Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

# Survey response for Austria

## OECD database of governance of public research policy

This document contains detailed responses for Austria to the survey on governance of public research policy across the OECD. It provides additional background information to the OECD database of governance of public research policy as described in Borowiecki, M. and C. Paunov (2018), "How is research policy across the OECD organised? Insights from a new policy database", *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Policy Papers*, No. 55, OECD Publishing, Paris, https://doi.org/10.1787/235c9806-en. The data was compiled by the OECD Working Party on Innovation and Technology Policy (TIP). Data quality was validated by delegates to OECD TIP Working Party the in the period between March 2017 and May 2018. Additional references that were used to fill out the questionnaire are indicated.

The data is made freely available online for download at https://stip.oecd.org/resgov.

*Contact:*
Caroline Paunov, Senior Economist, E-mail: Caroline.Paunov@oecd.org;
Martin Borowiecki, Junior Economist, E-mail: Martin.Borowiecki@oecd.org.

# Abbreviations and acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| AQ Austria | Agentur fur Qualitätssicherung und Akkreditierung Austria<br>Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation Austria |
| AIT | Austrian Institute of Technology |
| AWS | Austria Wirtschaftsservice GmbH |
| BMVIT | Bundesministerium für Verkehr, Innovation und Technologie<br>Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology |
| BMWFW | Bundesministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Wirtschaft<br>Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economics |
| ECTS | European Credit Transfer System |
| ERA | European Research Area |
| ERC | European Research Council |
| FFG | Forschungsförderungsgesellschaft<br>Austrian Research Promotion Agency |
| FTEVAL | Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation |
| FWF | Forschungs- und Wissenschaftsfonds<br>Austrian Science Fund |
| HEIs | Higher Education Institutions |
| IST | Institute of Science and Technology Austria |
| RFTE | Rat für Forschung und Technologieentwicklung<br>Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development |
| OEAW | Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften<br>Austrian Academy of Science |
| PRIs | Public Research Institutes |
| WKÖ | Wirtschaftskammer Österreichs<br>Austrian Federal Economic Chamber |

