



„Best practice in multinational programme collaboration“



Peter Tischer



MEDEA +



Introduction to MEDEA+, EUREKA 2365

- **Subject of MEDEA+**
- **Development (first ideas, planning, implementation, assessment)**
- **Political and strategic aims**
- **Strengths and weaknesses**
 - **MEDEA = Microelectronics Development for European Applications**



MEDEA+ in a Nutshell

- **A programme driven by industry needs in a bottom-up flexible approach**
- **Initiated and monitored by industry with governmental financial support**
- **Involving the key European actors in the “microelectronics value chain“ from Equipment & Materials Suppliers to Semiconductor Manufacturers and System Houses incl. Universities and Institutes**
- **With approximately 2,500 researchers per year**
- **340 organisations/institutions from 21 countries**
- **Time frame 2001 - 2008**



MEDEA+ built on MEGA and JESSI

- **Development of Programmes MEGA and JESSI**
 - **First Ideas: We are far behind! If continuing alone, we might die!**
 - **Highly ranked European industry people decided to co-operate**
 - **Highly ranked European industry people convinced representatives of National Governments and the European Commission (JESSI) to financially support these activities.**
 - **Strong commitment of Public Authorities**
 - **Planning started very fast. Clear objectives and details were defined down to individual project level and manpower**
 - **Decision on funding of individual projects very fast**
 - **Assessment of success: achieving of objectives and satisfaction of programme participants**

Development of MEDEA and MEDEA+

- **Industrial partners want to continue to use the successful formula of JESSI: They documented their intention to cooperate.**
- **National governments hesitated to give a global commitment for funding. They want to decide on individual project level**
- **No financial support from the Commission**
- **Planning of activities was by far not so detailed as for JESSI: more or less a description of important working areas for future R&D**
- **Time for decision on national funding often very long**
- **Start of projects delayed, if some partners are not funded**
- **Assessment of the programme mainly based on project results**



Strategic Aims of MEDEA+

- **Improve the competitiveness of European companies**
- **Accelerate the technical development**
- **Make best use of knowledge of Institutes and Universities**
- **Achieve critical mass for difficult developments**
- **Focus on enabling technologies, not on products**
- **Foster co-operation of competitors**
- **Give fast feedback along the industrial value chain**

Programme Phase 1: Planning

<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Bottom up approach* Experience from former programmes helpful* Feedback from PAs during planning
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Not easy to define concrete measurable goals
<i>Remedies to Weaknesses</i>	



Programme Phase 2: Implementation

<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Programme and projects flexible* Simple format and procedures for application* Sharing of results: clear rules for IP
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* MEDEA+ label does not mean: funding is ok* No synchronization of funding decisions* Time for decision on funding often very long* No clear commitment of some PAs
<i>Remedies to Weaknesses</i>	

Speaker: Peter Tischer, MEDEA+



Programme Phase 3: Assessment

<i>Strengths</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* All project and programme reports well documented
<i>Weaknesses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* General goal “Improvement of competitiveness” assessible only long time after project end* In some cases: double reporting: to MEDEA+ and to some PAs, even in national languages
<i>Remedies to Weaknesses</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">* Use other criteria for assessment* PAs to accept the MEDEA+ report in English

Recommendations

- **Powerful partners must demonstrate their willingness to cooperate.**
- **They must define goals, they want to achieve by this cooperation**
- **These goals must be of benefit for the partners but also for the society (e. g. innovations, employment, new applications, standards, ...)**
- **Attractive eye-catchers must be found**
- **Business as usual and general statements have low chances as arguments for public funding**