Chapter 1.6

The Development of Research Management and Administration in Europe: A Short History

Anna Groeninx van Zoelen

Leiden University, Leiden, Netherlands

Abstract

The development of Research Management and Administration (RMA) in Europe is strongly connected with the development of the Science and Technology (S&T) policy of the European Union (EU). These policies were the result of a continuous debate between the member states and the European Commission and European Parliament.

Although there is no data on the early development of RMA, there are some publications on the history of the development of the S&T policy in Europe: the excellent publication 'A History of European Union Research Policy' by Luca Guzzetti (Guzzetti, 1995). Guzzetti's book investigates the history of EU research policies from 1948 up to the preparation of the Fourth Framework Programme (FP) (1994–1998).

The RMA aspects are constructed mainly by oral history complemented with some written sources. The history shows a gradual development of the profession unevenly spread in time and European geography. This has mainly with the EU enlargement in the same period, when new member states were connected to the FP. The profession started with a few colleagues' way back in the eighties of the last century as financial people were dealing with the first European

financial reporting up to the present day where RMA is becoming a field of work attracting many new colleagues.

Keywords: European Union; oral history; field of work; Framework Programmes; RMA community; European Research Area; EARMA

Prehistory: 1948–1980: The First Cornerstones for European Research: Intergovernmental Versus Community Activities

After the Second World War, the political feeling all over Europe was: 'never again'.[1] Due to the limited number of researchers in Europe at that time, a need was felt to collaborate on joint research projects. This led in the 1950s to the establishment of the Council of Europe, which was the first debating chamber in Europe that led to other initiatives, e.g. CERN – the world-renowned European institute for nuclear physics. Next came the 1951 European Community of Coal and Steel Treaty (ECSC) which encouraged technical and scientific research in the iron and steel industry. The 1957 Euratom Treaty established the Joint Research Centre (JRC), with the cost-sharing contract research programme and procedures for the coordination of national research projects. The 1957 European Economic Community Treaty[2] (EEC) made provision for research intended to boost agricultural productivity and provided a general legal basis for action in a variety of sectors, including research and technology, for which no specific constitutional provision was originally made.

Technological Gap

Halfway into the sixties, a new debate emerged on European level what came known as the Technological Gap. It was noted with alarm that developments in the USA were not only quantitatively greater, but of a different kind. While Europe was still busy with post-war reconstruction activities, in the USA technology was revolutionising industry and society. This development was recognised in the different national governments who developed their own strategies. The inescapable conclusion – for Europe to meet the American challenge the countries must come together, creating a whole greater than the sum of parts.

In view of this, Mr Christopher Layton Chef de Cabinet of Commissioner Altiero Spinelli proposed some lines of development for a European Technology Community (Layton, 1969). His opinion was that it was essential for Europe to continue in areas where it had a pre-eminent position in the world (e.g. CERN). So the ideas for the Concorde and Airbus and the Channel Tunnel are to be placed in this line of thought, in the form of intergovernmental co-operation.

COST: Coopération Européenne dans la Domaine de la Recherche Scientifique et Technique

---

[1]https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Never_again#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20United-ed%20Nations,was%20adopted%20the%20same%20year
[2]European Economic Community: Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

In 1967, the Council of Ministers of the European Communities instructed a working party on scientific and technological policy, to examine the possibilities for European technological cooperation in seven principal sectors. Detailed proposals appeared in the 'Aigrain report' (1969). This document was sent to several non-member countries,[3] including the UK, along with an invitation to participate. Following discussions in a committee of senior national officials drawn from 19 interested countries (the COST committee) agreements initiating seven so-called COST research projects were signed by the Ministers responsible for science in 1971 (Aked & Gummett, 1976).

So far, the member states were reluctant to agree on community influence on R&D beyond JRCs, protecting their national interests. The Commissioners Spinelli (1970–1976), Dahrendorf 1973–1974, and Davignon (1977–1985) keep working towards R&D coordination and cooperation. The successful European Strategic Programme on Research in Information Technology (ESPRIT) pilot opened the eyes of the member states and they became more aware of the role of R&D and added value of cooperation. In 1973, United Kingdom, Denmark and Ireland joined the EEC.

