresse also intends to push for a classification system for Europe's universities. The benchmarks for this are to be considered by ministers in November. The aim is to encourage student, researcher and teacher mobility by giving a clear standard by which to measure the best European universities in different disciplines.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

Title	Kommunikation im grünen Kraftwerk; Markus Teige koordiniert ein EU-weites Netzwerk zu Chloroplasten-Forschung	
Author	Astrid Kuffner	
Newspaper company	Der Standard	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	15 April 2009	
Word count	376	
Text	Chloroplasten sind "grüne Kraftwerke": Sie wandeln in Pflanzen Lichtenergie in Biomasse um, wobei organische Substanzen wie Kohlenhydrate, Aminosäuren oder Vitamine aufgebaut werden. "Als Basis pflanzlicher Produktivität gewinnen Chloroplasten bei steigendem Bedarf an Nahrungsmitteln und nachwachsenden Rohstoffen an enormer wirtschaftlicher Bedeutung", sagt Markus Teige, der in den Max F. Perutz Laboratories der Uni Wien die Kommunikationsprozesse in Chloroplasten erforscht. Für den Biochemiker ist die Pflanzenforschung daher genauso wichtig wie medizinische Forschung. Seit April 2008 koordiniert Teige das EU-Marie-Curie-Trainings-Netzwerk Cosi (kurz für Chloroplast Signals), in dem die interdisziplinäre Ausbildung junger Forschender durch neun akademische Institutionen und den Industriepartner Bayer BioScience gefördert wird. "In den vergangenen 100 Jahren waren stets technologische Fortschritte die Triebkraft hinter revolutionären Entdeckungen", sagt der 42-Jährige, der 2005 schon das Konzept für Cosi entwarf. In diesem Netzwerk werden den Doktorandinnen und Doktoranden nicht nur moderne experimentelle Methoden, sondern auch Softskills vermittelt. "Angewandte Pflanzenbiotechnologie beinhaltet nicht zwangsläufig den Anbau genetisch modifizierter Pflanzen", betont Teige. Im European Research Area Projekt Cropp (Calcium Regulation of Plant Productivity) ist der Gruppenleiter einer von fünf Partnern. Ziel der beiden Forschungsnetzwerke sei es letztlich, "die Grundlagen für verbesserte Sorten zu legen".	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	Schon als Schüler faszinierte Markus Teige die Fotosynthese. Im Keller seines Elternhauses in Hannover führte er einfache Experimente durch und studierte später Chemie an der dortigen Uni. Die Dissertation schrieb er am IPK Gatersleben und ging als Humboldt-Fellow für den PostDoc an die University of Texas nach Dallas. 1998 kam er an die Uni Wien und habilitierte sich 2002. In einem weiteren Projekt erforscht Teige, dessen Gruppe ausschließlich durch Drittmittel finanziert wird, das Verhalten der Modellpflanze Arabidopsis (Ackerschmalwand) unter Salzstress und wie ihr Stoffwechsel vom "Tagbetrieb" (mit Fotosynthese und Aufbau von organischem Material) auf "Nachtbetrieb" (mit Atmung und Abbau von Speicherstoffen) umgestellt wird. Sein Erfolg als Forscher wird auch daran gemessen, wie viel Geld er lukrieren kann. "Bei der Begutachtung meiner Projekte gelten, wie bei allen Drittmittelprojekten, höchste internationale Standards, und für jüngere Forscher kann die Mitarbeit darin karriereentscheidend sein", beschreibt er seine Verantwortung. "Wie funktioniert das eigentlich?", ist die Frage, die er sich immer wieder stellt. Die Möglichkeit, seine Neugier professionell in Experimenten umzusetzen, macht für ihn den Reiz aus. Teige ist überzeugt: "Wenn man keine echte Passion hat, wird man aufgeben oder niemals zu wirklich wichtigen Ergebnissen kommen."	

Title	EU research boost	
Author	Clive Cookson	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	8 October 2009	
Word count	352	
Text	Research is one of the fields with most to gain from the likely ratification of the Lisbon treaty. Science and technology will be at the heart of the post-Lisbon transformation of the European Union from a 20th-century common market propping up farming and dying industries into a union promoting 21st-century growth. For a taste of what's to come - Tory Europhobes permitting - look at the first report of the European Research Area Board, published this week. Erab was set up last year by Janez Potocnik, who has been a remarkably successful commissioner for science and research since 2004. The inaugural Erab report provides a roadmap for a European research "renaissance" over the next 20 years. It is an appealing mixture of vision and specific objectives. The report lists practical tests that will enable people to tell whether the objectives have been achieved. For example, "we will know the European research area is a place of excellence in 2030 when we see 50 per cent of EC research funding going to frontier, high-risk R&D". John Wood of Imperial College London, who chairs Erab, says: "The biggest problem is the lack of mobility of researchers across Europe. We have pensions and social security systems that lock people in place. "For instance, if you have an academic post in Germany the pension is not transferable," he adds. "If you leave it, you lose it." Wood's second priority is for the EU to change the rules for state aid to industry, so that pre-competitive research can be funded more effectively.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	One of Erab's recommendations - the creation of a European chief scientist to work across all directorate-generals - has already been taken up as a commitment by José Manuel Barroso, the Commission president. Commissioner Potocnik says implementing the recommendations really would lead to a renaissance of European research. He notes too that the Lisbon treaty provides a legal foundation for strengthening science and technology in the European Research Area. After his successful five years in charge of research, Potocnik is certain to remain a commissioner though he is likely to move to a different portfolio.	

Title	A new renaissance	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	4 December 2009	
Word count	950	
Text	Plans for a European Research Area are well underway. But what exactly does that mean? The ERA is not just a political concept. It has to be a reality to deliver solutions for the future of all our citizens and for the future of the world THE EU has big ambitions when it comes to the knowledge society. Efforts are underway to create an European Research Area (ERA) where scientific engagement between states is as seamless as in the US and where the big social problems of our times are being targeted collectively by Europe's scientists. Ireland has an inside track on the ERA via the director general of Science Foundation Ireland (SFI). Prof Frank Gannon is one of 22 leading experts with a place on the ERA board, the body established a year ago to help deliver the ERA. In October the board submitted its first report on where we are with progress towards the nascent ERA. Already the board is laying down markers on the ERA's agenda; how it should perform, what its budget should be and how we will know when it is in place by the planned target date of 2030. "It is all a part of what Europe should look like in 2030," Gannon says. The ERA has been under active discussion for a number of years, but was first mooted as long ago as the 1970, Gannon says. He likens it to the much more readily understood "common market" which allows free movement of goods, services and people across EU borders. In the research context it would mean the free movement of researchers across EU countries, shared access to resources and a commonality of agendas. "It is making a single European Research Area where everyone thinks in a European context."	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	He acknowledges that it is "artificial to put boundaries around international science", and yet common thinking and common action is necessary to tackle the huge societal issues such as climate change, energy supply, Alzheimer's disease and the threat of world pandemics. "We need to get those problems solved, we need to get people working on them," he says. "Once you start to look at these societal needs you see the need for a ERA." The board was put together to help map out how Europe is to achieve a working ERA by 2030, and its recent first report begins to indicate how we might get there. "This is an overall blueprint," he says. "We were asked to think aggressively." With this in mind the board published a collection of targets under six key headings, indicating what a common research area would mean: the creation of an ERA; the solution of society's "Grand Challenges"; the interaction between science and society; the collaboration of public and private sectors in innovation; the encouragement of excellence and the promotion of cohesion. The ERA will have been delivered if certain targets are met including: the EU's own Framework Programme research budget, not including military research, doubles to 10 per cent of total research spending within the Community; greater co-ordination of research across the ERA; much greater mobility of researchers across Europe with at least 20 per cent of doctoral candidates working outside of their home countries; and the creation of a single fiscal regime for research, development and innovation across the EU. The board's first report includes more goals, many of them extremely ambitious. It wants a full one-third of all non-military research funding aimed at solving society's Grand Challenges and almost a third of all researchers, including humanities researchers, tackling these challenges. The board calls for absolute gender balance to ensure women maintain their role in research and it wants 3.3 per cent of EU GDP to be spent on higher education. And it wants the Lisbon target of 3 per cent of GDP for research to be increased to five per cent.	

	The plan envisions the appointment of a chief scientific adviser who would become the public face of the ERA and hopefully a person to be trusted by the public. And it wants at least half of all research to be "frontier, high-risk" research. The commercial edge is also there however with the availability of public/private risk capital for early stage technology development to reach the equivalent of 0.15 per cent of GDP. The board harked back to European supremacy in science and research during the Renaissance, choosing to embed this in the report's title: "Preparing Europe for a New Renaissance - a Strategic View of the European Research Area". European Commissioner for science and research Janez Potocnik picked up on this theme in his introduction to the report, describing how scholars and artists "moved relatively freely around Europe" during this intellectual rebirth starting in the late Middle Ages. He believes there is a need for a "paradigm shift" in the way Europe conducts research, claiming that it is also beyond politics. "The ERA is not just a political concept. It has to be a reality to deliver solutions for the future of all our citizens and for the future of the world as we know it," he said. Even so the political realities will intervene, including how individual states will engage with such an entity and achieve the board's ambitious targets on spending in light of the fiscal situation. "There are strategic and political choices that must be made," Gannon says. Even so Ireland will have to engage with this grand project if it is to achieve a knowledge economy and aspire to world-class achievement in the sciences. "It means we have to be engaged," Gannon believes. "Ireland will be at the centre of Europe, making its contribution just as it does at the moment."	