# Survey of public research policy

## Topic 1: Institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations

**Table 1. Questions on institutions in charge of priority setting, funding and evaluations of universities and PRIs**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.1.1.** Who mainly decides on the **scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations** for a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br><br>c) Which are the main mechanisms in place to decide on **scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of national importance**, e.g. digital transition, sustainability? Please describe who is involved and who decides on the priorities (e.g., government, research and innovation councils, sector-specific platforms including industry and science, etc.).<br>*(This question does not refer to who sets overall science, technology and industry priorities. This is usually done by parliaments and government. The question refers to decisions taken after budgets to different ministries/agencies have been approved. Scientific priorities refer to scientific disciplines, e.g. biotechnology; sectoral priorities refer to industries, e.g. pharmaceuticals; and thematic priorities refer to broader social themes, e.g. digital transition, sustainability, etc.)*<br>d) From 2005-16, were any significant changes introduced as to how decisions on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic orientation of major programmes are taken (e.g. establishment of agencies that decide on content of programmes)? | a - b) In Austria, the Federal Ministry for Transport, Innovation and Technology (BMVIT) and the Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economics (BMWFW) decide on scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities of budget allocations via various funding programmes. Funding programmes are managed by funding agencies. HEIs and PRIs can apply and receive additional project-based funding for research and innovation within the specific priorities and scopes of these programmes. Basis for all policy decisions regarding HEIs and PRIs is the RTI-strategy 2020 of the Austrian government from 2011.<br><br>c –d) Missing answer. |
| **Q.1.2.** Who allocates **institutional block funding** to a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br>*(Institutional block funds (or to general university funds) support institutions and are usually transferred directly from the government budget.)*<br><br>Who allocates **project-based funding** of research and/or innovation for c) HEIs and d) PRIs?<br>*(Project-based funding provides support for research and innovation activities on the basis of competitive bids.)*<br><br>e) Is there a transnational body that provides funding to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. the European Research Council)? What is the importance of such funding relative to national funding support?<br><br>f) From 2005-16, were any changes made to way programmes are developed and funding is allocated to HEIs and PRIs (e.g. merger of agencies, devolution of programme management from ministries to agencies)? | a) In Austria, the BMWFW allocates institutional funding to HEIs.<br>b) The BMVIT, together with the BMVIT, is also responsible for budget allocations to several PRIs.<br>c - d) Funds for research and/or innovation projects, i.e. open calls are allocated by national agencies. The national funding agencies (the Austrian Research Promotion Agency, FWF, and the Austrian Science Fund, FWF, CDG-Christian Doppler Research Association) together with the ministries (BMWFW, BMVIT) develop programmes supporting research and innovation at HEIs and PRIs and allocate budgets to them (which they receive from the ministries) in a competitive way.<br>e) HEIs and PRIs are eligible for additional funding from the European Commission and the European Research Council (ERC). The European Commission is responsible for the Funding schemes of Horizon 2020. In the period 2014/15, Austrian universities received 335 Mio. EUR from European funds which corresponds to approximately 6% of their budget (around 5 400 Mio for the period 2014-15).<br>f) In 2006, the Institute of Science and Technology Austria (IST Austria) was founded. IST Austria is a public research institute dedicated to basic research and graduate education in the natural and mathematical sciences. IST has a unique position in the Austrian funding system as it receives institutional funding BMWFW and federal performance based funding. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.1.3.** Do **performance contracts** determine funding of a) HEIs?<br>*Institutional block funds can be partly or wholly distributed based on performance. (Performance contracts define goals agreed between ministry/agency and HEIs/PRIs and link it to future block funding of HEIs and PRIs.)*<br><br>b) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract?<br><br>c) Do performance contracts include quantitative indicators for monitoring and evaluation?<br><br>d) What are the main indicators used in performance contracts? Which, if any, performance aside from research and education is set out in performance contracts?<br><br>e) Do HEIs participate in the formulation of main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts?<br><br>f) Do the same priorities and criteria set in performance contracts apply to all HEIs?<br><br>g) Are any other mechanisms in place to allocate funding to HEIs and PRIs?<br><br>h) From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs?<br>*(In case performance contracts are in place that bind funding of PRIs, please provide information about them.)* | a) Funding of HEIs and PRIs is subject to performance agreements (performance contracts) between BMWFW and institutions.<br><br>b) 94-96% of institutional funds is allocated based on the performance contracts<br><br>c) The performance contracts do not include quantitative indicators. See annex for further information.<br><br>d) See annex for further information.<br><br>e) Yes.<br><br>f) No, the performance contracts are made between the Ministry and each institution.<br><br>g) Missing answer.<br><br>h) Performance contracts between HEIs and BMWFW were introduced in 2007 and reformed in 2011 (introduction of Higher Education Area Structural Funds); Performance contract with the Austrian Academy of Science (OEAW) since 2012; Performance agreement with the Institute of Science and Technology Austria since 2015. See annex for further information |

*References:*
De Boer, H., Jongbloed, B., Benneworth, P., Cremonini, L., Kolster, R., Kottmann, A., Lemmens-Krug, K., and Vossensteyn, H. (2015), "Performance-based Funding and Performance Agreements in Fourteen Higher Education Systems: Report for the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science", Center for Higher Education Policy Studies CHEPS, No. C15HdB014l, pp. 42-45, Enschede, CHEPS, http://doc.utwente.nl/93619/7/jongbloed%20ea%20performance-based-funding-and-performance-agreements-in-fourteen-higher-education-systems.pdf (accessed 05 October 2016).
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Denmark. Response C4 and B12.
Österreichischer Wissenschaftsrat (203), Analyse der Leistungsvereinbarungen 2013–2015und Stellungnahme, p. 35, Available at: http://www.wissenschaftsrat.ac.at/news/LV_2013_2015_Endversion.pdf (Accessed 07 November 2016).
Unger, M., L. Dünser, B. Thaler, and A. Laimer (2011), "Evaluierung des formelgebundenen Budgets der Universitäten" (German), p. 134, Available at: http://www.equi.at/dateien/Endbericht_Formelbudget.pdf (Accessed 08 November 2016).