In 1970, Altiero Spinelli became commissioner for Industry Policy in DG III. The discussion of intergovernmental versus centralised policy at community level continued. Spinelli was a convinced federalist and worked towards community programs. A R&D task force was formed to set up a multi-annual research programme. This plan was not to replace the national R&D policies of the member states but to provide a framework for whenever the situation required greater efforts than the individual member states could make. This proposal was partly accepted in 1973 in the sense that the European Research and Development Committee was created.

Ralf Dahrendorf became commissioner for research, science education and JRC under Directorate General (DG XII). Dahrendorf, realising that about 90% of research was done by the member states, R&D should focus on two major objectives: improving quality of life and regenerating European industry. He emphasised the importance of creating infrastructure for handling and distributing information and the collection and processing of data.

At The **Paris Summit,** 1972, the council adopted four resolutions in the field of S&T:

I   The coordination of national policies and the definition of projects of community interest. Establishment of CREST: The Scientific and Technical Research Committee.

II   Establishment of European Science Foundation (ESF) to oversee the development of fundamental scientific research. ESF became a Foundation not a community institution.

III   Confirmed the necessity for the community to have its own S&T policy, working together with CREST.[4]

IV   Setting up a specific venture to establish a permanent forum for technological forecasting and evaluations.

---

[3]Sweden, Switzerland, Austria, Spain and Portugal.
[4]CREST: comité de la recherche scientifique et technique / Scientific and Technical Research Committee.

The oil crisis of 1972 and the Arab-Israeli war in October 1973 had a huge impact where countries made huge cuts in their R&D budgets. On the EU level initiatives came to a standstill. The publication of the first report to the Club of Rome: 'Limits to Growth' 1972 (Meadows et al., 2018) influenced the thinking of economic models. This interweaving of economic crises and reflections on ultimate aims of technological developments raised questions about the type of research needed to be responsive to the needs of ordinary people instead of (expensive) 'big' science (space, risks, nuclear power, reactor, radiation). It was clear that the community alone could not cope with such enormous problems: the financial means were not available.

In 1976, the commission presented the first Action Plan for the Information Technology sector[5] (1979–1983). Etienne Davignon was commissioner for Internal Market and Industrial affairs (1977–1981) and in 1980 he invited the senior executives from 10 companies to discuss the future of information technologies (IT) in Europe. They recognised the weak position of the European IT sector. In August 1982, the commission presented the council the proposal for the pilot phase of the ESPRIT programme.[6]

The response to the invitation to tender resulted in 145 proposals involving 600 companies and research organisations. In 1985, the Review Board concluded that the cooperation between companies, universities and research bodies was very profitable and there were the first signs of a willingness to pursue joint R&D even outside ESPRIT. Among other comments and recommendations, there were also criticisms, mainly about the lack of Research Management and Administration (RMA): time to contracts, payments, paperwork and inefficient information flows.

Development of RMA Through Technology Transfer

Up to the eighties of the last century, one could not speak of RMA as we know it today. Most universities and research organisations in Europe were funded by their respective governments of authorities based on their own research agendas. Research administrational support was mainly in the financial domain. The volume of external funding of research was minimal. In Europe, the general notion was that academia, along the lines of its independent nature and traditional role, should remain separated from the commercial sphere. The USA Bayh-Dole Act[7] of 1980 is a federal law that enables universities, nonprofit research institutions and small businesses to own, patent and commercialise inventions developed under federally funded research programs within their organisations. This act has inspired the development and implementation of similar Technology Transfer policies across the industrialised world, including Europe. Member states adjusted the Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in their laws and developed mechanisms to support Universities and Public Research Organisations in this area: the Technology Transfer Office was born, and indirectly also to an international community of practitioners. From many of these technology transfer officers Research Managers and Administrators will develop in the coming 30 years.[8]

---

[5]COM(79) 650 final.
[6]OJ L 67/54 March 9, 1984.
[7]Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act USA.
[8]Jan Andersen presented, at the NUAS Conference in Trondheim in 1999, an unpublished survey on the origins of RMA offices, and beyond the TTO also sections in the finance departments (due to the increase in external funding of research), International Offices (due to increase in student mobility and need for European Networks) and Rectors Offices initiatives (seeking policy insight) contributed to the establishing of RMA support offices.