Title	Die Freie Universität Berlin ist als erste deutsche Universität mit einem eigenen Büro in Brüssel vertreten	
Author	Carsten Wette	
Newspaper company	Der Tagesspiegel	
Country of origin	Germany	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	19 December 2009	
Word count	993	
Text	Es war natürlich nicht mehr als ein zufälliges zeitliches Zusammentreffen: Um Mitternacht des 1. Dezember 2009 trat der Vertrag von Lissabon in Kraft, der die europäische Integration einen bedeutenden Schritt voranbringt. Am Abend desselben Tages blätterte in Brüssel, dem Sitz der Europäischen Union, die Freie Universität Berlin eine Seite in ihrer Geschichte um: Im europäischen Viertel der belgischen Hauptstadt eröffnete sie als erste deutsche Universität ein Verbindungsbüro. Es ist nach den Außenstellen in New York, Peking, Moskau und Neu-Delhi das fünfte Büro im Ausland. Gemessen an der historischen Dimension des Vertrags zwischen den 27 EU-Mitgliedsstaaten nach Jahren des Ringens um eine europäische Verfassung ist die Entscheidung der Freien Universität für Brüssel natürlich eher weniger bedeutend. Ein gewisser Zusammenhang zwischen dem Inkrafttreten des Vertrags von Lissabon und der Eröffnung des Verbindungsbüros besteht allerdings doch - deshalb war der Zeitpunkt des Bürostarts gut gewählt: Mit dem neuen EU-Vertrag verwirkliche die Europäische Union eine bislang eher in Sonntagsreden beschworene Entwicklung hin zu einem europäischen Forschungsraum, sagte Wolfgang Burtscher, stellvertretender Generaldirektor der "Generaldirektion Forschung" der Europäischen Kommission. Gerade bei Herausforderungen wie der noch nicht überwundenen Wirtschaftskrise oder den Folgen des Klimawandels seien exzellente Institutionen wie die Freie Universität gefragt - Institutionen, die EU-weit und darüber hinaus zu kooperieren wüssten.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

	Die Freie Universität werde ihren Teil dazu beitragen, dass ein europäischer Forschungsraum Wirklichkeit werde, sagte Jochen Schiller, Vizepräsident der Freien Universität bei der Eröffnung des Büros. Rund 100 Vertreter europäischer Institutionen und Wissenschaftsorganisationen nahmen daran teil. Unter den Gästen waren auch viele Absolventen der Freien Universität. Schiller betonte, Kooperationen über Ländergrenzen hinweg seien Teil des Selbstverständnisses der Freien Universität - sie war 1948 gegründet worden als Reaktion auf die Verfolgung regimekritischer Studenten an der damaligen Universität Unter den Linden im sowjetischen Sektor des geteilten Berlins und ging von ihrer "Insellage" in Westberlin aus Verbindungen in alle Welt ein. Es sei deshalb kein Zufall, dass die Freie Universität im Exzellenzwettbewerb des Bundes und der Länder mit dem Zukunftskonzept "Internationale Netzwerkuniversität" erfolgreich gewesen sei, zu dessen Umsetzung die Einrichtung des Büros in Brüssel zählt. Aufgabe der Vertretung sei es allerdings nicht allein, Forschungskooperationen zu initiieren, erklärte Schiller: "Das Büro soll auch helfen, mehr EU-Gelder einzuwerben." Dies geschieht in enger Zusammenarbeit mit dem Koordinator für EU-Angelegenheiten in der Forschungsabteilung der Freien Universität, Ulrich Rössler. Die Leiterin des Brüsseler Büros, Charlotte Fiala, kann dabei helfen, eine Erfolgsgeschichte fortzuschreiben, denn schon jetzt ist die Freie Universität überaus erfolgreich beim Einwerben sogenannter Drittmittel aus EU-Quellen: Nur zweieinhalb Jahre ist es her, dass die Europäische Kommission den Europäischen Forschungsrat einrichtete, eine Institution, die über die Finanzierung von Projekten der Grundlagenforschung entscheidet. Vier Forscher der Freien Universität bekamen bereits 7,4 Millionen Euro zugesprochen. Zahlreiche weitere Projekte werden aus EU-Mitteln gefördert, allein in den Politik- und Sozialwissenschaften sind es zurzeit 14 im Umfang von etwa 3,5 Millionen Euro. Die EU sei für die Freie Universität allerdings nicht nur als Geldgeberin bedeutsam, hob Tanja Börzel hervor, Inhaberin der Professur für Europäische	

Integration - vielmehr sei sie selbst ein wichtiger Forschungsgegenstand. So forschten Wissenschaftler in einem an der Freien Universität angesiedelten "Jean Monnet Centre of Excellence" über die EU und ihre Bürger. Auch in den Geisteswissenschaften werde man die Kooperation über Landesgrenzen hinweg intensivieren, sagte Professor Joachim Küpper, Direktor des Dahlem Humanities Center der Freien Universität. Büroleiterin Charlotte Fiala trägt die europäische Idee gewissermaßen im Lebenslauf: Sie studierte an der Freien Universität, promovierte in Oxford und war für verschiedene Institutionen in Brüssel tätig. Sie spricht fließend Englisch wie Französisch und könnte mit Vertretern der Europäischen Kommission auch auf Spanisch verhandeln. Bei regelmäßigen Besuchen trifft sie künftig in Berlin Wissenschaftler der Freien Universität, die Kooperationspartner für Forschungsprojekte suchen oder sich um EU-Mittel bewerben wollen. "Ich freue mich auf Impulse aus den Fachbereichen", sagt Charlotte Fiala. Für ihre Netzwerk-Missionen liegt das Büro, das die im Gebäude ansässige Helmholtz-Gemeinschaft und der Leiter des Sprachenzentrums der Freien Universität, Professor Wolfgang Mackiewicz, unterstützten, ideal: Im Haus sitzen die Wissenschaftsvertretungen Tschechiens, Polens und Dänemarks. Partner bei Verbundprojekten, die Unterschriften aus mindestens fünf EU-Staaten tragen sollten, könnte Charlotte Fiala also ein paar Türen weiter finden. Nur eine Fahrstuhlfahrt kostet sie der Besuch bei der Koordinierungsstelle für Wissenschaftsorganisationen, die alle deutschen Universitäten und Institutionen über Projekte der EU-Forschungsförderung informiert. Das Europäische Parlament und die Zentrale der Europäischen Kommission liegen nur wenige Gehminuten entfernt. "Ich sehe mich als Netzwerkerin zwischen der Freien Universität, deren Wissenschaftlern und den EU-Institutionen", sagt Charlotte Fiala.

Zu den Aufgaben des Brüsseler Büros - wie der anderen Außenstellen auch - zählt es, Absolventen der Freien Universität vergangener Jahre in die Arbeit einzubinden. "Viele der Ehemaligen, die in Brüssel tätig sind, stehen jetzt am Anfang ihrer Karriere", sagt die Direktorin des Center for International

	Cooperation (CIC) der Freien Universität, Dorothea Rüland. "Sie könnten uns unterstützen, denn sie werden früher oder später in Führungspositionen tätig sein." So wie Michael Cwik, Absolvent der sechziger Jahre, der auf eine 40-jährige Karriere in Brüssel zurückblickt, und den man da nicht zweimal fragen muss: "Vielleicht kann ich der Freien Universität dabei helfen, Türen zu öffnen", sagt der 69-Jährige und erzählt lachend von der Tür, der er 1969 den Beginn der Karriere in Brüssel verdankt: Sie führte in das Büro des Direktors für Internationale Währungsfragen der Europäischen Wirtschaftsgemeinschaft - und stand offen. Cwik überrumpelte den Direktor zu einem Bewerbungsgespräch. Michael Cwik, damals gerade für seine Arbeit über die "Kontroverse zur Einführung einer Einheitswährung in Europa" an der Freien Universität Berlin diplomiert, setzte mit dem selbstbewussten Auftritt zum rasanten Dreisprung vom Praktikanten zum bezahlten Experten und Beamten an. Und Ende 2002 - wenige Monate vor seiner Pensionierung hatte er die von ihm erwartete Gemeinschaftswährung tatsächlich im Portemonnaie. Für manche EU-Fördermittel sind Kooperationen mit Partnern auch aus nicht-europäischen Ländern nötig. Hier kann das Brüsseler Büro zusammen mit den anderen vier Außenbüros sowie zwei weiteren, die 2010 in Ägypten und Brasilien an den Start gehen, Unterstützung anbieten. Mit welchen politischen Ereignissen die Eröffnungen in Kairo und Rio de Janeiro zusammentreffen, ist noch nicht ausgemacht, aber bedeutsam für die Freie Universität werden auch sie sein.	

Title	Europe-wide code of consumer rights and contracts rooted	
Author	Arthur Beesley	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	7 January 2010	
Word count	521	
Text	THE DEVELOPMENT of a European civil code of law has been mooted as incoming members of the European Commission set out their stall to the European Parliament before a key series of confirmation hearings next week. Luxembourg's nominee to the justice, fundamental rights and citizenship portfolio, Viviane Reding, said in a submisssion to MEPs that she wanted to make significant progress in work towards a European contract law in the first three years of her mandate. Such a law would facilitate cross-border transactions in the business-to-consumer field particularly, she said, adding that this could evolve in the medium term into a European civil code. "The move from the first building blocks of European contract law (common frame of reference, standard terms and conditions, consumer rights) to a European Civil Code . . . could take the form either of a voluntary tool to improve coherence, or of an optional 28th contract law regime or of a more ambitious project," she said. Ms Reding and 25 other commissioners designate will be questioned by MEPs on the plans in a series of hearings beginning next week in Brussels. The parliament has already endorsed a second term for José Manuel Barroso, the commission president. The responses of the commissioners designate to written questionnaires from the parliament were notable for their repeated commitments to keep MEPs fully abreast of their policy work.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	The powers of the parliament, which can reject the entire Barroso team if it deems any candidate unsuitable, were significantly enhanced with the enactment of the Lisbon reform treaty. The submissions to MEPs from the incoming commission members were made public as the outgoing EU executive initiated legal action against member states over their move to halve a pay award to civil servants working for the union. The commission said it had no political discretion in respect of its action in the European Court of Justice because the reduction of the pay award was an illegal violation of the members' own system for determining pay. Ireland's nominee to the new commission, Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, said she would work in the research, innovation and science portfolio to ensure the "completion" of the European Research Area, a slow-moving project to set up unified research systems throughout the EU. Ms Geoghegan-Quinn also pledged in her submission to MEPs to review the union's current research programme, with the aim of simplifying procedures. Given moves to develop a new economic plan for the union in the years to 2020, she also plans to publish a new policy paper on innovation next year. Olli Rehn, the incoming economic and monetary affairs commissioner, said his top priority would be the battle to rekindle economic growth and boost employment. With governments throughout the union struggling to balance their books, his second priority was to work to ensure the sustainability of public finances. "We have to strengthen existing instruments for EU policy co-ordination, while using their flexibility to cope with the exceptional depth and duration of the current economic crisis." Incoming foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton said she hoped to finalise plans for the development of the union's External Action Service in April.	

