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Especia
Triple Helix and European Union (Eu) Funding: The case of Latin America, especially Mexico and the Seventh European Framework Program (FP7)

Jürgen Haberleithner

Introduction and basic positions

The idea behind this topic and the subsequent paper originated in a meeting of concepts and their correlating lines of action drawn from Triple Helix and the seventh European Framework Program (FP7). Including various regions of the world in FP7 was a strategic decision on behalf of the European Union in light of its worldwide partnerships for research and development (R&D). This particular FP7 program therefore presents an interesting foundation on which potential project ideas using Triple Helix can be put into effect. The implementation of Triple Helix’s basic concepts —furthering innovation through the networking of universities, industry and the governments responsible— not only integrates well into Eu framework programs because of its global structure, but also sees itself realized in the general requirements of FP7’s respective calls for bids. Because they pres-

1 Research professor of the Pacific Basin Studies Center-Apec Studies Center - University of Colima, Mexico.
ent two like-minded approaches, they require a program- and process-oriented analysis of their mutual potentials.

With a budget of €50 billion from 2007 to 2013, the seventh European Framework Program (FP7) is the world’s largest global-scale program promoting research and development with an international focus. For a large number of developing countries, this program represents a remarkable opportunity to participate in global research and innovation projects. Latin America, as a political and social space, has strong relations with Europe due to its socio-economic and historical development, and has a special position within the innovation policy of the European Union. A great number of FP7’s “target countries” are located in Latin America. The FP7, amongst other comparable programs, is also a very attractive financing option for projects in Triple Helix’s area of expertise because Triple Helix provides up to 100% recoverable costs, compared to other programs which only provide a partial contribution. An evaluation of the opportunities generated in Latin America with FP7 (and with previous programs, e.g. FP6) based on the actual participation of these countries in the program clearly shows the great potential for positive results. Further optimization of the available options would require more funding to support advisory activities for the recipients of Triple Helix assistance in Latin America, for which an active participation in FP7 is strategically important. This “missing link” between communication about the program (see chapter “The Missing Link” or “Academic Coaching” for the FP7) and its preferably large-scale presence (not only for the already well-networked recipients) can be considered an essential optimization tool. In order to promote a sustainable analysis of this necessary medium, the initial focus will rest on an important Latin American country: Mexico. The first step will be to define the strategic partnership between Mexico and the EU and to identify the significance of scientific cooperation. As a second step, a concrete solution will be developed using expert opinions, as well as by evaluating the needs of the key players and the potential project approaches for providing the “missing

4 http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html and http://ec.europa.eu/research/iscp/index.cfm?lg=en&p=pp=countries (Both links from Sept. 1, 2010) represent the call for bids in the current Framework Program, as well as the project opportunities that also contain country-specific treaties between the EU and third countries for the analyzed region.

The combined methods will ensure a representative view that provides solutions to the problems in Latin America.

The question of communication and possible solutions for advising FP7-projects is central to this paper’s research interest. However, the political dimension of the problem is no less important than the research design, as it plays a complementary role in the analysis of possible intervention models. Mexico, as a leading model country in Latin America, provides us with the possibility to carry out an exploratory study of an innovative nature. Considering an FP7-oriented “establishment” of a Triple Helix in Mexico is essential if we want to show the model of optimized communication and institutionalization of optimized access to the FP7 (and successor programs) not only from a theoretical point of view, but also with the aim of realizing the project successfully.

The following analysis not only seeks to develop new potential intervention models; it also aims to create a detailed analysis of the existing problems with regards to communication among the active participants of Triple Helix (especially in Mexico). The special situation in Latin America with regards to existing corruption, the unequal distribution of power between the government and the private sector, dependence on other economies and other social issues will be analysed in accordance with the main focus of the investigation. The subsequent linking of potential partners to the development of an initiative for submitting a future Triple Helix/FP7 project represent an important contribution to a longer-term perspective on the preceding investigation. The potential partnerships between Europe and Latin America (in addition to other possible world regions, such as, for example, Pacific Asia) will create an initial project draft within the scope of the conference.