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.1.4.** Who decides on the following key **evaluation** criteria of HEIs and PRIs?<br><br>Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of a) HEIs? Who is responsible for b) evaluating and c) monitoring HEIs' performance?<br><br>Who is responsible for setting criteria to use when evaluating performance of d) PRIs? Who is responsible for e) evaluating and f) monitoring PRIs' performance?<br><br>g) From 2005-16, was any institution created for evaluating HEIs and PRIs or were any changes made to criteria applied for evaluations of HEIs and PRIs? | a and d) The BMWFW sets criteria to use when evaluating performance of HEIs and PRIs. The BMWFW is responsible for quality assurance within the higher education system, including public universities, private universities, and (universities of applied sciences).<br>In terms of evaluation of HEIs. The BMWFW defines performance criteria to be used for performance contracts in the National Development Plan for Higher Education (see also response 1.3).<br>Moreover, the platform FTEVAL provides evaluation standards for evaluators, institutions commissioning evaluations, funding institutions as well as those to be evaluated. In 2012, new evaluation standards were drawn up in a joint interactive process involving stakeholders from government and funding agencies (OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on trends, impact and institutionalisation of evaluation practices).<br>b and e) An independent national agency conducts evaluations. The independent Agency for Quality Assurance and Accreditation Austria (AQ Austria) conducts the evaluations while the Ministry monitors the performance of HEIs as set out in performance contracts. AQ Austria was established in 2012. Its board comprises national and international experts from academia, quality assurance, as well as student representatives (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses B12, C4, C6, C11, F3, and H4).<br>c and f)The BMWFW monitors performance of HEIs. The BMWF monitors performance of institutions using instruments such as reporting systems, performance indicators as set out in performance agreements and development plans.<br>g) Establishment of AQ Austria in 2012. |
| *References:*<br>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Responses B12, C4, C6, C11, F3, and H4.<br>OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on trends, impact and institutionalisation of evaluation practices. | |
| **Q.1.5.** Which **recent reforms** to institutions that are in charge of priority setting, budget allocations, and evaluations of HEIs and PRIs were particularly important? | The University Act (2002) granted full autonomy to universities with regard to financial, organisational and personal affairs. The funding model was also completely changed, bringing in elements of performance based funding. Since then, the funding model has been altered several times.<br>Recent reforms that were relevant include the expansion of the Higher Educations Area Structural funds by two thirds for the performance agreement period of 2016-2018 (as compared to 2013-2015). The increase is meant for universities so that they can meet the following new targets of the national universities development plan:<br>– Improvement in the quality of teaching (e. g. the implementation of new curricula for teachers' training);<br>– Improvement in performance figures of teaching (e. g. the increase in students actively taking examinations);<br>– Promotion of young researches (e. g. number of doctoral or postgraduate schools).<br>– Moreover, performance agreements were introduced between PRIs and BMWFW in 2012 (with the Austrian Academy of Science) and 2015 (with the Institute of Science and Technology Austria). |
| *References:*<br>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Response H4.<br>OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on major evaluation exercises. | |

.