Title	Geoghegan-Quinn outlines EU's top research priorities	
Author	Lorna Siggins	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	20 March 2010	
Word count	385	
Text	EUROPEAN Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science Máire Geoghegan-Quinn has identified climate change, energy, food security and quality of life for an ageing population as top priorities in her new portfolio. Speaking at NUI Galway yesterday, Ms Geoghegan-Quinn also said that her job was to transform Europe into an "i-conomy", as in a "really vibrant innovation economy". The commissioner said that although she was not blind to the current difficulties, she was optimistic Europe had the right assets to overcome them, and had outlined those in its proposals for a Europe 2020 strategy. "In times of crisis, those of us in public life have a public duty to optimism," she said. Ireland had "actually got a lot of things right" in terms of economic planning over the last decade, she said, and it was "easy to forget" Ireland's strong track record of "sustained strategic investment in research and education". "This will stand it in good stead now as it seeks to emerge from the crisis and ensure a durable recovery," she said, while also warning that research and development budgets should not be cut. This week the European Commission told the Government that its projections for correcting the economy were too optimistic and that cuts might have to be more severe than planned. Ms Geoghegan-Quinn said that there was a "huge commonality" between the "smart economy approach adopted by the Government here at the end of 2008 and the Europe 2020 strategy".	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	In identifying her focus on the “grand challenges” facing society, including climate change, energy and food security, she said her first step would be to strengthen the science base, and she strongly supported the 3 per cent of EU gross domestic product target of investment in research and development. “I am worried that, with budgets under pressure, governments may view research and development as an easy area for cutbacks,” she said. “This would be completely the wrong reaction.” She said she was committed to a single European research area, and more collaboration between the EU’s 4,000 third-level institutions. “I want to remove, once and for all, the pension and social security obstacles which prevent researchers from moving freely between countries,” she said. “And I want to put an end to the fragmentation of national research efforts and avoid duplication of effort,” she said.	

Title	Not the time to relax efforts having reach the global R&D stage	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	24 June 2010	
Word count	814	
Text	ONE ELEMENT of the Lisbon Treaty that may have escaped your attention, even upon second reading, is that the European Research Area (ERA) is now a legal objective of the European Union, writes CONOR O'CARROLL The ERA is the embodiment of European research policy and focuses on the free movement of knowledge across the EU with the objective of creating a single market for research. From an investment perspective, our new commissioner has renewed the objective of achieving an EU average of 3 per cent spend of GDP on R&D. This is investment in future competitiveness of Europe through research and innovation. The main thrust of achieving the ERA is through national funding for research. The main EU-wide instrument identified clearly in the Lisbon Treaty for supporting this policy is funding by the European Commission for research through the so-called framework programmes. The current programme – Framework Seven (FP7) – has a budget of more than €55 billion to spend over seven years. What is only now apparent is that despite the recession across Europe, the funds for this collaborative research effort are guaranteed. The framework programmes have over the years focused on issues of strong European interest or "Grand Challenges" from developing wind energy to combating major diseases. They grew from the recognition that while each country had its own research focus much could be achieved by pooling resources across Europe.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	During the sparse years of Irish national R&D funding in the 1990s, researchers in Cork were more likely to be working with partners in Cologne and Barcelona than Dublin or Galway. It is worth noting that in this period Ireland spent its structural funds wisely, using them to support the national research effort. The basic, strategic and applied research grants from Forbairt/Enterprise Ireland were over 85 per cent supported by European structural funds. The major national investments over the past 10 years meant that researchers in Ireland concentrated on building up national infrastructure and competence. As a consequence Ireland is now clearly on the international research landscape. One of the best measures of research quality is the impact of our creativity that is captured in internationally recognised high-quality publications. In the early 1980s the impact of Irish research was on a level with Greece, Portugal and Poland. From 2000 onwards Ireland left these countries behind, exceeding the world, the EU 27 and by 2008 the OECD averages for research impact. In fact, in terms of impact we have moved from a world position of 36th in 2002 to 19th in 2008. This has taken us close to that of Germany, France, the UK and Finland. Recent signs indicate that the Government has taken the foot off the accelerator and this will have serious consequences. Our international reputation will suffer and there will be a loss of essential expertise in leading research groups as continuation funding for successful programmes is no longer available. Ireland will be less attractive to internationally mobile researchers who now see that the opportunities for carrying out research in Ireland have significantly decreased. The cuts mean that PhD training is severely reduced and numbers supported will be halved. We pride ourselves on our cultural heritage and international reputation in literature. These recent cuts will impact severely on research in the humanities.	

	There is a changed focus by Government in concentrating funds on industry-oriented and applied research at the expense of basic research. This is extremely short sighted as the pipeline of new companies being spun out of the universities depends critically on funding for basic research. Some would say that the Irish research community relaxed its efforts in Europe and the best way to react to the cutbacks would be greater participation in the European framework programme. There is no doubt that our focus on the national effort meant that our participation in European research levelled out. Over the past 10 years the participation of the universities and institutes of technology in European research increased, although not as rapidly as in the 1990s. The share of EU as a percentage of the total R&D funding in Ireland dropped from 24 per cent in the late 1990s to 7 per cent in 2009. This shows our past dependence on EU money and our current situation would be typical of a mature research environment in countries like France and Germany. Europe is there to bring added value to national programmes and can never be considered as a substitute. Investment in research and innovation is only about 1 per cent of the total spend by Government in all areas. This is the only aspect of Government spend that is investing in the future of Ireland. European research is an integral component of our national research effort for the future. However, it must be clear that this is to bring added value and can never substitute the core research funding that must be provided nationally.	

Title	Ireland recognised by US as major competitor for researchers	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	26 August 2010	
Word count	847	
Text	THE ISSUE OF emigration is highly topical, with the prospect of many Irish graduates leaving the country. Yet, for PhD students and researchers, leaving is often an integral part of becoming a professional and gaining experience. International mobility is generally considered a necessary part of scientific career development. Of course, there is a fundamental difference as this is voluntary migration and not forced through economic circumstances. The nature of science is that it is truly international with the same approach used whether the work is done in Cork or Caracas. This is not a new phenomenon as throughout history scholars have moved country to work with others and learn from experts. What we forget now is that for many centuries Latin and Greek were common languages across Europe, Africa and Asia. This meant that scientists and scholars could move country relatively easily and communicate. Indeed, going to meet others was a real necessity as there was no other means of communication. In an age of easy e-mail, social networking and video conferencing much can be achieved without the need to travel. However, this cannot replace the professional and cultural experience of working in leading research groups in another country. Nowadays, despite resistance, English has taken that position as the international language of science. A number of years ago the Chinese changed their policy, and they now encourage their researchers to publish in English. While English does dominate, moving to France or Germany, for example, does really require the knowledge of the language. The leading scientists do speak English but this is not true for the technical and general staff. Anyone who has worked in a lab knows well that a good relationship with technical staff is	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	essential to get equipment and support. The reality is that working in a new environment has much more than purely scientific benefits. People move to gain experience in the internationally recognised centres of excellence in their area. Studies have show that this type of mobility has clear positive benefits as it increases scientific productivity and quality. It also improves job prospects, as experience abroad has often become a prerequisite for academic posts. Paradoxically, the increase in research investment in Ireland has meant that many researchers do not leave and can, in the long term, become less competitive for jobs. European policy in this area has evolved to promote a form of single labour market for researchers. Integral to this is the need for open and transparent recruitment procedures that do not favour local incumbents. The Irish system is already a very open system with positions being filled on the basis of qualifications. This is in contrast to a number of European countries where nationals are always favoured, regardless of quality. Currently about 35 per cent of PhD students and 38 per cent of researchers on contract in the seven Irish universities are foreign, figures that are evenly split between EU and non-EU nationals. The three countries that dominate the latter category are China, India and the US. Recent data from the Irish universities study have shown that it is the quality of institutions and research that is attracting students and researchers here. From an individual's perspective, there remain many obstacles to movement. In 2001 an expert group appointed by the European Commission concluded that access to information was a major barrier to mobility, as well as issues on pensions, visas and work permits. This spurred on efforts to open Europe to researchers globally and resulted in a new fast track immigration scheme. Ireland was an early adopter of this scheme and it has certainly made it much easier to bring in researchers from across the world. Despite a number of initiatives the issue of pension transferability is a long way from resolution.	

	The situation has improved dramatically for researchers with regard to practical information and support, with the establishment of a Europe-wide network of dedicated offices – the Euraxess network. Despite these positive initiatives, Europe is still far from the US Federal system that makes mobility very easy, but we are moving in the right direction. Of course, right across the world, countries are engaged in the same game. We are all competing to bring in the best and retain our own students and researchers. The Irish science (IRCSET) and humanities (IRCHSS) research councils have used EU Marie Curie funding to create radical new fellowship schemes. This enables researchers to go abroad to gain experience for up to two years. Crucially, there is a third year of funding where they return to Ireland to bring back the knowledge they have gained. International mobility is now a cornerstone of EU policy and is at the centre of the European Research Area, the single market for research and innovation. The creation of the European Higher Education Area through the Bologna Process has reached the point where we are now seen by the US as a major competitor for international students. The success of the European Research Area will be measured when it is recognised by the US as a challenge to their research system.	

Title	European fund for animal health research aims to tackle disease	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Irish Examiner	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	14 April 2011	
Word count	253	
Text	ANIMAL health researchers can avail of a new €450,000 European fund aimed at protecting the continent's herds against infectious diseases. The funding package is aimed at three highly specialised areas of animal health. One such research area of particular interest to Ireland due to the importance of livestock to the Agri-Food sector and the wider economy, is EMIDA (Emerging and Major Infectious Diseases of Livestock). Funding of Irish research participation will be limited to Paratuberculosis (Johne's Disease) in ruminant livestock; Improved diagnosis of mycobacterial infections; and Anthelmintic resistance. Minister for Agriculture, Food and the Marine, Simon Coveney said: "I am very conscious and supportive of the importance of continued investment in research and development, especially considering the ambitious growth targets contained in the Food Harvest 2020 report. The Livestock sector is of crucial importance to this country and I am confident that Irish involvement in transnational research will yield tangible herd health benefits over the coming years resulting in improved profitability on cattle farms." The minister wished "every success to Irish researchers and their consortia in applying for funding under the EMIDA research call". Ireland is involved in several European Research Area Networks (ERA-NETS). The objective of the ERA-NET scheme is to improve co-operation and co-ordination of research activities carried out at national or regional level in the member states and associated states via networking of research activities conducted at national or regional level, as well as transnational research calls.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	The funding relates to the second EMIDA ERA-Net research call for transnational research.	