**Keywords:** 7th Framework Programme (FP7), European Community, Latin America, Mexico, Triple Helix Model.
Mexico and the European Union acting as partners on R&D

In 1997, the European Union signed a partnership treaty with Mexico—the first Latin American country to do so— that went into effect in 2000. One of the main goals of the treaty outlined a common Free Trade Area (FTA), in order to counteract, among other things, the NAFTA treaty signed by Mexico in 1994. The topic of innovation was likewise important in furthering mutual efforts towards the realization of innovative research and development projects. At the same time, transatlantic efforts with a primary focus on Mexico and the EU are being coupled with multilateral endeavors that constitute participation in EU framework programs (currently, the FP7 and EU-LAC process). Access 2 MExcyt is one example of such a project advancing the interests of the partnership. The project initiative embodies a classic project standard geared towards cross-regional research efforts, common networking interests, and immediately usable information databases. These tools provide both sides with relevant information needed to find the right project partner and to be able to process the information into a usable form. Through its own corresponding initiative, Mexico stands as a country which has responded well to EU efforts. However, the active stakeholders’ lack of training in these areas can be seen as a considerable barrier on the way to an optimally functioning partnership, especially when it is not just about information-linking, but also about generating knowledge over large distances. The uncontrolled access of potential partner-institutions to the various programs can be seen as an additional problem area in this context, whereby the coordination of mutual efforts towards cooperation is often strongly centralized. In contrast to that, the participation in calls for bids in the diverse multilateral programs (var. support programs, FP7) is free of “national coordination”. The scientific standards for taking part in these parts of the program, however, are exceptionally high. The National Contact Points (NcPs) in the participating countries of the EU go some way


Conacyt (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología, Mexico) is primarily responsible for the coordination of (and thereby only rarely for the direct access to) projects concerning bilateral agreements.
towards filling the above-mentioned gaps in training and well-aimed support for project development, naturally only according to their diverging areas of focus.\textsuperscript{9}

However, these efforts are predominantly only available to the interested parties within the participating countries of the EU, which in turn means that new programs mainly initiated by Latin America rely on their own initiation funds. Because the required know-how, as previously mentioned, needs to already be at a very high level in order to turn project proposals into FP7 successes, it may be assumed that Latin American project leaders often find themselves in a blatantly weak position. This assumption was confirmed not only by the insufficient training and coaching structures in Latin America (and the lack of support for project proposals), but also through empirical investigations at different Mexican universities in the course of various research expeditions and series of lectures from the author of this paper.

In summary, an initial analysis shows the necessity for an instrument that facilitates greater promotion of the Mexican scientific landscape through a strong emphasis on training, coaching and promotion—in other words, financial funding of promising project proposals, such as a National Contact Point according to the European model (i.e., in the EU member states). If one knows anything about the scientific structures within Mexico (see structural criticism within the same chapter), one can proceed on the assumption that any planned NCP needs to be set up as a private initiative which nevertheless follows public interest in regards to the participation of Mexican applicants in FP7. This model is not at all unusual. One need only refer to the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (see FFG [Austrian Research Promotion Agency, NCP of Austria]), which, while being managed as a private economic initiative, does a convincing job in furthering scientific and public interests. An idea along these lines would in turn be conceivable as an assisted FP7 for Mexico. Naturally, differences in quality regarding its execution would still need to be considered, ranging from a purely scientific and analytical level, to the integration of small- and medium-sized businesses (a part of any basic FP7 approach), to the

\textsuperscript{9} According to FFG (Austrian Research Promotion Agency, NCP of Austria), project proposals with proposal check (by the NCPs) are usually more successful than without proposal check.
participation of regional governments, who could secure initial financing through national aid connections. The basic idea of Triple Helix, namely securing the industry as a strong partner, could be implemented on an empirical level by way of project output (e.g. patents). Furthermore, one could consider an additional effort on behalf of the industry to support especially promising projects via supplementary base financing at the time of submittal.

The “Missing Link” or “Academic Coaching” for FP7

In order to make suggestions regarding reinforced aid for Mexican (and other Latin American) actors in FP7 more specific, a potential scenario will be developed over the course of this chapter, one which both satisfies explorative demands and illustrates concrete solution bases. As one such possible scenario, we will use a project draft developed together with the “Universidad Autónoma de Aguascalientes” in Mexico as a concrete answer to the demands of FP7. The project draft is designed to be carried out by an NCP (devised according to the EU model, see preceding chapter) that already functions as a consulting authority. Currently, this plan is still in a peer review phase and could, if deemed feasible, serve as a model for other research establishments and universities. By outlining this model at this stage, we hope to not only point towards concrete efforts in reaching the specified goal, but also to motivate others to initiate similar projects.