1984–1987: The First Framework Programme: Founding Years for RMA in Europe

At the beginning of the eighties, community research affairs were greatly disordered, despite resolutions in the seventies; there was no community policy in S&T, governments were on the whole opposed to any extension of community activities in the area and every single programme had to be unanimously approved by the council. These programmes were developed, financed and managed by the individual Directorates General of the community and there were absolutely no links between them.

Etienne Davignon, European Commissioner for Industrial Affairs and Energy (1977–1981), working together with Director General Paolo Fasella rationalised former initiatives by putting them together in a single coherent framework for Research and Development, which served as a basis for a real research policy.

In its resolution of 25 July 1983,[9] the council approved the principle of Framework Programmes (FPs) for periods of four years and defined the scientific and technical objectives and selection criteria for the period 1984–1987 with a budget of 3.3 billion ECU.[10,11] The FP was to become not only a programming tool but also a financial one. It aimed at:

- Bringing together national policies and avoiding duplication and dissipation of efforts.
- Defining the common priorities.
- Defining the criteria for selecting joint actions and initiatives: the Reisenhuber criteria.[12]

The first FP – from a financial point of view – can be considered as a dress rehearsal. Under the existing laws, it was not possible to approve the allocation of finance to research in general, so the total budget of FP1 corresponded to the sum of all the separate budgets for the programmes in the different DGs. (Including the different contractual stipulations around IPR, delivering results and financial funding and reimbursements.)

The increased interest of the community for industrial innovation also led to the setting up in 1984 of IRDAC (Industrial Research and Development Advisory Committee), consisting of 16 independent experts chosen by the commission for their ability and experience in the field of industrial R&D. CREST was composed of national representatives with the task of coordinating national and community research with independent experts advising the commission on scientific and technological research.

1987–1991: Second Framework Programme Budget 5.4 Billion 12 EU Member States

The preparation of FP2 began in September 1985. The commission clarified the objectives of the FP, introducing the concept of **subsidiarity**.

---

[9]OJ C 208 1983: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv: OJ.C_.1983. 208.01.0001.01.ENG.
[10]ECU European Currency Unit: predecessor of the Euro.
[11]For the 10 EC member states.
[12]Named after the German Research Minister.

The structure of FP2 was to resemble that of FP1 with thematic objectives and transversal actions. There would be a special focus on access and support to research infrastructure, research worker mobility, support for actors in the innovation process, including small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) and the involvement of non-community European countries in the programme.

The additional criterion of establishing greater cohesion in the community regarding research was added to the list of FP1 criteria for the selection of specific programmes.[13]

The resolution establishing FP2 was adopted in September 1987 by the council under the procedures established by the Single European Act (SEA).[14] The structure was seven selected topics: quality of life (health and environment), information and communication technologies (ICTs) and services (including transport), modernisation of industrial sectors, biological resources, energy, science and technology (S&T) for development, and marine resources.

An eighth priority gathered the horizontal actions for human resources, infrastructure, forecast, and dissemination of results. The programme SCIENCE was introduced for human resources and individual fellowships. About 30 specific programmes were adopted to implement FP2, still in a successive and unsynchronised way throughout the duration of FP2.

Maastricht Treaty Makes European Research a Fully-Fledged Financial Tool and Turning Point for RMA

The Treaty on European Union (EU), commonly known as the Maastricht Treaty, is the foundation treaty of the EU. Concluded in 1992 it announced chiefly in provisions for a shared European citizenship, for the eventual introduction of a single currency, and for common foreign and security policies. Research is now also considered deemed necessary 'by virtue of other chapters of the Treaty',[15] opening up for the social sciences and humanities.

1990–1994: The Third Framework Programme

Fillipo Pandolfi became Commissioner of Science, Research and Technology, Telecommunications, Information and Innovations Industries, DG XII+XIII (1989–1993). While the specific programs of FP2 were still being adopted, the preparation of FP3 started, based on the idea of maintaining a rolling mechanism where successive FPs would overlap.