Title	The future of funding is critical	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	26 May 2011	
Word count	695	
Text	FOR NEARLY 30 years the EU has supported R&D funding through the Framework Programmes. Currently we are in the middle of the seventh and it may come as a surprise to know that it will be the last. Last week saw the deadline for submissions to an open consultation on the future of EU funding to support R&D. More than 650 written submissions were received with 11 from Ireland. There will be an open conference on June 10th in Brussels to present the results. The reason for this change is to base funding for R&D on a clear European policy and unify the existing diverse sources. At the moment there are four major sources supporting research and innovation. First is the Seventh Framework Programme with a budget of €53 billion from 2007 to 2013. Second is the European Institute for Innovation and Technology (EIT) with €309 million. The Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP) has €3.6 billion. Separately there are the investments by member states made through the structural funds (€86 billion). The Commission is now leading a drive towards a Common Strategic Framework for EU research and innovation funding (CSF). The objective is to develop a coherent set of funding instruments along the whole innovation chain; so-called research to retail. These instruments should enable cross-Border pooling of resources to achieve critical mass and diffusion of knowledge. They should raise levels of excellence by promoting competition in research and innovation. This will increase the capacity of Europe to tackle societal challenges and strengthen competitiveness. By the way, there was an open competition for a	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	new name that will be announced on June 10th by Commissioner Máire Geoghegan-Quinn. From a practical perspective, the CSF should simplify the whole funding process and bring together different funding strands. For example, doctoral training is now supported through the Marie Curie Actions, Erasmus Mundus, the European Research Council, general Framework-funded projects and Structural Funds. All of these have different rules, if any, for supporting PhD researchers. Within the CSF there will still be diverse funding streams but all operating within the same framework. The online consultation was a list of 28 questions surrounding issues from the type of research funded to creating a more open and transparent process. Most importantly it framed the questions in the context of delivering EU policy, dealing with challenges to society, strengthening competitiveness, the science base and the European Research Area. There was a national submission co-ordinated by the Advisory Science Council. This brought together perspectives from all of the funding agencies, government departments, universities, institutes of technology and the private sector. In addition to the national position, there were other submissions from Ireland including the Health Research Board, the Irish Universities Association, the Royal Irish Academy and Forfás. The national submission supports a fully complementary set of funding instruments for European research and innovation. It emphasises that an effort will be required in ensuring that the overall system is suited to the support of the full research and innovation cycle including eco-innovation, non-technological innovation and close-to-market innovation. The IUA submission stressed that universities are unique instituitions, combining the roles of training the new generation of researchers, carrying out research across a wide range of disciplines and transferring new knowledge to address economic and social issues. The universities in Ireland have had a very positive experience from EU-research funding through the Framework Programmes and structural funds.	

	During the 1990s community structural funds were used to support research and research training programmes in Ireland. Participation in the Framework Programmes was vital for building international partnerships and raising the quality of research. With more than 10 years of major national investments in research some have forgotten the significance of EU funding in building Ireland's research base. In the future, the CSF will provide a guaranteed source of funds. By December, we will see clear proposals from the Commission on the nature of the new research and innovation funding programme. Ireland's EU Presidency in the first half of 2013 will give us an opportunity to play a role in its final developments. From 2014 Europe will move from a set of fragmented schemes to anintegrated policy-led funding stream.	

Title	Bringing down the research barriers	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 August 2011	
Word count	678	
Text	Problems exist in research career development in the EU but these are being addressed, writes CONOR O'CARROLL ONE OF THE great disadvantages for Europe in global research is the lack of coherence across borders. The US federal system means that, despite the high level of individual state autonomy, the research system is uniform. There is a common currency, no barriers to movement, common federal funding agencies such as the National Science Foundation and a common career structure for researchers. In contrast, Europe does not have this level of coherence despite many good efforts. There has been a sustained effort since 2000 to create the European Research Area where knowledge and people can move freely. Much has been achieved towards these goals through hard and soft law. The 2005 Third Country Directive required countries to introduce a fast-track immigration scheme for non-EU researchers. Although Ireland is a non-Schengen country we have signed up to this directive and it has been a very effective means to attract international researchers to universities and companies. The 2005 European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment lays out the rights and responsibilities of researchers. It takes the soft-law approach and invites universities, funding agencies and companies to adopt and implement the charter. This has been less successful, principally due to the fact that it covered a large number of issues from open and transparent recruitment to intellectual property rights. It was difficult to persuade organisations to sign up to such a wide range of requirements.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	Since the partial failure of the charter and code, attention has turned to specific issues where agreement can be reached. There are no comparable research career structures across Europe. The labour market for researchers is fragmented nationally and there is segregation between careers in academia, industry and other sectors. Researchers, especially PhD students, may not be aware of the range of opportunities open to them in different employment sectors. Employers are not always aware of the competences that researchers possess and the benefits they could bring to their company. Over the past two years there has been ongoing work with the European Commission to develop a pan-European career framework for researchers. I chaired a working group with participants from the European University Association, European Science Foundation, League of European Research Universities, Microsoft, Siemens and BMW. Along with representatives from all EU countries and the EC, we have recently agreed a European Framework for Research Careers with four categories. The purpose of the framework is to capture the essential and necessary competences of researchers at different career stages. The First Stage Researcher is for doctoral candidates, followed by Recognised Researcher for those with a PhD but who are not yet considered fully independent (often called "postdocs"). The category of Established Researcher is for those who conduct research independently and publish as lead author. The fourth category, Leading Researcher, is reserved for those with an international reputation based on research excellence. The full details will be available soon on the Euraxess Ireland website (euraxess.ie). In Ireland, we do not have a single national research career structure. There are clear recommendations from the Higher Education Research Group and the Advisory Service Council. They all map directly to the agreed European Framework. The framework is intended to apply to all researchers, independent of where they work in the private or public sector. Its purpose is to provide a reference point for researchers and employers. This is not an attempt to create a new	

	uniform career structure across Europe. For example, the framework could help researchers identify job opportunities close to their individual profile in different countries and diverse employment sectors. Although the framework has just been agreed by all European countries, it is still in a pilot phase. Much information needs to be gathered which will provide examples of research careers across Europe. The target for achieving the free movement of researchers and knowledge is set for 2014. While there is still much to be done, the European Framework for Research Careers is a step in the right direction.	

Title	Plan would allow EU researchers to move more easily	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Irish Examiner	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	14 September 2011	
Word count	340	
Text	THERE is over €10 billion a year available in the EU for researchers, but often the best and brightest find it easier to move to the US than stay in Europe. Máire Geoghegan Quinn, the EU's commissioner for research and innovation, wants to know why. With this in mind, she has launched some research of her own with a view to enticing people to work closer to home. The potential is there for 3.7 million jobs and an €800bn boost to the EU's GDP. "This is the kind of growth and jobs we desperately need," Ms Geoghegan Quinn said, adding that Europe faced an innovation emergency. While many of the borders in the EU have been broken down, making it easier for tourists and workers to travel and find jobs in any of the 27 states, she said research and innovation are still locked behind national boundaries. "It is unacceptable that it is often more attractive and easier for our top scientists to cross the Atlantic than to move across the EU. "We want those involved in the research community to tell us what they need, so we can work to tear down what amounts to serious barriers to growth and jobs." The commissioner wants to create a borderless European research area by 2014 when the EU's next research budget will come on stream. It should mean it is easier not just for researchers to move around the EU but also to allow ideas to flow. "We should have free circulation of researchers, students, scientists and university teaching staff. It should make it easier for a good researcher in a small	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	university or research centre in one of Europe's less developed regions to collaborate and co-operate with others across Europe on high-level research." The research area would play a major role in the EU's future research strategy, for which the Commission hopes to have €80bn available for the years 2014 to 2020 — together with increased investment by member states and business amounting to 3% of the region's GDP by 2020.	

Title	Telescope to be built in deep sea of the Mediterranean	
Author	Richard Gray	
Newspaper company	The Telegraph	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	1 January 2012	
Word count	746	
Text	The £210 million deep sea observatory will detect elusive particles known as neutrinos as they bombard the Earth from outer space. Usually these high-energy particles pass straight through our planet unnoticed, but scientists hope that the new telescope will allow them to pick up traces the particles leave and use them to view the universe in an entirely new way. The EU funded project, which has just been selected as a key priority in a re-view of European astrophysics infrastructure, promises to reveal new details about some of the most powerful events in our universe, including supernova and even the Big Bang. The telescope, known as the Multi-Cubic Kilometre Neutrino Telescope or KM3NeT, is also expected to reveal entirely new phenomena that still remain undiscovered as they are undetectable using conventional methods for viewing the sky. “It is really going to open a new window on our universe," said Dr Lee Thompson, a reader in neutrino physics at the University of Sheffield who is working on the KM3NeT project. “Much of what we know about the universe to date has been gleaned from looking at different frequencies within the electromagnetic spectrum such as visible light and X-rays. “Using neutrinos to probe the universe is a completely new and fresh idea, so it is going to give us an entirely new perspective. “There are objects out there that we know are emitting neutrinos but there could be things out there that cannot be seen with the telescopes we currently use."	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

	A small prototype of the KM3NeT telescope is already operational off the south coast of France and it is hoped work on a larger prototype will begin within the next three years. For the full telescope, more than 12,000 beachball-sized sensors are to be deployed underwater over a cubic mile. Strings of detectors half a mile long will be anchored to the sea floor up to two miles down and will be suspended in the water by floating buoys above. Neutrinos are basic subatomic particles that are thought to emanate from the remnants of exploding stars known as supernovas, or from supermassive black holes. As neutrinos interact so little with other matter, it is hoped that they will provide information about parts of the universe where light currently does not reach the Earth from – so it may be possible to learn more about what lies within black holes and supernovae. It is also hoped neutrinos may even help scientists find dark matter for the first time – a mysterious material that does not emit any light but is thought to make up more than 83 per cent of the universe. Most of the time neutrinos, which travel close to the speed of light, pass harmlessly through the Earth without hitting anything, but occasionally they do collide with atoms. By building the telescope under water, which is far denser than air, the scientists will increase the chance of a neutrino colliding with atoms in the seawater. A collision releases other particles called muons and shock wave that produces a brief flash of blue light, which can be detected by the sensors. By tracing back the direction of this light using data recorded from the surrounding sensors, physicists say they will be able to determine the source of the neutrinos and build up a picture of the sky. “One of the strangest quirks about this telescope is that rather than looking up, we will be looking down," said Dr Thompson. “As high energy cosmic neutrinos pass through the Earth so readily, we can use the Earth as a	

	kind of shield to filter out other particles and noise. “It means we will actually be looking at the sky on the opposite side of the Earth from the Mediterranean. At first glance it seems a strange thing to do – build a telescope under water that looks down rather than up, but it is going to change our view of the universe." The project was last month given the go-ahead by as part of a European road map drawn up by the Astroparticle European Research Area (ASPERA) network of European national funding agencies, including the UK’s STFC. Dr Christian Spiering, chairman of ASPERA, said: “Neutrinos allow us to look deeper into compact sources than gamma rays do. They are like X-rays for the medicine. “To see them we need detectors of the size of one or even many cubic kilometres. The next two years will teach us more about the necessary size."	