## Topic 2: Policy co-ordination mechanisms

**Table 2. Questions on research and innovation councils**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.2.1.** a) Is there a **Research and Innovation Council**, i.e. non-temporary public body that takes decisions concerning HEI and PRI policy, and that has explicit mandates by law or in its statutes to either?<br>– provide policy advice (i.e. produce reports);<br>– and/or oversee policy evaluation;<br>– and/or coordinate policy areas relevant to public research (e.g. across ministries and agencies);<br>– and/or set policy priorities (i.e. strategy development, policy guidelines);<br>– and/or joint policy planning (e.g. joint cross-ministry preparation of budgetary allocations)?<br><br>b) What is the name of the main research and/or innovation Council/Committee? Are there any other research Councils/Committees?<br><br>c) Are there any other research Councils/Committees? | a) The Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development (Rat für Forschung, und Technologieentwicklung, RFTE) is the main research and innovation council in Austria; it gives recommendations to the Austrian Government, e.g. with regard to the National Foundation for Research, Technology and Development, or on policies aimed at improving the framework conditions for innovation. It is also an advisory body for HEIs and PRIs.<br><br>b) Besides the RFTE, there are two other federal-level councils (Austrian Science Board and ERA Council Forum Austria) and federal (regional) states councils. The Austrian Science Board is the main advisory body to the Federal Minister of Science, Research and Economy, parliament and universities, in all university-related matters. The ERA Council Forum Austria offers policy advice with regard to Austrian participation in the European Research Area (ERA), for priority setting at the crossroads of national and European RTI policies, and for exploiting European funds for the success of the Austrian RTI strategy. |
| *References:*<br>Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development (2016), Tasks, website, Available at: http://www.rat-fte.at/tasks.html (accessed 04 November 2016).<br>Schwaag Serger, S.,Wise, E., Anrold, E. (2015), "National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance: Characteristics & challenges", VINNOVA Analysis, VA 2015:07, pp. 38-39, Stockholm, VINNOVA, http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (accessed 30 September 2016). | |
| **Q.2.2.** With reference to Q.2.1, does the Council's **mandate** explicitly include a) policy coordination; b) preparation of strategic priorities; c) decision-making on budgetary allocations; d) evaluation of policies' implementation (including their enforcement); e) and provision of policy advice? | a – e) The Council's mandate includes policy advice and evaluation. The Council is responsible for policy advice to the Federal government and to the governments of the Federal States in the field of research, innovation and framework conditions supporting innovation. It was established in 2000 and had initially a budget allocation responsibility, effectively allocating 600 million EUR of public funds to research until 2007. Since 2008, the Council operates primarily as an advisory body. Response 2.2 changed accordingly after 2007. |
| *References:*<br>Schwaag Serger, S.,Wise, E., Anrold, E. (2015), "National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance: Characteristics & challenges", VINNOVA Analysis, VA 2015:07, pp. 38-39, Stockholm, VINNOVA, http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (accessed 30 September 2016). | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.2.3.** With reference to Q.2.1, **who formally participates** in the Council? a) Head of State, b) ministers, c) government officials (civil servants and other representatives of ministries, agencies and implementing bodies), d) funding agency representatives, e) local and regional government representatives, f) HEI representatives, g) PRI representatives, h) private sector, i) civil society, and/or j) foreign experts | a – j) Representatives from HEIs, PRIs, the government, the private sector, and foreign experts.<br>The Council consists of eight independent experts from academia, including PRIs and HEIs, foreign experts, and representatives from the business sector. Council members are appointed on an individual basisd for five years by the BMVIT (appoints four members) as well as the BMWFW (appoints four members). Members without voting rights are the Minister of Transport, Innovation and Technology, and the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Science, Research and Economy. The composition of the Council has been adjusted to include perspectives from foreign experts and the business sector on the whole chain of the innovation process (Schwag Serger et al., 2015, pp. 38-39). |
| *References:*<br>Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development (2016), Council Members, website, Available at: http://www.rat-fte.at/council-members.html (accessed 04 November 2016). | |
| **Q.2.4.** With reference to Q.2.1.b., does the Council have its own a) **staff** and/or its own b) **budget**? If so, please indicate the number of staff and the amount of annual budget available.<br><br>c) From 2005-16, were any **reforms** made to the mandate of the Council, its functions, the composition of the Council, the budget and/or the Council's secretariat? Was the Council created during the time period? | A and b) RFTE has its own staff of eight and its own budget. Background information. The RFTE is supported by a secretariat consisting of nine people. The Secretariat used to belong to the BMVIT but since 2004 it is an independent entity which receives its annual budget from the Ministry. The budget covers the salaries of the staff of the Secretariat, as well as providing funding for commissioning reports and analysis (Schwag Serger et al., 2015, p. 38-39).<br><br>c) The Strategic Research Council was reformed in 2007. Since 2008, the Council operates primarily as an advisory body. Between its establishment in 2000 and the year 2007, it decided on budget allocations to research. The Secretariat used to belong to the BMVIT but since 2004 it is an independent entity which receives its annual budget from the Ministry. |
| *References:*<br>Schwaag Serger, S.,Wise, E., Anrold, E. (2015), "National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance: Characteristics & challenges", VINNOVA Analysis, VA 2015:07, pp. 38-39, Stockholm, VINNOVA, http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/National-Research-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (accessed 30 September 2016).<br>Schwaag Serger, S.,Wise, E., Anrold, E. (2015), "National Research and Innovation Councils as an Instrument of Innovation Governance: Characteristics & challenges", VINNOVA Analysis, VA 2015:07, pp. 38-39, Stockholm, VINNOVA, http://www.vinnova.se/en/Publications-and-events/Publications/Products/NationalResearch-and-Innovation-Counsils-as-an-Instrument-of-Innovation-Governance/ (accessed 30 September 2016). | |

