



***„Best practice in
multinational programme
collaboration“***

***Morten Ween
The research Council of
Norway***

NORDITE



Introduction to NORDITE

- Subject of the Programme:
 - **TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT within the fields of:**
 - **SW radio, Wireless Sensors, Short Range Wireless Networks and RFID or MEMS utilizing RF Technology**
- Eligible applicants:
 - teams composed of Swedish-Norwegian-Finnish universities and research institutes
 - Steering group from industry
 - Technology development projects for which is foreseen a significant market.
- Political and strategic aims
 - The main goal of the initiative is to support Swedish, Norwegian and Finnish research institutes and universities in their effort to develop state-of-the art research in the above-mentioned fields in beneficial areas for Sweden, Norway and Finland.
- Budget (call 1):

– Finland (Tekes):	3 M Euro
– Sweden (VINNOVA):	2.2 M Euro
– Norway (RCN):	Not determined at start-up



Introduction to NORDITE (cont.)

- Development: (first ideas, planning, implementation, assessment)
 - Predecessor: EXITE, 2001 – 2003
 - Tekes and VINNOVA
 - Nordic WS on bench marking and best practice, 2003
 - May Norway join the follow-up?
- start/end-date:
 - First NORDITE planning meeting, February 2004
 - EOI closing September 2004
 - Call 1 opening April 2005, closing June 2005
 - Call 2 closing June 2007
 - Projects closing December 2010
 - Post programme seminar 2011
- Project assessment process
 - Separate national project assessments
 - Joint funding recommendations November 2005
 - Common point-rated evaluation criteria
 - Technical content and managerial content
 - National funding decisions

Programme Phase 1: Planning

<i>Strengths</i>	Cultural commonalities, well known partners Experience from previous co-operations Common understanding of the objectives No stone carved prerequisites Informal communication
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Uncertainty on budgets and decision trees Time consuming hearings Consensus needed, complex decision making Travel cost
<i>Remedies to Weaknesses</i>	Flexibility Understanding on what the agency can be committed to Confidence



Programme Phase 2: Implementation

<i>Strengths</i>	Well defined call National routines could be used for administration National sovereignty maintained No points of conflict needing compromises
<i>Weaknesses</i>	Synchronisation with a national call needed in Norway Q&A possible source for confusion Differences in national administrations
<i>Remedies to Weaknesses</i>	Identify possible conflicts Identify minimum and absolute requirements Identify legal constraints and differences

Programme Phase 3: Project assessment

Strengths	Quality assurance through three independent assessments Pre-defined point-rated criteria
Weaknesses	Different ranking in results One weak part could sink the project One part could block a good project Weak calibration of the rating
Remedies to Weaknesses	Calibration differences ruled out by averaging results National rankings presented to obtain joint understanding before a joint ranking



Recommendations

- **DO:**
 - Look for the overlapping areas of interest
 - Know your partners
 - Work together during the planning
 - Define the target groups
 - Clarify the expectations and objectives
 - What do you want from this?
 - Identify the decisions needed
 - Who
 - When
- **DON'T:**
 - Expect conditions not to change during the planning