The model was conceived in modular form and has its basis in the fundamental concepts of group dynamics. (Tuckman, 1965; Developmental Sequence in Small Groups. Forming, Storming, Norming and Performing) As the potential participants come from many scientific disciplines and have the most variable time and place requirements, the seminar units will be staggered in time. Parallel to that, the participants will be

10 Project title: “Academic Coaching for the Process of Internationalization of the Self-Governed University of Aguascalientes”.

11 The projects “Coaching Académico” in “Centro Universitario de Estudios e Investigaciones sobre la Cuenca del Pacífico-Centro de Estudios Apec” of the University of Colima (Mexico) and “Mentoring”, from the nonprofit organization “Austrian Scientists and Scholars in North America” (Canada, USA and Mexico) served, among others, as referential projects. Both projects share a key focus (although embedded in different academic contexts): networking of participants in cross-national and-regional research projects.
working on the various project ideas and necessary steps online. The project groups have a maximum of 10 members. The various disciplines not only represent an additional challenge to the program leaders, but corresponding synergies are also expected. Additionally, the participants will be chosen for specific criteria, which should guarantee successful performance in the entirety of the coaching program.\footnote{The project is estimated to last at least 12 months.}

As a first step, some basic issues must be sorted out together with the participants, such as getting to know one another, previous experiences with the FP7 programs, differences in research perspectives, a “reality check” in regards to the demands of the various pillars of the program, a basic introduction to the FP7 program and similar topics related to the process of convergence with the European research area. As soon as clearing the basics has opened up an academic panorama, the participants will break up into sub-workgroups (the smallest groups) in order to develop the individual researchers’ resumes. They will then work out the essential cornerstones needed to optimize the information found inside the resumes and finalize their creation. A further vital step consists of using the results of the preceding “reality checks” to sound out where and inside which of the respective program pillars researchers will potentially be able to house their proposed projects. In the process, special care needs to be exercised to identify the possible niches that could bring about success and a Unique Selling Proposition (USP)\footnote{USP (Unique Selling Proposition), an idea taken from marketing, means occupying a distinct, unique position in the market-in case of a successful project proposal in FP7, this could prove a decisive criterium and contribute to the success or failure of an idea.} for the project idea. These actions are complemented by a review of existing research networks, the development of expansion strategies, and most importantly, the analysis of “best practice” methods. The quality of the networks competing within the various program pillars will undergo a similar analysis as a focal point in the concrete coaching program. Weaknesses will be investigated and scenarios developed to compensate for said weaknesses.

Efforts to improve skills in the areas of project planning and management make up the second step. Here, specific tools and experts that serve to impart the “hard facts” of this important area will be deployed. The daily running of these projects, the
incredible responsibility inherent in their coordination and a knowledge of financial management are to be considered fundamental elements in order to reach positive results. In this context, the merits, which lie in not being entrusted with the coordination of a project directly but rather joining an FP7 project as a partner, need to naturally be considered.

If the prerequisites from the first two steps (Module 1) are met, a phase follows in which the participants of the coaching program receive virtual mentoring (Module 2) via an online platform. The participants will form their own project groups that are geared towards necessary performance steps in the operational process. The main foci planned for the project ideas are analysis of calls for bids, project groundwork (to be base financed as far as possible; see recommendations in the previous chapter) and targeted “lobbying”.

Module 3 is designed parallel to Module 2 and takes place in the form of an attendance-mandatory seminar every three months. The contents of the seminars are drawn from the unfulfilled requirements from the second module. This means that all of the endeavors that could not be properly addressed virtually in the second module will be analyzed and completed as part of this seminar.

First positive effects can be expected after a project has run a minimum of twelve months. The chances of handing in a successful project depend strongly on various factors, such as the participants’ individual basic qualifications and the quality of the proposals.

As previously addressed, there is insufficient improvement of the opportunities for participants in the Mexican scientific community in EU-based programs, presumably not due to lack of coordination efforts, project ideas and resources, but rather due to the [lack of] reinforcement of the potential participants in regards to orientation within the programs, training in specific skills, better international networking and more internal autonomy.

14 The fact that it is easier to operate as the non-primarily responsible party in a project is often underestimated. Benefits and drawbacks must, naturally, be examined, and one must be able to identify the main points of a project’s contents.
15 Both initial modules are attendance-mandatory seminars.
16 “Lobbying” means, in this context, that potential project partners with common interests will be suggested and the corresponding project applications accelerated.
The question of institutional consultation, or “Where does internationalization begin?”