**Table 3. Questions on national STI strategies**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.2.5.** a) Is there a national non-sectoral **STI strategy** or plan?<br><br>b) What is the name of the main national STI strategy or plan? | The Austrian National STI Strategy is the main STI strategy in Austria. It was passed in 2011 by the government (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2, B1 and F3). |
| **Q.2.6.** Does the national STI strategy or plan address any of the following priorities?<br><br>a) Specific themes and/or **societal challenges** (e.g. Industry 4.0; "green innovation"; health; environment; demographic change and wellbeing; efficient energy; climate action) - Which of the following themes and/or societal challenges are addressed?<br>– Demographic change (i.e. ageing populations, etc.)<br>– Digital economy (e.g. big data, digitalisation, industry 4.0)<br>– Green economy (e.g. natural reReferences, energy, environment, climate change)<br>– Health (e.g. Bioeconomy, life science)<br>– Mobility (e.g. transport, smart integrated transport systems, e-mobility)<br>– Smart cities (e.g. sustainable urban systems urban development)<br><br>b) Specific **scientific disciplines** and **technologies** (e.g. ICT; nanotechnologies; biotechnology) - Which of the following scientific research, technologies and economic fields are addressed?<br>– Agriculture and agricultural technologies<br>– Energy and energy technologies (e.g. energy storage, environmental technologies)<br>– Health and life sciences (e.g. biotechnology, medical technologies)<br>– ICT (e.g. artificial intelligence, digital platforms, data privacy)<br>– Nanotechnology and advanced manufacturing (e.g. robotics, autonomous systems)<br><br>c) Specific **regions** (e.g. smart specialisation strategies)<br><br>d) **Supranational** or transnational objectives set by transnational institutions (for instance related to European Horizon 2020)<br><br>e) **Quantitative targets** for monitoring and evaluation (e.g. setting as targets a certain level of R&D spending for public research etc.)<br><br>f) From 2005-16, was any STI strategy introduced or were any changes made existing STI strategies? | a and b) The Austrian National STI Strategy (2011) addresses specific themes and societal challenges and societal challenges.<br>The National STI Strategy sets the objective to address societal challenges (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B1). Based on the STI Strategy, the strategic document "Beyond Europe: The Internationalisation of Austrian STI beyond Europe" defines in detail social challenges to be addressed by Austrian STI policy (no order of preference): Demography, e-mobility, renewable energy and related technological and social innovations (i.e. resource efficiency; sustainable construction; sustainable waste management) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response G6).<br><br>There are further sub-strategies derived from the main the RTI-strategy:<br>• Open Innovation Strategy for Austria (2016)<br>• Zukunftsstrategie Life Sciences und Pharmastandort Österreich (2016)<br>• Digital Roadmap (2017)<br>• Austrian ERA-Roadmap (2016)<br>• Creative Industries Strategy for Austria (2016)<br>• Land der Gründer: Auf dem Weg zum gründerfreundlichsten Land Europas (2015)<br>• University Development Plan (2016)<br>• Intellecutal Property Strategy for Austria (2017)<br>Further, the "Austrian EU Action Plan: Strengthening Austria's RTI Players – Actively Benefitting from Europe – Advancing towards the Group of Innovation Leaders" aims at the expansion of Austrian participation in European programmes, among others, ERC (ERC grants), ERA-NET and ERA-NET plus (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B1).<br>c) With regard to specific regions, performance contracts between the BMWFW and HEIs encourage institutions to develop place-based 'location concepts' (Standortkonzept) as part of their internationalisation strategy for research and to attract EU Structural Funds (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, response F3).<br>Further, the "Austrian EU Action Plan: Strengthening Austria's RTI Players – Actively Benefitting from Europe – Advancing towards the Group of Innovation Leaders" aims at the expansion of Austrian participation in European programmes, among others, ERC (ERC grants), ERA-NET and ERA-NET plus (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016, responses A2 and B1).<br><br>d) The Austrian National STI Strategy (2011) also addresses supranational (European) objectives<br>e) The National STI Strategy has set the quantitative target for R&D spending to reach 3.76% of GDP by 2020.<br>f) The Austrian National STI Strategy was introduced in 2011. |

*References:*
BMWFW (2016), RIS3: "Standortstrategien für Smart Specialisation "(German), website, Available at: http://wissenschaft.bmwfw.gv.at/bmwfw/forschung/national/standortpolitik-fuer-wissenschaft-forschung/ris3-standortstrategien-fuer-smart-specialisation/ (Accessed 04 November 2016).
Chancellery of the Federal Republic of Austria (2013), "Austrian EU Action Plan: Strengthening Austria's RTI Players – Actively Benefitting from Europe – Advancing towards the Group of Innovation Leaders", p. 7. Vienna, Austria, Available at: https://era.gv.at/directory/159/attach/0_20130711EUAktionsplan-1172013ENfinal.pdf (accessed 04 November 2016).
Chancellery of the Federal Republic of Austria (2013), "Beyond Europe: Die Internationalisierung Österreichs in Forschung, Technologie und Innovation über Europa hinaus" (German), p. 7. Vienna, Austria, Available at: https://era.gv.at/directory/160/attach/FTI_AG7a_Brosch__re_Ansicht.pdf (accessed 04 November 2016).
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Response A2, B1, F3 and G6.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.2.7.** What **reforms** to policy co-ordination regarding STI strategies and plans have had particular impact on public research policy? | Impact oriented public budgeting and administration; RTI Mid Term Report 2016; Performance report of the Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development - current status of implementation of the Austrian National RTI Strategy (2011); additional evaluation reports about specific RTI-measures; nNational STI sStrategy (2011); inter-agency Task Force for STI (2013)<br><br>The Task Force for STI was set up to coordinate and derive concrete measures for the implementation of the National STI Strategy (2011) as well as for the strategic and systemic coordination of the activities of individual ministries with STI agendas. It is an informal inter-ministry taskforce that is meeting annually to comment on the proposals of the RFTE on the progress of the implementation of the STI strategy. Several informal voluntary inter-ministerial working groups existed supporting the Task Force for STI between 2011 and 2013. |

*References:*
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Response B6.