Title	Research in a developing EU area	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	24 May 2012	
Word count	695	
Text	A good time to assess progress in the realisation of the ERA, writes CONOR O'CARROLL THE END of 1992 marked the deadline for achieving the Single European Market for the free movement of goods and services in the EU. This was a major achievement of the union as it broke down centuries of trade barriers between countries. For the past 12 years, EU research policy has aimed at creating a single market for researchers and knowledge, the European Research Area (ERA). The concept is for people and knowledge to move freely throughout Europe. Examples of activities that promote ERA are the lowering of immigration barriers for non-EU researchers to attract global talent and open access to publications making knowledge more accessible. The process began in March 2000 when the European Council of Ministers agreed at a meeting in Lisbon that to strengthen Europe there should be a transition to a knowledge-based economy and society by improving policies for research and development. On June 15th, 2000, the council adopted a resolution establishing an ERA that sought to implement the conclusions of the Lisbon European Council (Lisbon Agenda). The Lisbon Treaty took the ERA further. It made it a legal objective of the EU, and, in particular, it promoted the ERA as a means to strengthen the scientific and technological bases of the union and thereby make its industries more competitive. The completion of the ERA is an explicit part of the Europe 2020 strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.	VIS-BIG TO- NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

	In 2011, the European Council of Ministers stated that Europe needed a unified research area to attract talent and investment and called for the completion of the ERA by 2014. So what has happened over the past 12 years in changing Europe? One of the main tools has been the open method of co-ordination, which is based on "soft law" mechanisms such as guidelines and indicators, benchmarking and the sharing of good practice. This is voluntary and there are no sanctions against countries that do not participate. An example is the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for their Recruitment (2005), which was developed by the European Commission in partnership with EU countries. The charter and code is a set of principles and requirements that specify the roles, responsibilities and entitlements of researchers, employers and funders with regard to research careers. These principles are built on the basis that improving researcher career prospects provide an incentive for individuals to remain within research careers and stay in Europe. The charter and code is voluntary and more than 220 organisations representing more than 1,000 institutions across 30 countries have committed to implementing the principles (the Irish Universities Association signed up in 2006). However, on analysis, its success has been variable. For example, the principle of open and transparent recruitment of researchers is by no means implemented across Europe. Funding schemes that admit only nationals, and recruitment practices that make it difficult for outsiders to compete, are still common. We do have an open system in Ireland; more than 35 per cent of doctoral candidates and 35 per cent of post-doctoral researchers are from overseas. The percentage of international permanent academic staff across the seven universities goes from about 26 per cent up to 42 per cent. However, there has been significant progress recently through the Human Resources Strategy for Researchers, a tool that helps employers and funders to	

	put the principles of the charter and code into practice. It is implemented by individual universities and is based on internal self-assessment. There is a logo, HR Excellence in Research, associated with the universities that go through this process. Six Irish universities are in the process of acquiring the logo. While this logo is not linked to funding it will be a positive factor in the decision-making process when researchers are considering a position. In the first half of 2013, Ireland will hold the presidency of the EU. The Irish Universities Association will host, along with the Department of Jobs Enterprise and Innovation, a presidency conference focusing on researcher mobility and careers. It will be a good time to assess the progress of the realisation of the ERA.	

Title	Central body to oversee ‘biotanks’ storing human tissue focus of report	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	26 June 2012	
Word count	533	
Text	THE CREATION of a single Government-funded body to oversee the retention of human tissue samples has moved a step closer with the preparation of a report by an expert group on health research. The group is finalising its findings for the Department of Health and Children and a national co-ordinating body could be up and running before the end of the year. The body would regulate the activities and procedures carried out by “biobanks”, collections of human biological material such as blood, cells from organs and tumour cells. These tissues represent an extremely valuable resource used by researchers to study diseases. Establishment of a national biobank co-ordinating body would in turn make it easier for Ireland to link to similar bodies being set up in countries across Europe. The goal is to harmonise the way materials are collected, catalogued, stored and shared between banks and in turn accessed by international researchers. “We are looking at a national structure for biobanks in order to conduct clinical research,” said Dr Siobhán O’Sullivan, chief bioethics officer in the Department of Health and Children and a member of the health research group, chaired by Enda Connolly, which put together recommendations in the report. The group was set up under the Health Research Action Plan by the previous government to co-ordinate the various biobanks that started to form six to eight years ago. The Health Research Board issued recommendations on an	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	all-Ireland biobank as long ago as 2004. Many biobanks here are associated with individual universities or consortiums of universities. The Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland has a bank, and tissue samples are collected and used for research by the Prostate Cancer Research Consortium set up in 2004 involving Trinity College Dublin and University College Dublin. There are several other biobanks in existence. The expert group "should be delivering soon", Dr O'Sullivan said. Details of its recommendations and the structures to be established were not available but she said it would be modelled on the Biobanking and Biomolecular Resources Research Infrastructure (BBMRI), an EU-funded body formed under the European Research Infrastructure Consortium. This body has 53 members in 30 countries and is based in Graz, Austria. The workings of the BBMRI came under discussion last week in Strasbourg during an international conference on biobanking organised by the Council Of Europe. It involved experts in the application and use of biobanked tissue samples and policymakers from departments of health from around Europe and from the council's own committee on bioethics. The council prepared its own recommendations on biobanking in 2006, believing these should be reviewed after five years. The meeting was an effort to engage the assembled experts in discussions that could help the council update its recommendations, the meeting's organisers said. Biobanking and the research that it fosters held great promise for the future but, to be successful, it required the protections afforded by the Human Rights Commission, said Philippe Boillat, director general of the council's human rights and rule of law directorate. While success required willing participation, "the development of public trust is another important goal. ” Director of the European Commission's European Research Area Dr Octavi Quintana Trias said biobanks "hold great promise for society".	

Title	‘Policy Day’ will stimulate scientific dialogue	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	2 July 2012	
Word count	392	
Text	SUCCESSIVE GOVERNMENTS have given strong backing for the scientific research sector given its potential to create both jobs and wealth. The need for a clear policy framework on research and what form this might take comes under debate during the EuroScience Open Forum conference taking place later this month. The forum will be Europe’s largest single meeting of its kind this year, running from July 11th-July 15th. One of the goals of the forum is to support dialogue between the scientific community and the policy-forming community across Europe. For this reason, its planners have organised a “Policy Day” on Friday, which has attracted an impressive line-up of international speakers. Ireland’s EU commissioner Maire Geoghegan-Quinn will formally open proceedings with a plenary address entitled: Collaboration, Competition, Connection – Evidence of Intelligent Design in European Science Policy? Prof Anne Glover, chief scientific adviser to European Commission president José Manuel Barroso, will participate along with Subra Suresh of the US National Science Foundation, and the New Zealand and UK science advisers Prof Sir Peter Gluckman and Prof Sir John Beddington. There is also an impressive list of keynote talks from a surprisingly varied range of speakers. For example, Helga Nowotny, president of the European Research Council, will speak, as will Sir Bob Geldof. The Policy Day programme will include more than 20 individual sessions and workshops throughout the day, dealing with topics such as Horizon 2020, the EU’s new science budget worth in excess of €80 billion; the need to improve	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	research infrastructure; developing the European Research Area; young researchers and their participation in the important Marie Curie Programme; and others. The programme for the day has attracted senior staff from multinational bodies and governments, but also members of the European scientific community. Participants include John Bell, Maire Geoghegan-Quinn's chef de cabinet; Robert-Jan Smits, director general for research and innovation; Dominique Ristori, director general of the Joint Research Centre; and Dr Yongyuth Yuthavong, former Thai minister of science and technology. The 20 sessions will deal with a wide range of issues of importance to policy-makers. Shale gas fracking comes up for discussion, as does how to get more small to medium enterprises engaged with the Horizon 2020 programmes. There will be a "great debate" on the battle to feed a changing planet, and a session on building an economy based on the development of good ideas.	

Title	EU plan for research to hit publishers	
Author	James Fontanella-Khan	
Newspaper company	The Financial Times	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	17 July 2012	
Word count	395	
Text	The European Union, which controls one of the world's largest science budgets, said on Tuesday it would give free access to all research funded by European taxpayers, in a move that could hit the profits of scientific publishers such as Reed Elsevier, Wiley and Springer. Plans by the European Commission, the EU's executive arm, to release for free and to a wider audience articles usually held by expensive academic journals would benefit innovation, but would force publishers, which currently generate about $8bn in revenues, to revolutionise their business models, analysts said. "We are opening up access to scientific publications and the underlying data," said Neelie Kroes, EU commissioner for the digital agenda. "In future you won't have to pay expensive subscriptions to access information generated with your taxes." University libraries around the world are currently forced to pay millions of dollars annually to access research that has often been funded by public grants and developed by their own researchers. "This package is also a major part of the wider movement to open up what is produced with public money - whether by a government or the organisations they fund," said Ms Kroes. From 2014, the commission plans to award grants worth €80bn through its Horizon 2020 programme for research and innovation, making it one of the world's most influential financiers for academic research.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-EU END-YES LAN-INFO

	EU officials added that starting from 2014 all scientific papers that have benefited from the Horizon 2020 programme will have to be freely accessible through "open access" online databases. The move was widely welcomed by international academics present in Brussels for the launch of the European Research Area programme, which apart from promoting the free access of publicly funded scientific papers is also trying to create a single market for offering grants and fostering innovation in Europe. Paul Boyle, president of Science Europe, which comprises 50 research funding and research performing organisations from 25 countries, said that open access to research was fundamental for the future of research around the globe. Angelo Volpi of Italy's National Research Centre said that open access to research would be revolutionary. "Open-access will allow us to make significant steps forward in research and it will seriously cut down the incredible amount of duplication that currently goes on ... researchers will be able to use better each others work," Mr Volpi said. Reed Elsevier declined to comment.	

Title	Ireland is on the path to Open Access	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	25 October 2012	
Word count	658	
Text	THIS IS international Open Access Week, promoting the free availability on the internet of the outputs of research, including publications and data. It may seem surprising that in a world where so much information is easily obtained online, the results of scientific research funded by the taxpayer can be difficult to access. Taking account of the need to also protect potentially valuable intellectual property, the outputs from publicly funded research should be openly available to researchers and users in education, business, charitable and public sectors, and indeed to the general public. Publishing a scientific article has an associated cost. Submitted articles must be checked by the editors and are evaluated through peer review. All of this costs time and money. This is necessary to ensure the veracity, quality and integrity of published results. Advancements in science depend on communication of results that can be accessed and relied upon by the global research community. The scientific journals are mainly subscription-based and produced by a wide range of publishers ranging from commercial to learned societies. Many publishers provide discount deals where institutions can subscribe to most of their publications. However, few institutions can afford to pay for all the 25,000 peer-reviewed journals in circulation. Individuals who do not belong to a university or research organisation have very limited access to publications. For example, to download a single article from a leading journal can cost in the region of €30. Without access through a university library, a literature review would be a costly venture.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

There are a growing number of open-access journals that turn the subscription-based model on its head.