The previous chapter served to determine how to support interested researchers on an empirical level—hence, the focus lay on the competence of the individual researchers rather than on the framework conditions necessary for attaining these goals. Gabriela Díaz Prieto writes in her current, noteworthy work (also her Master’s thesis) about the weaknesses of the Mexican system and the necessity of implementing an active manager figure:

Para lograr un aumento en la participación mexicana en los “Programas marco” es necesario promover el interés y la voluntad de vincularse con investigadores y empresas europeas. Sobre todo porque el éxito en la aprobación de los proyectos en los “Programas marco”, depende en gran medida de la existencia previa de redes de socios. La figura del gestor de RTD 17 es tan vital como desconocida para lograr este objetivo. Por lo tanto, es necesario identificar o entrenar y organizar a estos gestores a fin de que aumenten la cantidad y la calidad de la cooperación. 18

The meaning of social networks in the field of science and the necessity of networking more with Europe on both an economical and operational level are to be understood as crucial points of Díaz’ criticism. Here, one can also see direct approaches that are equally significant to the initiators of the planned Triple Helix projects.

17 RTD: Support program: “Investigación, Desarrollo Tecnológico e Innovación” of CONACyT (Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología de México).
18 Díaz Prieto, Gabriela. Desafíos para México. Cooperación América Latina-Unión Europea en Investigación, Desarrollo Tecnológico e Innovación. Page 14, Mexico, 2010. Quotation in English: “In order to achieve an increase in the Mexican participation in the Framework Programs, it is necessary to promote the interest and will to connect with European researchers and companies, especially since the successful adoption of the Framework Programs projects depends largely on the prior existence of partner networks. The figure of the RTD manager is as vital to achieve this goal as it is unknown. Therefore, it is necessary to identify and/or train and organize these managers in order to increase the quantity and quality of the cooperation”. Díaz Prieto speaks of the necessity of an active consultant figure (gestor) and notes that this figure corresponds to the English “Science P.R.”, but that the official diction of the European Union portrays this figure as “Knowledge Attaché”.
Diaz further holds that: Primero, México no cuenta con una política de cooperación internacional en RDI. Es necesario fortalecer el liderazgo de Conacyt en este sentido, a fin de que sea capaz de definir estrategias de cooperación internacional con la Unión Europea a mediano plazo, hacer un análisis de la cooperación actual y darle la visibilidad que merece.19

If we consider this excerpt, it is easy to comprehend how the role of Conacyt20 is analyzed: the essential resources are already available in principle. What is needed is a reinforced role of the leading Mexican and public scientific institutions with the aim of strengthening scientific cooperation between Mexico and Europe. This analysis starts with the basic assumption that supplying the prerequisites for promoting the scientific community in Mexico in regards to Europe is a task of the state. One might also consider running a private initiative in parallel, which situates itself somewhere between scientific institution and the private business sector (see chapter “Mexico and the European Union acting as partners on R&D”). Apart from the idea to bring the NCP in Latin America closer to the European model, finding an answer to the question posed by private economic initiatives remains equally vital, particularly if one considers the weaknesses of the state-run structures as described above. Private universities could also come into their own here, bringing to the table new questions about their role in the grand scheme of things and what scenarios might spring from their involvement. It is of course common knowledge that private universities have different priorities than public ones. This tenet holds as true in Mexico as it does in other Latin American countries. One private university of vast interest for questions surrounding scientific joint-ventures with Europe is Santander University21 in Mexico. This institution is penetrating the scientific market

19 Diaz Prieto, Gabriela. Desafíos para México. Cooperación América Latina-Unión Europea. En: “Investigación, desarrollo tecnológico e innovación”. Pag. 146, México, 2010. Quotation in English: “First, Mexico does not have an international cooperation policy in RTDI. It is necessary to strengthen Conacyt’s leadership in this regard, in order to be able to define international cooperation strategies with the European Union in the medium term, carry out an analysis of the current cooperation, and give it the visibility it deserves.”