**Table 4. Questions on inter-agency programming and role of agencies**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.2.8.** Does **inter-agency joint programming** contribute to the co-ordination of HEI and PRI policy?<br><br>*(Inter-agency joint programming refers to formal arrangements that result in joint action by implementing agencies, such as e.g. sectoral funding programmes or other joint policy instrument initiatives between funding agencies.)* | a) Yes. The Partnership in Research funding programme (PiR) is a special anniversary initiative launched by the Christian Doppler Research Association (CDG) and managed jointly with the FWF. In this one-off programme, the CDG makes research funding available for 12 to 36 month research projects. PiR is designed to encourage scientists and researchers at universities, universities of applied sciences (FHs) and non-university research institutions in Austria to undertake basic research projects which may give rise to partnerships with businesses in new areas of cooperation. PiR mainly targets younger scientists and researchers from all disciplines in Austria who have not yet launched cooperation projects with businesses in a given field of research.<br>PiR is carried out jointly by the CDG and FWF: the FWF engages seeks new potentials in the science and research community, while the involvement of the CDG will create new opportunities for cooperation with businesses. From a total of 43 PiR-applications, 6 PiR-projects can be funded with a total of EUR 1.3 millionIn |
| **Q.2.9.** a) Is co-ordination within the **mandate of agencies**?<br><br>b) From 2005-16, were any changes made to the mandates of agencies tasked with regards to inter-agency programming? Were new agencies created with the task to coordinate programming during the time period? | a) No. A general mandate for co-ordination is not included in the legal framework of the FFG, FWF or the CDG. Nevertheless networking and cooperation activities between agencies take place in a practical context: i.e. the Christian Doppler Research Association (CDG) and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) jointly carry out the external scientific evaluation (Peer review) of applications of the COMET programme under agreement of the Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG).<br><br>b) Missing answer. |
| **Q.2.10.** What **reforms** of the institutional context have had impacts on public research policy? | Missing answer. |

## Topic 3: Stakeholders consultation and institutional autonomy

**Table 5. Questions on stakeholder consultation**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.3.1.** a) Do the following stakeholders participate as formal members in **Research and Innovation Councils**? *(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)*<br>– Private Sector<br>– Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations)<br>– HEIs/PRIs and/or their associations<br><br>b) Do stakeholders participate as formal members in **council/governing boards of HEIs**? *(i.e. Formal membership as provided by statutes of Council)*<br>– Private Sector<br>– Civil society (citizens/ NGOs/ foundations) | a) Representatives from the private sector and HEIs/PRIs participate in the formulation of national STI priorities informing scientific, sectoral and/or thematic priorities as members of the RFTE.<br><br>b) Representatives from industry participate in governing boards of HEIs taking decisions on strategic issues informing thematic and scientific priorities of HEIs. |
| *References:*<br>Austrian Council for Research and Technology Development (2016), Council Members, website, Available at: http://www.rat-fte.at/council-members.html (accessed 04 November 2016).<br>Technical University Vienna (2016), Mitglieder des Universitätsrat (website, German), Available at: http://www.tuwien.ac.at/wir_ueber_uns/universitaetsleitung/universitaetsrat/mitglieder/ (Accessed 07 November 2016).<br>University of Vienna (2016), Mitglieder des Universitätsrat (website, German), Available at: http://universitaetsrat.univie.ac.at/mitglieder-des-universitaetsrats/ (Accessed 07 November 2016). | |
| **Q.3.2.**a) Are there **online consultation** platforms in place to request inputs regarding HEI and PRI policy? b) Which aspects do these online platforms address (e.g. e.g. open data, open science)?<br><br>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms made to widen inclusion of stakeholders and/or to improve consultations, including online platforms? | a and b) ERA Portal Austria; Austrian Platform for Research and Technology Policy Evaluation (FTEVAL) (2006)<br><br>ERA Portal Austria is an online platform for public consultation on the future EU Framework Programme for Research.<br><br>FTEVAL provides evaluation standards for evaluators, institutions commissioning evaluations, funding institutions as well as those to be evaluated. Its objective is to set a common framework and a set of guidelines for the evaluation process in the field of research and technology policy. FTEVAL was established in 1996 and re-established as a society in 2006. The Standards were drawn up in a joint interactive process involving all Platform members in 2003. In 2012, the Platform revised its evaluation standards, which have been endorsed by its members including the relevant federal ministries dealing with STI issues and funding agencies.<br>In terms of impact, the evaluation standards issued by FTEVAL have become a central element of evaluation practice in Austria (OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on trends, impact and institutionalisation of evaluation practices).<br><br>c) In 2012, the Austrian Higher Education Conference (Hochschulkonferenz) was set up in order to improve coordination in tertiary education with main stakeholders. |