The commission proposal for FP3 included only five thematic areas and a transversal priority on human capital and mobility, with a budget of ECU 7.7 billion. For the first time, all these specific programs were to end at the same time in December 1994, marking a first step in synchronising the FP and its specific programmes. While completion of the single market was still a major aspect in the development of the FP,

---

[13]The introduction of this criterion marked the beginning of the tension between the idea of an FP based on scientific excellence without geographical considerations and that of an FP that should support scientific capacity throughout the union.

[14]Single European Act: was the first major revision of the 1957 Treaty of Rome. The Act set the European Community an objective of establishing a single market by 31 December 1992.

[15]OJ C 191/1 1992: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=OJ%3AC%3A19 92%3A191%3ATOC.

others were added, such as introducing a European dimension to research training, boosting economic and social cohesion, and including aspects regarding environmental protection and quality of life. FP3 introduced the idea of multidisciplinarity and the concept of addressing technological challenges.

FP3 marked clear tensions between the member states in the council and the commission and Parliament, especially regarding the budget. These tensions originated partially from two different views on the part of the member states: either the FP was seen as a source separate from national research budgets (additionality position) or as an extension of these budgets (attribution position).

The First Signs of RMA

At the beginning of the nineties, one can see a change in research support: technology transfer starts to develop into a separate specialised area with clear objectives in the field of patents, licences, business development, etc. A second type of research support is becoming clearer and more visible: RMA. In this period, the technology transfer office often was a mix joined with RMA with the legal support in between. For a long time, the unit's name under which to search on the university website was still Technology Transfer Office (TTO).

Also, the first national informal peer consultation groups started to come into existence to discuss the many issues concerning the new FPs. For example, OTRA-NL[16] established in 1985 was a national informal platform where heads of TTO meet to discuss and share knowledge concerning Technology Transfer issues. At the same time, the first European frameworks were launched and EU technicalities soon became the dominant subject. OTRA ceased to exist around 1990 and only in 2006 the EUPMAN[17] list came into existence; EU-ERFA DK, an Danish informal network on sharing EU-research insights and experience. EU-ERFA was run by volunteers and was later facilitated by the Ministry. EU-ERFA still exists.

The commission supported the establishment of networks of stakeholders to promote programmes and EU policies, and where they could get input 'bottom up' without it being filtered through the national ministries. Typically, a network could apply for seed money set aside in the programmes for networking, information and dissemination activities.[18]

In the UK universities, the position of research in the governance structure has long been different. Pro Vice Chancellor's would often have created a Research Office. Individuals in these new offices organised themselves in the association now known as the Association of Research Managers and Administrators (ARMA) in 1991.

The first three FPs financed thousands of projects, and these had to be project managed. The first project managers started to develop European collegial contacts and exchange of knowledge and practical information.

---

[16]Overleg TRAnsferpunten: national consultation Transferpoints in Netherlands.
[17]Dutch-email list among Dutch people working in RMA.
[18]This is not well documented, but e.g. EARMA and ASTP joined forces to apply for a network for Technology Transfer in smaller and medium-sized enterprises and this network has evolved into Technology Innovation International (TII – https://www.tii.org/en).

1994–1998: Fourth Framework Programme

The first ideas for FP4 were presented in 1993 by Antonio Ruberti[19] Commissioner responsible for science, research, technological development and education (1993–1994). The novelty was the introduction of **targeted socio-economic research**. The budget of ECU 11.7 billion was adopted in March 1996, slightly more than the formal proposal from the commission.

In the meantime, the commission had to tackle four practical implementation issues that were identified by researchers and research managers from the previous FPs. Firstly, the issue of promoting the FP to potential users to participate; secondly, to clarify the rules and regulations of the programme; thirdly, the creation of the VALUE relay centres network for SMEs. And finally, the excessive burden of paperwork and lack of information on the criteria used for selecting projects.

Several actions were undertaken: The commission established a community-wide network of information centres (Euro-Info Centres), distributed an information bulletin (RTD-INFO) and created a database CORDIS.[20] To encourage SMEs to participate the VALUE relay centres were established.