20 Conacyt-Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología of Mexico.

21 University of Santander: Universidad de Santander (UNISAN), see link from Sept. 1, 2010: http://www.unisan.edu.mx/
in Mexico with vehemence as well as great financial effort. A strong international orientation, however, is also an integral component of Unisan’s “corporate philosophy.” The possibility to exhaust the Mexican scientific community’s potential through targeted consultancy work, training and directed coaching in proposal-writing opens up an interesting alternative to public endeavors. The Austrian initiative “Centre for Social Innovation” (ZSI) is one exceptionally successful project of this nature and can be considered a seminal influence. The Center for Social Innovation stands as a non-profit organization in its own right, while simultaneously participating in various projects involving Latin America, such as FP7 and its predecessor-programs. ZSI’s unique approach lies in networking scientific expertise and applied project coordination, which is reflected in the Center’s participation in a number of projects as part of the European Framework Programs, as well as in its consulting and project maintenance record for external organizations and public institutions. This model is, understandably, a slowly growing one and heavily influenced by the European scientific tradition, wherein interdisciplinary collaboration and social networking are considered especially vital. Also, as previously stated, it is hardly possible to evaluate Mexican and other Latin American conditions using the European model as a base of reference. Still, it remains important to analyze the different intervention models and to evaluate their structures in and of themselves. To that effect, the combination of consultation and project participation can be seen as the key to a successful strategy towards asserting one’s organization in this formidable setting.

By looking at these references and models aimed at increasing participation in international research programs in Mexico, one may also discover the structural problem behind any attempts to fill the vacuum in targeted aid. If one considers the various approaches to organizational theories, the Theory

---

22 In communicating with the president of the private university Santander/Unisan, Mr. Oscar Hernandez, the author was convinced of the great interest that Santander University has in specific European programs. The idea of a private consulting firm aiding Mexico’s scientific landscape in achieving the proper “fitness” for a successful application in FP7 was specifically discussed and could contain elements such as targeted coaching, funding upon application, and “skills-oriented” training.

of Human Motivation (Maslow, 1984) among all others, the necessity of creating personal meaning during the working process becomes clear. It goes without saying that financial incentives do not suffice to create motivation, yet in a fragile economic situation as is often found in project-oriented work, finding personal meaning is an important consideration.

At this point, we return to the topic of public versus private economic intervention. In public organizations, one will sometimes find structures that hardly consider the worker’s motivations and bring administrative tasks to the foreground. Observations like these, combined with the lack of efficiency in the establishment of NCPS in Mexico,24 show the necessity of private initiatives.

Apart from consulting, how to communicate across national borders is an essential topic of discussion for the successful initiation and management of European-Mexican initiatives, an endeavor not solely reliant on resources, proper supporting initiatives and other public or private advisory services. The question of how far everyone is willing to stretch one’s boundaries of thought in order to cooperate is equally essential. In Mexico, researchers ‘and teachers’ day-to-day lives involve an enormous amount of bureaucracy. Apart from these hurdles, providing optimal training to potential participants in international research programs becomes a big problem if all communication is to happen in English. Although it is theoretically possible to write proposals and manage projects in all languages of the European Union, in practice it is absolutely necessary to use English as a hub language, especially concerning relevant academic standards. This does not mean that we can expect linguistic perfection, but rather, that offering language courses in academic English on an institutional level is imperative and needs to be considered as part of the project design for all coaching programs. (See chapter “The ‘Missing Link’ or ‘Academic Coaching’ for FP7”).

---

A theoretical point of view: Does Triple Helix fit supranational innovation, like FP7?

This simple question opens up a broad topic for the confines of one chapter, but the theoretical asking should resolve several basic issues between the Triple Helix model and the European FP7. For the purposes of this study, the Triple Helix model, which draws its theoretical position from the collaboration between the academic world, the industry and the state, is considered the reference. These theoretical positions move between the blocks of power that generate diverging meanings within the various systems and forms of government. If we choose a government model surrounded by descriptions like “western,” “democratic,” and “capital-oriented,” as a vantage point, the cultural spheres of the active participants’ will surely overlap in some areas, as well as differ in others. We can thus speak of a “mixed” model that endorses dominance by way of the state more or less depending on the situation. Other than the partial overlaps, society as a whole is interested in innovation; in the “free” democracies of the world, that interest applies as a part of the politics of innovation.

The influence of supranational research programs is a complex one, but should at least be outlined at this point. The European Union has set an ambitious goal for itself with its decision to catch up to the leading countries in R&D, i.e. Japan and the USA (the so-called Lisbon Strategy), and in order to reach the planned 2.6% capital expenditure for 2010 (see figure 1 in the appendix), will need to put forth major efforts within the FP7 for 2007 to 2013.