*References:*
OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on trends, impact and institutionalisation of evaluation practices.
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Responses H4.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.3.3.** Which **reforms** to consultation processes have proven particularly important? | ERA Portal Austria: Public consultation on the future EU Framework Programme for Research; Austrian Higher Education Conference (2012); evaluation of the Austrian research support and funding system (System's Evaluation) in 2008/09<br><br>2007-08 a nation-wide discourse on future priorities of the research system (Austrian Research Dialogue) was launched to prepare the national STI strategy. There were dialogue fora in place to align national and regional STI policies (e.g. Bundesländerdialog).<br>The Austrian RTI stakeholders were continuously involved during the process of drawing up the "Beyond Europe" Strategy. In the field of international cooperation a "Beyond Europe"-Round-Table format was established and is run by FFG to improve info-exchange and coordination of international activities of Austrian RTI-Stakeholders.<br>Relevant stakeholders have been included in the development of specific strategies (see response 2.7). The national creative industries strategy for Austria , for instance, was developed in cooperation with 100 creative entrepreneurs and experts from many disciplines. The process was led by the BMWFW in co-operation with Kreativwirtschaft Austria, Austria Wirtschaftsservice GmbH (aws, a state-owned development bank) and the Austrian Federal Economic Chamber (WKO). The stakeholders helped devising the strategy and contributed substantial input during a stakeholder workshop.<br>In 2008-2009, an evaluation of the Austrian research support and funding system (System's Evaluation) was conducted with the participation of important stakeholders from government, HEIs, PRIs, private industry and civil society. It was the most important system evaluation exercise carried out in Austria in recent years. The Austrian R&D support and funding system's evaluation strongly influences the policy debate even outside the narrow cycle of programme managers, and constituted a major input to the Austrian RTI Strategy, which was published in 2011 (OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question major evaluation exercises).<br>Moreover, the Austrian Higher Education Conference (Hochschulkonferenz) was set up in 2012 in order to improve coordination in tertiary education with main stakeholders. |

*References:*
EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Responses H4.
OECD STI Policy Survey 2014 for Austria, response to the question on major evaluation exercises.

