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7 KEY POLICY MESSAGES FROM THE PSF EXPERTS

- Ukraine's STI system needs ambitious reforms to boost its efficiency and impact (+strong governmental commitment to invest more)
- The country needs to "innovate its path to growth"
- Science in Ukraine should benefit society and the economy
- Urgent decisions are needed to prioritise Ukraine's STI actions
- STI institutions, funding and procedures need strong institutional revamp
- Ukraine should push for the internationalisation of its STI system
- The government and the STI community must take ownership and communicate on the STI reforms

UA: YES, these messages correspond to the goals of Governmental policy and the expectations of Ukrainian community
LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1: The National Board on the Development of S&T should work strategically in reforming the system of S&T in Ukraine on the basis of jointly defined priorities with all involved stakeholders (MESU, the future National Research Foundation and the National Academy of Sciences)

UA: YES, the National Board is being established and will start its work in 2017. The National Research Foundation will start to fund in 2018
2: The National Research Foundation should become a change-maker e.g. through a strong increase in the competitive funding of research projects

UA: YES! Principle fields for NRF funding: centers of excellence, key laboratories, research universities, academic mobility. Next step: co-funding of applied studies together with business

However, budget of NFP can’t be formed through reduce of existing funding of science in universities and of NASU

3: The National Research Foundation should be internationally supervised for a guarantee of higher accountability

UA: YES!
4: An international peer review system for projects should be introduced to support the excellence and internalization of Ukrainian science

UA: YES! All the “big” projects should be evaluated internationally

5: Research universities should be identified in a post-factum approach over 5 years on the basis of international standards

UA: YES! This correlates with the approach, adopted recently by the board of MESU
6: A process of profiling and merging of universities should be induced

UA: YES! MESU is already undertaking the corresponding measures

7: All research organisations of the Academies of Science and universities should be entitled to their own discretionary use of third party funding

UA: YES! Necessary amendments to legislation are prepared
8: The NASU should concentrate its priority focus

UA: MESU will strongly support the appropriate NASU activities. However, NASU is autonomous.

9: The NASU should make the organisation of its institutes’ more effective through regular independent evaluation exercises.

UA: YES! A procedure of state attestation involving independent experts would serve this purpose.
10: The NASU is advised to initiate several science communication activities

11: The NASU should broaden the diversity of its human capital, with a particular focus on age and gender balance

UA: MESU will strongly support the appropriate NASU activities for 10 and 11
12: The NASU and universities should promote publications in international journals and downsize in-house publishing

UA: YES! MESU prepares regulations, according to which publications in Scopus and Web of Science referred journals would be dominant for evaluation of universities, scientific institutions, scientists
13: The Sectoral Academies of Science should be modernised drawing on the transformation model of the NASU

UA: YES!

14: The institutes in the sphere of MESU and other ministries should be evaluated and – depending on the obtained results of these assessments – restructured or dissolved

UA: YES! Merging of 2 MESU institutes with universities is already in process
15: Research careers should be stimulated through a mix of policy instruments (i.e. increase in salaries, exchange programmes etc.)

UA: YES! A very successful call for junior scientists was organized by MESU in 2016

16: Research administration should become leaner, ensure less red tape and get rid of inefficiencies and corruption

UA: YES! The main tools toward this would be independent evaluation, open competition procedures for funding, participation in European programs
ENHANCED INTERNATIONAL COLLABORATION

17: The H2020 opportunities should be reaped through adequate accompanying support measures

UA: YES! 61 retained grants for the teams with UA participation, €11.5 mln for UA scientists. Coordinative Center is established by Government

18: Ukraine should become a member of COST and increase participation in EUREKA

UA: YES! The problem is with the possibilities for funding of COST and EUREKA related activities
19: Opportunities for international STI exposure, especially for junior and mid-career researchers, should be assured based on their contribution to research advancement

UA: YES! Different tools are discussed together with junior researchers communities

20: Access to national and international scientific infrastructures should be improved

UA: YES! Current valuable proposals from JRS
21: Cooperation with the scientific diaspora should be increased

UA: YES! Representatives of scientific diaspora are already working in Identification committee

22: The association to H2020 = source for policy learning

UA: YES!

23: International efforts in STI should be aligned with national priorities and strategies

UA: YES! The National Board would be a principle body to take decisions in this area
CONDUCTIVE FRAMEWORK FOR AN INNOVATION-DRIVEN ECONOMY

24: A cross-gov. Innovation Strategy on priority domains for science- and tech-based innovation

UA: YES! MESU and NASU treat the National Board as a natural platform for decisions in this area

25: Representation of the Ministry of Economic Dev. and Trade and innovation actors in the National Board on the Development of S&T

UA: YES! MEDT would be represented in National Board together with Ministry of Finance, NASU
26: Establish a permanent working group on innovation under the National Board on the Development of S&T

UA: YES!

27: Realistic and effective innovation policy instruments should be identified

UA: YES! A new legislation on innovations is being developed
28: Innovation vouchers for internationalization and validation of innovation activities for companies

29: Science-industry mobility schemes

30: Cooperative projects between the public research sector and industry

UA for 28-30: PRINCIPAL YES! Details are to be regulated within the new legislation on innovations
MESU together with NASU, and university community had already prepared a draft Action plan for implementation of the New law “On Science”.

It would be corrected with account for recommendations of the Peer Review.
KEY MESSAGE №1:

Ukraine's STI system needs ambitious reforms coupled with strong governmental commitment to invest more.

The target of 1.7% of public R&D expenditures/GDP in the new Law “On Scientific and Technical Activity” should remain valid and support the STI reform agenda. Competitive research funding should gain relevance to reach 40% by 2022.
Funding of academies and universities in 2017 according to draft State Budget (in UAH)

- **NASU** – 2 637 200 000
  Minimal additional demand – 681 000 000

- **Academy of medical sciences** – 1 317 700 000
  Minimal additional demand – 242 500 000

- **Academy of agricultural sciences** – 395 000 000
  Minimal additional demand – 317 000 000

- **Science in MESU universities** – 601 500 000
  Minimal additional demand – 89 500 000

- **State Fund of Fundamental Research** – 20 000 000
  Minimal additional demand – 80 000 000
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