To tackle the excessive burden of paperwork, a start was made to standardise the procedures by computerising them, starting with a series of optical reading forms.

Reviewing and selecting projects was to be carried out by independent experts (on a rotating basis) and providing the additional guarantee that research projects would be assessed purely on the basis of scientific and technological excellence.

RMA Community Is Growing and the First Formal RMA Organisations Come into Existence

Until now the different member states often had a rather laid-back attitude concerning European S&T and would send minor civil servants as representatives. However, member states began to realise that the FPs have a big impact on National Science and Innovation policies. Some countries used it as an excuse to cut the national budgets for research and innovation. For the member states, it became necessary to be involved in the agenda setting of the European S&T policy. Next to the diplomatic representations in Brussel, member states created additional information offices in Brussels mainly for policy information gathering, often with additional remits for science, innovation and education.

During this period, EARMA was founded (1995) in Genoa, Italy, following the Conference of Administrators of Research in Europe (CAdRE, Edinburgh, 4–5 July 1994). It was attended by 40 people from 10 countries. The CAdRE database contained at that moment 444 entrants from 24 countries, 185 of whom have expressed interest in the Association. 111 of the entrants on the database were known to have email connectivity and 100 of these are members of the email distribution lists.[21] The initiative was taken by two financial directors of respectively the Institute for the Physics of Matter (INFM) Italy and the Institut Laue-Langevin (ILL), France. They encountered many

---

[19]Ruberti launched a number of important initiatives including the Socrates and Leonardo da Vinci programmes, the European Week of Scientific Culture and the European Science and Technology Forum.
[20]https://cordis.europa.eu/ : Community Research and Development Information Service (1994).
[21]Minutes of the founding meeting, EARMA.

problems in the management and administration of complex (and mainly) European collaborative projects. There was no expert knowledge in that field in their own countries. In 1996, the first EARMA conference took place in Vienna.

At the same time, Sean McCarthy[22] entered the European stage, with his famous workshops in Brussels (since 1995) and his in-house workshops at universities. Coming from a scientific and SME background, the strength of his courses was that he for the first time clearly illustrated the reasoning of the EU (politicians and civil servants) behind the development of the FPs. He combined this with an excellent sense of humour presented in a charming Irish accent. These courses were mostly attended by support staff of research organisations. Researchers could attend, but often these courses were too political and bureaucratic for them. Sean has, with his courses, trained and educated whole generations of RMAs in Europe.

Rules for Participation and the Unified Consortium Agreement

In 1996, DG Research commenced the procedure to design FP5. One of the issues to be dealt with was setting up and agreeing the Rules for Participation (RfP) in a joint working group of IRDAC-ESTA. Alongside 19 heads of legal affairs from IRDAC, there were 5 RMA legal experts from Academia involved from Transferpunt University of Amsterdam; Transferpunt Technical University Delft; KTH Royal Institute of Technology; Chalmers University of Technology and University of Newcastle. They were invited by Robert Jan Smits, then the right hand man of the vice president of DG XII.

As the RfP forms the basis of any FP, the strategic importance to be involved in the discussions to agree on these is very high. The RfP also forms the basis for the Grant Agreement and the Consortium Agreement (CA).

Up to then, industrial interests were perceived to be over-represented in the articles of the FP Grant agreements in the definition of ownership of research results (Intellectual Property) and the use of such results. They also had the tendency to regard the contribution of academic research as the supplier of results instead of a fully entitled partner with its own interests. During the discussions, it came down to new and more balanced definitions and words for 'commercialisation', 'valorisation' and 'use'.

The Rules for Participation for the 5FP reflect the interests of academia for the first time.

For RMA, this was a major paradigm shift. The five academic representatives needed consultation and feedback from their constituents, so they set up in their respective countries a consultation and feedback constructions according to the then available networks in the respective countries. In the Netherlands, this resulted in a national RMA Liaison platform hosted by VSNU[23] and thereby creating a direct link to the top management of the university. A similar development happened in the Nordic countries. In Denmark, the RMA society pushed for transparent processes, leading to a formalised structure, with a stakeholder network around the national representatives.