Most of them charge a fee to authors, known as an article processing or publishing charge, before an article is published. Access for readers is then free of charge and with very few restrictions on use and re-use. The

latest is eLife, an open-access journal for outstanding advances in life science and biomedicine. This is backed by three powerful organisations, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, the Max Planck Society, and the Wellcome Trust.

Publishing scientific journals can be a highly lucrative business. The second-largest publisher, Springer, made a profit of €250 million last year and is currently for sale with a price tag of €2.5 billion. The American Chemical Society pays its chief executive more than $800,000. In contrast, learned societies use the income from their journals to promote the discipline and would not survive if there were a move to full free and open access.

The European Commission is backing open access. A pilot project is currently under way to encourage EU-funded researchers to place their results in an open-access repository. Open access is already integrated into the planned €80 billion investment in Horizon 2020 and is one of the five areas highlighted in the commission's policy to achieve a European Research Area (Era) for the free movement of researchers and knowledge.

In Ireland there is open access to publications from the seven universities and DIT through the Rian portal (rian.ie). This site harvests the content of each of the institutions' publications repositories to a single portal.

It is an international resource for researchers in academia and enterprise. In addition, Waterford Institute of Technology, the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Teagasc and the Marine Institute have open repositories for their publications.

Earlier this week, Minister of State with responsibility for Research and Innovation Seán Sherlock launched The National Open Access Statement. The aim of this policy is to increase the visibility and improve access to the outputs of

	publicly funded research. The next steps for this committee will be the planning of a sustainable national infrastructure for open access. Irish national policy is designed to support the global free flow of information; to support the principle of research-enabled teaching and learning; to contribute to open innovation through more effective knowledge transfer and diffusion; and to support greater transparency, accountability and public awareness of the results of publicly funded research.	

Title	Stephen Hawking’s boycott hits Israel where it hurts: science	
Author	Hilary Rose & Steven Rose	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	13 May 2013	
Word count	678	
Text	Hilary Rose and Steven Rose: What really winds up Israel is that this rejection comes from a famous scientist, and it is science that drives their economy, prestige and military strength Stephen Hawking's decision to boycott the Israeli president's conference has gone viral. Over 100,000 Facebook shares of the Guardian report at last count. Whatever the subsequent fuss, Hawking's letter is unequivocal. His refusal was made because of requests from Palestinian academics. Witness the speed with which the pro-Israel lobby seized on Cambridge University's initial false claim that he had withdrawn on health grounds to denounce the boycott movement, and their embarrassment when within a few hours the university shamefacedly corrected itself. Hawking also made it clear that if he had gone he would have used the occasion to criticise Israel's policies towards the Palestinians. While journalists named him "the poster boy of the academic boycott" and supporters of the boycott, divestment and sanctions (BDS) movement celebrated, Ha'aretz, the most progressive of the Israeli press, drew attention to the inflammatory language used by the conference organisers, who described themselves as "outraged" rather than that they "regretted" Hawking's decision. That the world's most famous scientist had recognised the justice of the Palestinian cause is potentially a turning point for the BDS campaign. And that his stand was approved by a majority of two to one in the Guardian poll that followed his announcement shows just how far public opinion has turned against Israel's relentless land-grabbing and oppression.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-MIX

	Hawking's public refusal follows that of prominent singers, artists and writers, from Brian Eno to Mike Leigh, Alice Walker and Adrienne Rich, all of whom have publicly rejected invitations to perform in Israel. But what winds Israel up is the fact that this rejection is by a famous scientist and that science and technology drive its economy. Hawking's decision threatens to open a flood-gate with more and more scientists coming to regard Israel as a pariah state. Its research ties with European and American scientists must be protected. That Israel, a Middle East country, has managed to secure membership of the European Research Area and the many collaborative links with European labs underlines the importance of these links. When European parliamentarians challenged its membership on the grounds of Israel's numerous breaches of UN resolutions and of the European Human Rights conventions, the European Commission responded to the effect that research trumped human rights. Israel's science and technology are not just a source of prestige and technolog-ical innovation, but underpin its military strength. It was an Israeli engineer who developed the drones that the US now employs in quantity. Israeli home-produced chemical weapons minimally match those of Syria, and Israeli universities amply supply the Israel Defence Forces with the sociologi-cal, psychological and technological methods it employs to suppress Palestin-ian protests against the occupation. The complicity of Israeli academia in Israeli state policy is incontrovertible. However, this is the first time that a scientist of Hawking's status has taken so public a stand – and the hyperventilating response of the Jerusalem conference organisers (it is worth noting that the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, where the conference Hawking refused to attend was to be held, is built on illegally annexed Palestinian land) has only added to its public impact. Lastly it has been the very public debates over the rights and wrongs of an ac-ademic boycott that have drawn attention to the subservience of the Israeli universities to the state. Until the boycott began internal critics were few and far between, and some of the sharpest such as Ilan Pappé were forced out. However, this subservience is beginning to yield. When in 2012 the education	

	minister attempted to close the politics department at Ben Gurion on "academic grounds", it was immediately recognised as a political attack on one of the very few departments where academics were willing to name Israel as an apartheid state. Prof Gilad Haran from the Weizmann Institute launched a petition stating "We sense that academic freedom in Israel's higher education system is in severe danger." The department remains open – one small victory.	

Title	Scientific Research and the European Union	
Author	Jon Butterworth	
Newspaper company	The Guardian	
Country of origin	United Kingdom	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	20 May 2013	
Word count	984	
Text	Jon Butterworth What effect does European Union membership have on science and research? And what would it mean if the UK left? A recent edition of the BBC Radio 4 science programme "Material World" fulfilled current BBC policy by including a member of UKIP. Roger Helmer MEP was in discussion with Professor Ed Hinds, from Imperial, about the effects of EU membership, or lack of it, on research. I was also there, to talk about pear-shaped nuclei and electric dipole moments. Ed is a world expert on electric dipole moments, and I am the UK representative on the CERN Council European Strategy Group (our draft strategy will hopefully be adopted in Brussels next week). So we both had things to say about each others topic. I know from experience that applying for, and spending, EU research funds used to be very bureaucratic and arguably not worth the effort. Most initiatives were not primarily targetted at research excellence, but at training, or at encouraging mobility of researchers and integration across the EU. As the size of a network grew, the administrative load grew and the amount available to spend on science per researcher shrank. However, even then it added a welcome diversity to the possible routes for scientific support. I was a part of the MCnet network, which really did make a difference to the fact that we have such high quality particle physics simulations in time for the start up of the Large Hadron Collider at CERN. We were recently successful in another funding round. More importantly, the European Research Council (ERC) is unashamedly now targetting excellence. The mission statement says:	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

	The ERC's mission is to encourage the highest quality research in Europe through competitive funding and to support investigator-initiated frontier research across all fields of research, on the basis of scientific excellence. And it does. Its fellowship grants are really substantial and are awarded on criteria at least as robust as anything the UK Research Councils or the Royal Society give out. The admin-to-award ratio is much better now, too. Helmer seemed to think it was a bad thing that "only" 30% or so of proposals are funded, but this is probably about the optimal number. Because UK research was severely cut in 2007 and has been limping along since at roughly constant-in-cash terms (so being eroded by inflation), the success ratios for application rounds to UK research councils are frequently much less than that, with many excellent projects unfunded. The UK does well from the ERC compared to other European countries. In absolute terms we are the second most successful country in Europe (after Germany). You could view that as a massive declaration of interest, and of course it is. Since 2007 about 12800 participants from the UK have received EU funding, totalling €4.9 billion. My university, UCL, is the seventh biggest recipient across Europe (€174M) and Ed's (Imperial) is eighth with €170M. We are both beaten by Cambridge (third) and Oxford (sixth) in this particular metric. British businesses, especially small ones, also do well, with about 400 small firms receiving more than €676M since 2007. Of course, as Helmer pointed out, a big proportion of this is our own money in a sense; but in the research portion of the EU budget at least, we get back more than we put in. The ratio is about 1.4 pounds back for every pound paid in. If we left the EU, perhaps some of the savings on our membership fees would stay in research, to be spent in the UK. But the reality of science is that in many, perhaps most, fields the best research is highly collaborative and requires efficient international links and stable strategies.	

	We do of course also collaborate effectively with the US and other non-EU countries: perhaps especially Switzerland and Israel, which are in the EU research scheme even though not EU members. Perhaps we could negotiate a similar deal if we left the EU. But currently we have a strong voice in setting the strategies and priorities for EU research funding. If we left the EU we'd lose a lot of that influence, as Máire Geoghegan-Quinn, the European commissioner for research, innovation and science described here to Times Higher Education). This would be bad for us and bad for Europe as a research environment. An obvious question is raised by CERN. It predates the EU. Not all EU countries are CERN members, and one of the host countries, Switzerland, is not an EU member state. It was set up to help rebuild European science after the second world war, and has been successful to the extent that it is now indisputably the premier world laboratory for particle physics. In particle physics we were driven towards consolidation and European strategy because of the huge size of the facilities needed to advance the science. But this is a trend in other areas of science too, and Europe desperately needs this level of coordination. The EU, with its framework programmes, its vision of a common European research area, and its guarantees of free movement for scientists, is starting to provide this. If this didn't exist, we would have to invent it. Particle physics did, and the EU is a route for other areas of science to reap the same benefits, in a multidisciplinary environment within which CERN is in fact becoming more integrated. I'm no uncritical fan of the EU. It would be nice if it could get its accounts to pass a proper audit, for example. And the bizarre annual migration of the parliament between Brussels and Strasbourg looks like an expensive joke. "Ever closer union" doesn't seem to me like a sustainable (or desirable) strategy. Any organisation should review itself and be flexible and responsive. But the research investment part of the	

	EU has done a pretty good job at that, and European science has benefitted from it.	

Title	Investing to keep scientific expertise in Europe	
Author	Dick Ahlstrom	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	21 May 2013	
Word count	726	
Text	The Irish EU presidency is working hard to reach agreement on the next Brussels research budget, thought likely to be worth €70 billion. Embedded within this figure is a €7 billion allocation for the Marie Curie Actions, a funding programme that is becoming increasingly important to Ireland's growing knowledge economy. There is nothing like the Marie Curie programme anywhere else in the world and certainly nothing to match it in terms of funding. Its main purpose is to support European research by making it easy for academics and industry to collaborate, to help students and senior academic researchers advance their career prospects and to help scientific expertise developed within Europe to stay within Europe. "Marie Curie is unique," says Dr Conor O'Carroll, director of research at the Irish Universities Association and chairman of the European Research Area steering group on human resources and mobility. It provides financial resources across a staggering range of award programmes that can range from a standard €200,000 up to €10 million. There are schemes that support young postgraduates and postdoctoral researchers, senior researchers at mid-career level, programmes to support industry and academic research collaborations and others that support placement of researchers in companies and company staff in research institutions, and the list goes on. An important aspect is that Marie Curie Actions ignores borders; it is designed to facilitate free movement of research expertise across frontiers with an	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-MIX

underlying goal of trying to retain a strong research community working within the EU.