Despite the economic crisis worldwide, the pre-determined budget for the period 2007-2013 will not be reduced, which is already being interpreted as a positive move in the direction of crisis stability. On a national level, the members of the European Union simultaneously complement the community’s efforts with national programs. Measuring the influence of the FP7 on the national innovation sites of the so-called third countries (that is, those outside of the Eu) is more difficult than measuring influence on those countries inside the Eu. Without the ability to empirically monitor measurability, one should refer to the direct effects on the countries taking part in the Framework Program.

In any case, the financial factor and academic incentives to take part in this program can be viewed as empirically verifiable factors in realizing innovation. In this way, Triple Helix acquires an additional “player” (namely, the European Union), which, although being regarded as belonging to the public sector, can not be considered a direct nationalist influence. The presence of the European Union as a supranational government\textsuperscript{26} means a new, strong influence on the behavior of the participating countries with regards to innovation. Due to the massive sum invested in the FP7 (2007-2013: € 50 billion), the exertion of influence on non-European states (and the Triple Helix structures in these countries) nevertheless carries great import.

In general, it can be said that Triple Helix has been considerably influenced by the impact of supranational research programs. The precise balance of the decision-making process within Triple Helix, especially the manner of influence regarding private capital, should still be ascertained separately. The European Union represents a specific “player,” whose dynamic development has great meaning in the architecture of all potential innovation projects that contain at least some amount of European involvement. Because of this, Triple Helix is experiencing a new quality of targeted, supranational innovation politics.

\textbf{Summary}

The present inquiry is oriented towards Mexico’s position within the framework of scientific cooperation with the European Union. The analysis emanates from the various bilateral and multilateral efforts, which serve as groundwork for the cooperation in the branches of Research and Development. A theoretical comparison will be considered on the level of the institutions and active participants in R&D, which will analyze the changes in Triple Helix and in the architecture of the respective projects. In this light, the European Union’s program FP7 represents a direct influence on the theoretical and empirical positions in Triple Helix’s domain. It also exerts

\textsuperscript{26} Author’s note: Since the Treaty of Lisbon and its entering into force on Dec. 1, 2009, the European Union moved significantly closer to the status of a supranational state. National responsibilities are being pushed back and it has become possible to speak of the EU having its own “governmental responsibility”, see especially authorities in foreign and security policy.
influence on all levels and opens up a new area for strategic evaluation of this program’s influence in developing countries. Performance related to the active support of involved research organizations and other prospective participants interested in FP7, will be analyzed on the level of the Mexican institutions as an object of analysis for the empirical part of the inquiry. This concrete manner of consultation is evaluated as inefficient and complex. Potential solutions are discussed and substantiated with solid examples. Above all, the possibility of success via applied coaching programs (as a type of social intervention in the academic market) will be discussed using a number of concepts.

The foundations devised in this paper should serve towards the future advancement of ideas to aid the collaboration between Mexico and the European Union in matters of innovation. The main focus is the development of theoretical positions in order to analyze the processes utilized by Triple Helix and the analysis of practical influence on behalf of supranational research programs. The intent to organize a workshop on the theme “Triple Helix in connection with the program options in FP7,” within the framework of the “Triple Helix VIII International Conference on University, Industry and Government Linkages” in October 2010 in Madrid, is only a first step in this direction. There is already a keen interest in the continuing development of these thematic overlaps.

One final thought that we can hold onto is that the European Union would do well to more strongly emphasize the potential of private initiatives in relation to consultation in Latin American countries, and to move more actively into that direction. Not only is indirect aid in this line of consulting advantageous for respective calls for bids (bearing in mind private shareholders), but a concrete course correction with regards to private responsibility in the course of political debates would be just as desirable. The private sector’s responsibility towards the development of innovations is uncontested and could provide a significant contribution in scientific cooperation between Latin America and the European Union.

27 The workshop titled “Triple Helix and EU Funding-Latin America as a target region for Europe” is planned for Oct. 21, 2010 (in Madrid, Spain) within the framework of the conference “Triple Helix VIII International Conference on University, Industry and Government Linkages”.
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Figure 1. Source: Cordis, Introduction to FP7, http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/home_en.html Link from September 1, 2010
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