A spin-off activity from the RfP group was the creation of the first Unified Consortium Agreement (UCA). After contributing to the RfP, the academic legals went

---

[22]Hyperion, Ireland.
[23]Universities of the Netherlands.

on to create the European UNITE group: a smaller group of university EU-legal experts (around 6), who set themselves the task to create a UCA in order to secure the academy interests realised in the RfP. Signing a consortium agreement (CA) in those days was advised by the commission but was not mandatory. There were several CA versions in circulation, mostly on the initiative of and often favouring the interests of the industry. The UNITE group created a CA in which the interests of research and researchers were firmly secured. By campaigning through various informal RMA networks of colleagues throughout Europe (including EARMA), Universities started to use this UCA and refused to sign others. The UNITE group became the Development of a Simplified Consortium Agreement group, and these agreements are still in place today (DESCA, 2022).

1998–2002: Fifth Framework Programme: A Shift Towards the Needs of the Community and Its Citizens

The preparation of FP5 was guided by the idea of extending the scope of community research policy and its main instrument, the FP, to put it at the service of society. The commission noted that community research had so far been based largely on technical achievement and that 'the aim now is to make research more efficient and increasingly directed towards meeting basic social and economic needs'. Research in the field of Social Sciences – mainly economics – was strengthened.

It reaffirmed the principle of excellence and the need to improve cooperation and to 'create a real European scientific area and single market'.

The decision establishing FP5 was adopted in December 1998 together with the rules on participation and dissemination. FP5 was the last FP adopted under the unanimity rule in the council. The Treaty of Amsterdam, which entered into force on 1 May 1999, modified the procedure for adopting the FP, requiring only a qualified majority of the council.

Individual Fellowships

One of the specialisations within the RMA area is colleagues who specifically support individual researchers in obtaining individual fellowships/grants on both PhD and postdoctoral level.

From the very start of the European Research and the FPs, there always has been a facility to stimulate individual researchers at postdoctorate level. In due time, this developed through 'SCIENCE'; Human Capital and Mobility (HCM), Training and Mobility of Researchers (TMR), Human Potential (HP), Human Researches and Mobility (HRM) to the Marie Skłodowska Curie Program in FP7. Successively the programme developed from only individual postdoctoral fellowships, to an elaborate programme with individual Fellowship for postdoctorates, training networks for PhD degrees, individual PhD/Postdoctoral fellowships for international positions, and so on.

The rules and regulations to finance and manage these fellowships evolved as well, however soon all kinds of practical problems came to light which hindered the objectives of the programs. In 1996, a commission green paper was published

'The obstacles to transnational mobility in Education – Training – Research'.[24] It described in total 10 areas where obstacles were defined and 9 lines of actions. These became to be known as 'Mobstacles'.

In order to find solutions to these Mobstacles, a so-called high-level working group was created under the chairmanship of Rafaello Liberali one of the unit directors within DG XII. Many European colleagues were involved in this, not only RMAs but also individuals from human resources departments, legal professionals and specialists in taxations representing public and private research organisations.

Many of the described obstacles could be summarised to the status of the fellow (depending on the type of fellowship): if they were considered officially as 'student' then certain national and European rules could be applied. However, if they were considered as 'worker' or 'bursary' then another set of national and European rules applied and they were not always applicable in the case of scientific research. Or no rules existed.

Another issue was the EU financing of the fellowships: the amount of money was not enough to cover the costs of a postdoctoral salary and about enough if they were a student with a bursary. Most members of this high-level expert group advocated that the post-doctoral fellow should be considered to be an employee. Eventually, this resulted in a financing method of fixed calculations of the salary costs with a country-specific coefficient in the FPs.

One other result of this expert group was the setup of EURAXESS[25] and eventually Human Resources Strategy for Researchers (HRS4R).

RMA at the Beginning of the 21st Century

Up until this period, more and more colleagues started working in RMA and felt the need to exchange information among each other, but there was still no appetite to make formal national associations: no commitment from their management, no time to contribute as volunteers, too complicated processes and nobody aspired to board-member type of function. Often the solution was found in setting up informal national or regional e-mail distribution lists. But a fire had been sparked, and besides looking towards what the ARMA did in the UK, there was an increasing interest in what was going on in the US in NCURA and SRAi. New ideas and suggestions on how to organise professional development and networking were shared and inspiring the come-into-existence of RMA associations more widely.