Nor does it take a doctrinaire approach to the research it funds, other than only supporting research excellence, says Dr O'Carroll.

The X-Men and Matrix films may seem a long way from scientific research but in fact a Marie Curie funded researcher, Prof Anil Kokaram, now based at Trinity College Dublin, developed special effects computer software with a company in London, The Foundry. He received an Oscar in 2007 for his efforts.

The Marie Curie Actions began as a pilot programme in the 1980s and Dr O'Carroll was among the early participants, benefiting from a placement in Italy while working towards his PhD. The programme officially began in 1990 although it wasn't named after the famous Polish scientist until about 1996, Dr O'Carroll said.

Since then it has grown from strength to strength. Marie Curie Actions received funding worth €1.73 billion under the FP6 programme (2002-06) and this rose to €4.7 billion within FP7 (2007-13), he says.

The Actions is special for another reason, he believes. "It always had the money follow the person. It gave a level of control over how research careers progressed. It has moved the concept of career advancement out of a narrow channel and brought it into the mainstream."

In a way the Actions support a positive kind of emigration, one where you are funded to leave Ireland and work in the US or France or Italy. "They go for a few years and come back with all that expertise," Dr O'Carroll says. "It is a great way to keep all that expertise in Europe."

Served well The Marie Curie Actions has served Ireland well, he added. "We in Ireland have certainly taken advantage of it." It has funded many hundreds of research placements abroad for Irish scientists. It has facilitated placements within Ireland where an academic researcher may spend time in a company while an employee from the firm transfers into the research laboratory.

	We received about €60 million under the Actions during FP6, and so far under FP7 we have reached about €70 million in support. The €60 million represented 30 per cent of all the funding received under the FP6 research budget, he says. In 2007 the Actions launched a new programme, Cofund, where national research funders such as Science Foundation Ireland and the Health Research Board were able to apply for and leverage additional funding from Cofund for stated projects that were aligned with the Marie Curie Actions. "We have had a 100 per cent success rate under Cofund with every application made receiving support," he says. The Irish Research Council for example received €5 million under Cofund to support a new fellowship scheme called Elevate. Cofund was later extended to include groups of third level institutions and even individual university bids, as in the case of University College Dublin. This year UCD got €1.8 million under a Cofund bid.	

Title	Research key area for job growth	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	23 May 2013	
Word count	392	
Text	Across Europe more than five million jobs have been lost between 2008 and 2010. In contrast, knowledge-based jobs driven by research and innovation increased by more than 800,000. The current economic crisis had made it difficult for countries to maintain their levels of investment in R&D. However, there is one area that goes beyond funding and it is the underlying suite of policies that ensure that Europe can attract and retain the best researchers. Since 2000, the goal of having a borderless Europe for the free movement of researchers and knowledge has been encapsulated in the European Research Area (ERA) policy. This policy focuses on the underpinning issues that are necessary for free movement; fast-track immigration and merit-based recruitment. There is urgency about this policy now as nations become more competitive in attracting researchers. Also, the deadline for achieving the European Research Area is imminent - the end of this year. To come up with practical solutions, the Irish EU presidency hosted a conference on researcher careers and mobility last week organised by the Irish Universities Association, Department of Jobs, Enterprise and Innovation and the European Commission. The conference brought researchers and policy makers from 33 countries in Europe. It ensured a variety of perspectives with contributions from academia and industry; governmental and funding agency representatives. There was strong	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

	participation from the European Universities Association, EURODOC, the European Research Council, the European Science Foundation and Science Europe. The European Commission's Innovation Union 2010 sets a clear target of an extra million researchers in Europe by 2020 if the EU is to meet research investment targets. The increased supply of researchers must be based on the understanding that the majority will work in sectors outside of academia. This poses a real challenge in achieving different objectives within the same policy agenda. There is the basic need to attract and retain the most talented researchers - whilst also ensuring the majority who do not pursue academic careers are properly equipped for employment across the public or private sectors. Delegates discussed topics such as how to support researchers in making the transition from university to industry. For all researchers there must be a balance of the primacy of research with skills acquisition and employability. There was full agreement that the Horizon 2020 programme should ensure that all of those funded must implement the ERA policies.	

Title	Mobility of researchers: how open is Europe?	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	29 August 2013	
Word count	713	
Text	A stated policy of the European Union is that, by the end of this year, there should be an open labour market for researchers. This is a core part of the European Research Area and recognises the need for knowledge transfer. To understand the movement of researchers and their reasons for moving it is essential to have high-quality data. A major survey by the European Commission sought to provide internationally comparable data to support further evidence-based policy development on the research profession at European and national level. It was carried out across the 28 member states and five other countries, including Norway, Iceland and Turkey. The survey was completed last March and preliminary results are available. One of the most striking is the increase in the mobility of researchers over the past 10 years. Currently, 15 per cent of researchers in the EU are internationally mobile. More than 31 per cent of all researchers have been mobile in the past 10 years, compared with only 17 per cent more than 10 years ago. There are interesting results for Ireland in terms of PhD mobility. Across the EU, about 10 per cent of PhD students graduate abroad. Ireland is fourth behind Malta, Greece and Slovenia, with 35 per cent of our PhDs being awarded abroad. In terms of hosting foreign PhD students, Ireland is in seventh place, with a make-up of about 32 per cent. The countries hosting the highest percentages of foreign PhDs are Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. The UK has about 28 per cent foreign PhDs. For post-PhD mobility, Ireland has about 38 per cent of researchers from abroad; Switzerland and Denmark are the highest, both with more than 54 per	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-YES LAN-INFO

cent from abroad. The UK has just below 30 per cent. However, it has the highest total numbers of foreign researchers.

Mobility patterns

There are some very interesting transnational mobility patterns. The main feeder countries of researchers to the UK are France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Greece, the Benelux countries and Ireland. The main source of foreign researchers in Ireland is the UK, but it should be kept in mind that these will be on a second or third international move. France attracts researchers from Germany, Spain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Greece and Austria. Germany brings researchers from Greece, Italy, Spain, Poland, Bulgaria and Estonia.

Over the past 10 years, 44.5 per cent of mobile researchers have moved for three to six months, with 26 per cent having moved for more than two years. The motives for mobility are explored in the survey: career progression, the opportunity to work with leading experts, availability of funds and positions are the main factors. Respondents were also asked about the effects of mobility on their careers. On the positive side are the acquiring of advanced research skills, increased international collaboration, patents, and higher-quality publications. However, researchers believe mobility comes at a price, and this includes greater difficulty in finding a job and slower career progression.

One of the principal reasons for the survey was to gauge progress on achieving an open Europe for the movement of researchers. Respondents were asked about transparency in the recruitment process in their organisations, and the results are revealing. For 18 countries, fewer than 60 per cent believe the process is open. These include Bulgaria, Finland, France, Austria and Portugal. Only three countries come in at under 50 per cent - Italy, Lithuania and Croatia. The three countries believed to be most open are the UK, Estonia and Ireland at 80 per cent, 75 per cent and 70 per cent respectively.

There are a number of factors that work against open recruitment. National funding programmes can be closed to foreigners or have application processes that favour nationals. Recruitment procedures in higher education institutions may be structured in a way that makes it difficult for those coming from

	abroad. It must be recognised that some countries are coming from very different historical situations. For example, Croatia is now making strong efforts to increase the number of foreign researchers. Researchers recognise the challenges in getting jobs in the higher-education and public-research sectors. Only 25 per cent of PhD students and 20 per cent of postdoctoral researchers are confident of obtaining long-term employment. The full report will be published in September.	

Title	Employment prospects of PhD grads in sharp focus	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	26 September 2013	
Word count	677	
Text	In 2002 the Roberts Set for Success review addressed the supply of science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills throughout the education system in the UK. Among the recommendations were two that related directly to postgraduate researchers and research staff. These focused on having better structure and career development for PhD candidates and postdoctoral researchers. The UK government responded by investing £150 million through the research councils to increase stipends and the length of doctoral programmes, and to provide training for their funded researchers. The training and professional development is sponsored by Research Councils UK, the agency with oversight of all the seven councils funding research. The entire training and development is run by the organisation Vitae. It is a network- based organisation, with a central team based in Cambridge and a series of eight regional hubs throughout the UK and some international networks. Vitae has recently developed the comprehensive researcher development framework (RDF). This enables researchers to manage their professional development, focusing on areas including engagement, influence and impact; and knowledge and intellectual abilities. It has been successfully applied in the UK and a number of other countries, including Germany and Japan. It is really important for researchers and institutions to engage fully in career development. International studies show that in many countries more than 50 per cent of PhD graduates leave academia to find employment.	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-EU END-NE LAN-INFO

	The 2010 Royal Society report The Scientific Century: Securing Future Prosperity highlights that only 3.5 per cent of PhD graduates in the UK will obtain the status of permanent research staff and a mere 0.45 per cent will achieve professorial status. Although there is some variation in statistics, similar overall trends have been shown for other European states. As a result, the issue of employability of PhD graduates and researchers has come into sharp focus on the European Research Area agenda. A 2012 EC report Professional Development of Researchers - Provisions for the Future concluded that skills training and professional development for researchers is highly variable across Europe. This was based on a study of seven countries; Austria, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia and the UK. There is a high level of support for researchers at doctoral level, followed by a sharp decrease for postdoctoral researchers. Overall training and development in independence, knowledge exchange and innovation is poor, even at doctoral level. Proactive approach Vitae held its annual conference in Manchester on September 4th and 5th last. One of the keynote speakers was Indi Seehra, the director of human resources at the University of Cambridge. As a university with significant public and private funding, it is taking a highly proactive approach to supporting researchers. Cambridge was one of the first universities in Europe to engage in the European Commission's HR Excellence in Research institutional self-evaluation. All of the Irish universities, the Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, many of the institutes of technology and other research bodies, including Teagasc and the Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, are in this EC-sponsored HR process. The seven Irish universities have put structures in place to support researcher career development. In the case of UCD, for example, there is dedicated research skills and career development support. The objective is to provide a range of courses, development opportunities, career workshops and one-to-one	

	coaching sessions to support researcher career planning. The role of the UCD research staff association is recognised in promoting the interests of researchers. Funding is limited for these types of services. Similar structures are present in the other universities. They do not fall under the categories of core university or competitive research funding. Cambridge faces the same problems as all universities, with few academic career paths and researchers retained on soft money from external research contracts. However, its significant funding resources enables it to put into place services to support researchers. It is critical to have in place proper career development support in order for researchers to make informed choices regarding their future. However, this can only happen if there are the resources available to ensure these structures can be put in place.	