At the beginning of the 21st century, the profession of RMA is now well embedded. In the Northwestern part of the EU, RMA colleagues are becoming more and more organised through EARMA membership but apart from in the UK there are no formal national RMA associations. Differentiation in RMA jobs is progressing: the distinction between pre-award (grant writing and project development) and post-award (project management, and finance) is established; there are positions for more policy-oriented activities (developing internal European research strategies; lobby activities at home and Brussels). There are information systems and training courses in place

---

[24]Green Paper: Education - Training – Research The obstacles to transnational mobility; COM(96) 462 final.
[25]https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/

and internal statistics concerning research performance is becoming more important for senior managers.

In the Southern European countries, more RMA colleagues become engaged with European research and are identifiable through their universities' websites. Due to university-cultural differences, the process of professionalisation is slower. Organising RMA colleagues in informal networks is often more regional than national and no formal associations exist yet. Career advancement is more in its infancy.

With the expansion of the EU, colleagues from the Middle and Eastern European Countries start to join the ranks of RMAs. Since the end of the cold war, the communist states began their transition to free market democracies, aligning to Euro-Atlantic-integration. The question of enlargement into the continent was thrust onto the EU R&D agenda. During FP3 and FP4 special fellowship programmes promoting pan European collaboration were set up (e.g. PECO fellowships). The former Central European Candidate Countries (all of them now regular EU member states[26]) were associated with the fifth European Framework Programme for research and technological development. There the field of RMA is completely new, with many universities and research institutes still culturally and organisationally communist in nature.

FP6 2002–2006: *Implementing the European Research Area*

Commissioner Philippe Busquin (1999–2004) successfully launched the concept of the European Research Area (ERA). The objective was to address the fragmentation, isolation and compartmentalisation of national research systems and the lack of coordination in the manner in which national and European research policies were implemented.

New instruments were introduced to realise the ERA: Networks of national research programs (ERA-NET), Networks of Excellence (NoE) and the Large-scale Integrated Projects (IP).

In addition, there was support for the innovation process and SMEs. The budget for research infrastructures and human resources, especially mobility, increased. Finally there was greater focus on interactions between science, society, and citizens. Last but not least, Social Sciences and Humanities research was introduced as a specific area.

This was also the programme which welcomed 10 new member states in 2004 from Middle and Eastern Europe. FP6 would be the last FP with a four-year budget and the beta version of the online Participation Portal was tested, starting the move from paper-based information to electronic.

For RMAs however, FP6 will perhaps mostly be remembered for the novel use of audit certificates by the member states and the possibility for universities to go 'full costs'. The mantra for designing FP6 was 'simplification' of administration.

The delegation of management to coordinators in the large Integrated Projects and the novel use of audit certificates to be provided by member states, whereby the auditors acted as substitutes for the activity of the commission's own financial services, were in principle seen as positive steps.

But the use of non-standard auditing criteria and failures to impose auditing requirements which are proportionately continued to leave participants exasperated. Many European university financial departments organised crash-courses on budgeting EU proposals, especially on human resources and imposing the use of time recording sheets.

---

[26]A.k.a. EU 13.

RMA: The Next Steps

It can be said that during FP6, and its successor FP7, the profession became more mature: marked by the emergence of more national RMA associations. During the EARMA Leiden Conference in 2015, a first meeting took place with RMA colleagues describing the current state of RMA development in their respective countries. There was a great variety in the degree of organisation from e-mail distribution lists, informal regional networks and one or two formal associations. In terms of associations, there was ARMA in the UK (Kerridge, 2023b, Chapter 5.40), the Polish Research Council had created KRAB in 2007 (Krasiński & Tomasik, 2023, Chapter 5.23), the Danish had established DARMA in 2008 (see Westensee et al., 2023, Chapter 5.28), and this was soon to be followed by others such as Finn-ARMA in Finland in 2012 (Backman et al., 2023, Chapter 5.29); ICEARMA in Iceland in 2012 (Kristjánsdóttir et al., 2023, Chapter 5.32); NARMA in Norway in 2013 (Silva & Nedberg, 2023, Chapter 5.36); FORTRAMA in Germany in 2018 (Winkler et al., 2023, Chapter 5.31); ARMA-NL in the Netherlands in 2018 (Groeninx van Zoelen & Kanters, 2023, Chapter 5.35); more recently PIC in Portugal (Barbosa et al., 2023, Chapter 5.37); and CZARMA in Czechia (Sip, 2023, Chapter 5.22).

A common issue was the lack of recognition of the profession and the need for formal education and clear career paths. Through the many annual EARMA conferences, expert knowledge and best practices were shared. EARMA also started the first certified professional education for continental European research managers in 2016 (see Ritchie et al., 2023, Chapter 2.7). From the early years, EARMA has connected with colleagues from North America and around the world, and is a founding member of INORMS[27] the International Network of Research Management Societies (see Kulakowski, 2023, Chapter 1.7).

The RMA community in Europe and around the world is thriving and providing an invaluable service to help make research happen.

Epilogue

The start of the seventh Framework Programme (FP7) was a game changer in many ways: the European Research Council was introduced with the highly prestigious personal grants; many 'new' compliance issues became more important, the Participants Portal was launched. However, that is a story for another day.

References

Aigrain Report. (1969). *Scientific and technological cooperation between European Countries; Possibilities in 7 Sectors*. Doc. 7301/11/69-E, and 10.121/11/69-E Brussels.

Aked, N. H., & Gummett, P. J. (1976). Science and technology in the European communities: The history of the COST projects. *Research Policy*, *5*(3), 270–294.

Backman, J., Haverinen, S., & Bingham, E. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Finland. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 663–667). Emerald Publishing.

---

[27]https://inorms.net/

Barbosa, C., Borrego, F., Costa, T., Ferreira, A., Martins, M., Moreira, S., Santos, J., & Silva, J. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in the Portugal. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 735–744). Emerald Publishing.

DESCA. (2022). *DESCA model consortium agreement*. Retrieved October 10, 2022, from https://www.desca-agreement.eu/desca-model-consortium-agreement/

Groeninx van Zoelen, A., & Kanters, E. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in the Netherlands. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 715–721). Emerald Publishing.

Guzzetti, L. (1995). *A brief history of European Union research policy* (p. 172). Office for Official Publications of the European communities.

Kerridge, S. (2023b). The profession of research management and administration in the UK. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 759–767). Emerald Publishing.

Krasiński, Z., & Tomasik, C. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Poland. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 613–621). Emerald Publishing.

Kristjánsdóttir, G. B., Gíslason, Ú. K., & Erlingsdóttir, Á. S. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Iceland. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 687–695). Emerald Publishing.

Kulakowski, E. (2023). The establishment and history of the international network of research management societies. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara, (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 83–95). Emerald Publishing.

Layton, C. (1969). *European advanced technology: A programme for integration*. Allen and Unwin.

Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. (2018). The limits to growth. In K. Conca & G. D. Dabelko (Eds.), *Green planet blues* (pp. 25–29). Routledge.

Reillon, V. (2018). *EU framework programmes for research and innovation : Evolution and key data from FP1 to Horizon 2020 in view of FP9 : In-depth analysis*. Publications Office European Parliament, Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services. https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2861/60724

Ritchie, J., Lythgoe, E., & Donovan, J. (2023). RMA education, training and professional development in North America and Europe. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 177–186). Emerald Publishing.

Silva, N. E., & Nedberg, H. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Norway. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 723–733). Emerald Publishing.

Sip, J. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Czechia. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 603–610). Emerald Publishing.

Summit, P. (1972). Statement. *Bulletin of the European Communities*, *10*, 14–26.

Westensee, J., Vad, A., Svenningsen, O., & Andersen, J. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Denmark. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 655–662). Emerald Publishing.

Winkler, P., Krüger, J.-P., & Steinack, K. (2023). The profession of research management and administration in Germany. In S. Kerridge, S. Poli, & M. Yang-Yoshihara (Eds.), *The Emerald handbook of research management and administration around the world* (pp. 679–685). Emerald Publishing.