Title	EU puts research firmly on the Horizon	
Author	Conor O'Carroll	
Newspaper company	The Irish Times	
Country of origin	Ireland	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	28 November 2013	
Word count	659	
Text	The European Parliament in Strasbourg ratified the Horizon 2020 programme on November 20th. The EU member states will now sign off at ministerial level, paving the way for the first calls for proposals on December 11th for €70 billion of research and innovation funding between 2014 and 2020. However, it is worth keeping in mind that the budget represents only 4 per cent of the total investment in research across the 28 countries of the European Union. The purpose of Horizon 2020, the latest in the framework programmes that have been running since the 1980s, is to bring true added value at EU level to national programmes. In 2012, the European Commission focused on five key objectives of the European Research Area (ERA) that should be achieved by the end of 2014. These are: more effective national research systems, including increased competition and sustained or greater investment in research; optimal transnational co-operation and competition; an open labour market for researchers; gender equality and gender mainstreaming in research; and optimal circulation and open access to scientific knowledge. The European Commission published in September the ERA Progress report for 2013. This is the first comprehensive review of the steps taken across Europe in completing the ERA objectives. The report shows that while there is progress, there are significant differences between countries in different parts of Europe. More effective national research systems mean there is increased competition based on excellence and sustained or greater investment in research. Across the EU, government expenditure on research has been in decline since 2009	VIS-BIG TO-NE PRO-DOM END-YES LAN-INFO

	and, at 1.47 per cent in 2011, was at its lowest level since 2002. All countries allocate some research funding through competitive calls for projects. Ireland is among 21 countries where institutional funding is linked with an assessment of research performance and where international peer review is widely applied. Optimal transnational co-operation and competition is about raising quality through Europe-wide open competition. On average, only 3.8 per cent of R&D budgets are directed towards transnational co-ordinated research (Ireland would be at about 4 per cent). Over 80 per cent of funding organisations have common eligibility criteria, but only about 30 per cent of them implement common priorities and common selection decisions. An open labour market for researchers requires breaking down barriers to researcher mobility, training and attractive careers. On average, 40 per cent of researchers in European universities do not believe their employers implement open and transparent recruitment. In contrast, more than 70 per cent of researchers in Ireland believe the national system is open. Gender gap European (and indeed global) research still suffers from a substantial loss of highly skilled women, and from a lack of gender dimension in research content. There are few women in leadership positions or involved in decision-making. In 2010, women represented only 19.8 per cent of senior academic staff, and less than 20 per cent of research-performing organisations apply recruitment and promotion policies and provide support to leadership development for female researchers. Open access to publicly funded research is increasing in Europe. About 50 per cent of research performers indicated that their publications are in open access. Ireland has been highly active in developing repositories since 2007 with the RIAN project, and, in 2012, Ireland launched a national strategy for open access. The achievement of a European Research Area needs the full commitment of member states. The Horizon 2020 programme could have taken a tougher line	

	on the five policy objectives. For example, it would seem reasonable that open and transparent recruitment of researchers would be obligatory for all projects funded under Horizon 2020. During negotiations, there were attempts to make policy objectives like open recruitment obligatory; this did not happen. However, it must be remembered that the final Horizon 2020 programme is a compromise between the 28 member states, the European Commission and the European Parliament. That being said, there were intensive discussions and the importance of the ERA policy objectives was recognised by all.	

Title	Mehr Mittel aus Brüssel	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Die Presse	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Right	
Date	22 January 2014	
Word count	229	
Text	Forschungspolitik. Mitterlehner beruft Helga Nowotny als Beraterin für EU-Forschungsprogramme. Wien. Österreich war schon im jüngsten EU-Forschungsrahmenprogramm recht erfolgreich: 2007 bis 2013 wurde knapp eine Milliarde Euro aus dem Brüsseler Fördertopf nach Österreich geholt _ das entspricht rund 125 Prozent dessen, was Österreich einzahlt. Für das neue Programm Horizon 2020 (2014 bis 2020) sollen die Rückflüsse weiter gesteigert werden. Wissenschafts-, Forschungs- und Wirtschaftsminister Reinhold Mitterlehner (ÖVP) nannte gestern, Dienstag, als Ziel 1,5 Milliarden Euro. Dafür soll die Beratung von Förderwerbern durch die FFG verstärkt werden _ nicht erst bei der Einreichung eines Projekts, sondern schon im Vorfeld (etwa um schlagkräftige Konsortien zu bilden). Know-how dafür will sich Mitterlehner von einem neuen Beratungsgremium, ERA (European Research Area) Council Forum Austria, holen, das in Ergänzung zu den bewährten Beratungsorganen (Forschungs- und Wissenschaftsrat) tätig werden soll. Geleitet wird der international besetzte Rat von Helga Nowotny, die bis Jahreswechsel Präsidentin des Europäischen Forschungsrates (ERC) war. Aufstockung des FWF Mitterlehner kündigte am Dienstag auch eine Erhöhung der Mittel für den Wissenschaftsfonds FWF an: Heuer werde das Basisbudget um 8,9 Prozent höher als 2013 sein, 2015 solle es noch einmal um drei Prozent auf 171,9 Mio. Euro steigen. Aus dem FWF wird vor allem universitäre Grundlagenforschung gespeist. Über Projekte, Spezialforschungsbereiche, Reisestipendien oder Doktoratskollegs stehen	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-INFO

	mehr als 3800 Wissenschaftler auf der "Payroll" des FWF. Dessen Budget stagnierte in den vergangenen Jahren, die Zahl der Anträge stieg indes	

Title	Mit hohen Zielen zu neuen Horizonten	
Author	n/a	
Newspaper company	Der Standard	
Country of origin	Austria	
Company alignment	Left	
Date	22 January 2014	
Word count	471	
Text	Mehr Bürgernähe und Innovationsnachfrage beim Auftakt des EU-Forschungsprogramms „Horizon 2020“ gefordert „Wir müssen die Forscher aus ihren Silos locken und Resultate liefern, die etwas bewegen.“ Das verlangte EU-Forschungskommissarin Máire Geoghegan-Quinn am Dienstag anlässlich der österreichischen Auftaktkonferenz zu „Horizon 2020“ in Wien. Doch das war noch nicht alles: „Wir müssen den Menschen zeigen, dass das Geld, das für Forschung ausgeben wird, ihr eigenes Leben betrifft, von den Fahrzeugen, die sie benutzen über die Lebensmittel, die sie essen, bis hin zur Energie, die sie nutzen.“ Es müsse im neuen EU-Forschungsprogramm auch für mehr Bürgernähe der Forschung gesorgt werden, zumal in Zeiten der grassierenden EU-Skepsis. Die Auswirkungen von Projekten würden künftig bei der Vergabe von Förderungen stärker berücksichtigt, kündigte Geoghegan-Quinn an. Grundsätzlich räumte die Kommissarin bei der Veranstaltung in der Hofburg Österreich gute Chancen ein, um im Wettbewerb um EU-Fördermittel zu reüssieren: „Österreich ist ein Nischenplayer. Es konkurriert nicht um Kosten, sondern um Köpfe.“ Österreich selbst hat sich hohe Ziele gesteckt: 1,5 Milliarden Euro sollen aus dem mit 80 Mrd. Euro gefüllten Fördertopf von „Horizon 2020“ nach Österreich zurückfließen, verlangte Henriette Egerth, Geschäftsführerin der Forschungsförderungsgesellschaft FFG. Im vorhergehenden 7. Rahmenprogramm waren es 1,1 Mrd. Euro Fördermittel – 125 Prozent der eingezahlten Mittel.	VIS-SML TO-NE PRO-DOM END-NE LAN-MIX

	Um eine weitere Steigerung zu erreichen, soll das zuletzt stagnierende Engagement der Unternehmen bei der Forschungsfinanzierung angekurbelt werden. Dazu will die FFG ihre Beratungen ausbauen. Zudem wird ein neues Gremium eingerichtet, das Probleme aufspüren und das nunmehr vereinte Wissenschafts- und Wirtschaftsministerium beraten soll: Das „ERA (European Research Area) Council Forum Austria“ wird von Helga Nowotny, der ehemaligen Präsidentin des Europäischen Forschungsrates (ERC), geleitet und ist mit vier weiteren hochrangigen Wissenschaftern aus dem In- und Ausland besetzt. Doch nicht nur Industrieforschung und die Bewältigung „gesellschaftlicher Herausforderungen“ sind tragende Säulen von „Horizon 2020“, sondern auch die Grundlagenforschung, die in der Förderschiene „Exzellente Wissenschaft“ gestärkt werden soll. Was Europa vorlebt, müsse auch auf nationaler Ebene verwirklicht werden, betonte Pascale Ehrenfreund, Präsidentin des Wissenschaftsfonds FWF. „In Österreich werden pro Einwohner 26 Euro für die Grundlagenforschung investiert, in der Schweiz sind es rund 89 Euro“, gab Ehrenfreund ein Beispiel. „Horizon 2020“ soll nicht nur eine nahtlose Verschränkung von Grundlagenforschung über Innovationsförderung bis hin zur Markteinführung fördern, sondern auch kleinen und mittleren Unternehmen (KMU) den Zugang zu Förderungen erleichtern, wie Geoghegan-Quinn betonte. Das soll durch neue Mittel speziell für KMU und unbürokratischere Abläufe erreicht werden. Insgesamt sei „Horizon 2020“ kein „massiver Paradigmenwechsel“, sondern eher eine „Konsolidierung“, konstatierte Jakob Edler vom Manchester Institute of Innovation Research. Studien hätten gezeigt, dass das Haupthindernis für Innovation die mangelnde Nachfrage nach Innovation sei. „Gleichzeitig macht der Sektor der öffentlichen Beschaffung etwa 18 Prozent des EU-BIPs aus.“ Hier gehe man nicht ambitioniert genug vor.	

	Außerdem fehlt dem Innovationsforscher eine globalere Ausrichtung von „Horizon 2020“: „Fünf Prozent internationale Beteiligung im letzten Rahmenprogramm sind nicht genug. Hier hab Europa, etwa im Vergleich zu den USA, aufzuholen.	