**Table 6. Questions on autonomy of universities and PRIs**

| Question | Response |
|---|---|
| **Q.3.4.**Who decides about **allocations of institutional block funding** for teaching, research and innovation activities at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If HEIs face national constraints on using block funds, i.e. funds cannot be moved between categories such as teaching, research, infrastructure, operational costs, etc. This option also applies if the ministry pre-allocates budgets for universities to cost items, and HEIs are unable to distribute their funds between these.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs are entirely free to use their block grants.)* | a and b) In Austria, the BMWFW allocates institutional funding to HEIs and PRIs. HEIs and PRIs are free to move funding internally, i.e. between teaching and research between categories. |
| *References:*<br>Data on institutional autonomy is based on a survey conducted by the European University Association between 2010 and 2011 across 26 European countries. The answers were provided by Secretaries General of national rectors' conferences and can be found in the report by the European University Association (Estermann et al., 2015).<br>Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.<br>European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016. | |
| **Q.3.5.** Who decides about **recruitment** of academic staff at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If recruitment needs to be confirmed by an external national/regional authority; if the number of posts is regulated by an external authority; or if candidates require prior accreditation. This option also applies if there are national/regional laws or guidelines regarding the selection procedure or basic qualifications for senior academic staff.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to hire academic staff. This option also applies to cases where laws or guidelines require the institutions to publish open positions or the composition of the selection committees which are not a constraint on the hiring decision itself.)*<br><br>Who decides about **salaries** of academic staff at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If salary bands are negotiated with other parties, if national civil servant or public sector status/law applies; or if external authority sets salary bands.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to set salaries, except minimum wage.)*<br><br>Who decides about **reassignments** and **promotions** of academic staff at e) HEIs and f) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If promotions are only possible in case of an open post at a higher level; if a promotion committee whose composition is regulated by law has to approve the promotion; if there are requirements on minimum years of service in academia; if automatic promotions apply after certain years in office, or if there are promotion quotas.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs can promote and reassign staff freely.)* | a - f) Recruitment and promotions of academic staff is decided at the institutional level while salary bands are negotiated by collective bargaining at the national level. Since reforms in 2002, universities are responsible for payroll of their staff. They can decide how they employ academic staff, e.g. on the basis of short term contracts or long-term fixed contracts (OECD, 2014, p. 141). However, salary bands for academic staff are negotiated by collective bargaining at the national level. With regard to promotions, universities and PRIs are free to decide themselves. |
| *References:*<br>Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.<br>European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016. | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Q.3.6.**Who decides about the **creation of academic departments** (such as research centres in specific fields) and functional units (e.g. **technology transfer offices**) at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If there are national guidelines or laws on the competencies, names, or governing bodies of internal structures, such as departments or if prior accreditation is required for the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to determine internal structures, including the opening, closure, restructuring of departments, faculties, technology offices, etc.)*<br><br>Who decides about the creation of legal entities (e.g**. spin-offs**) and **industry partnerships** at c) HEIs and d) PRIs?<br>*(National/regional level: If there are restrictions on legal entities, including opening, closure, and restructuring thereof; if restrictions apply on profit and scope of activity of non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.*<br>*Institutions themselves: If HEIs are free to create non-profit organisations, for-profit spin-offs, joint R&D, etc.)* | a – d) HEIs and PRIs themselves decide jointly with the ministry (BMWFW) about internal academic structures and the creation of legal entities (spin-offs) and joint R&D partnerships with industry.<br><br>Plans of creating new departments or new initiatives are stated in institutional development plans and are negotiated in the performance agreement between PRI and ministry.<br>In order to leverage synergies the BMWFW and the AWS financed the establishment of three regional knowledge transfer centres (WTZ Ost, WTZ Süd, WTZ West), as well as a specialised knowledge transfer centre in the life sciences field. Moreover, several science-industry partnerships are funded via agency funding programmes. Some of these co-operations (i.e. COMET) require the establishment of a legal entity. |
| *References:*<br>Estermann, T., Nokkala, T., and Steinel, M. (2015). University Autonomy in Europe II The Scorecard. Brussels: European University Association. Retrieved from http://www.eua.be/Libraries/publications/University_Autonomy_in_Europe_II_-_The_Scorecard.pdf?sfvrsn=2, accessed 19.09.2016.<br>European University Association (2016). University Autonomy in Europe (Webpage). Retrieved from http://www.university-autonomy.eu/, accessed 19.09.2016. | |
| **Q.3.7.** Who earns what **share of revenues** stemming from IP (patents, trademarks, design rights, etc.) created from publicly funded research at a) HEIs and b) PRIs?<br>– HEI<br>– Research unit / laboratory within HEI<br>– Researchers<br><br>c) From 2005-16, were any reforms introduced that affected the institutional autonomy of HEIs and PRIs? | a) At HEIs, the researchers receive 10-35% of revenues while HEIs receives 30-60% and the research unit share 25-33% of revenues. Examples for distributions for the part of IP revenues which are attributed to HEI:<br>– TU Wien: 35 % researcher, 25 % research unit, 40 % HEI;<br>– Montanuniversität Leoben: 10-30 % researcher, 30 % research unit, 40 % - 60 % HEI;<br>– Universität Wien: 1/3 researchers, 1/3 research unit, 1/3 HEI<br>b) PRIs set their own schemes.<br><br>Regardless of HEI/PRI-internal IPR-schemes, science-industry co-operations which are co-funded by public and private partners within specific FTI-funding programmes (i.e. COMET, CD-Labs) require also specific contractual arrangements concerning the management and usage of IPRs. The share of IPR-revenues depends on various factors and the specific funding/legal set-up of these partnerships (i.e. single-or multi-firm cooperation; sector-specific IPR-needs of the involved partners).Because of these differences there are no uniform rates for IP-revenues.<br><br>c) Institute of Science and Technology was established in 2006; University autonomy reforms 2002; introduction of performance agreements 2007 and reforms there of 2011 (introduction of Higher Education Area Structural Funds); Introduction of National Development Plan for Higher Education (2007); performance agreements between BMWFW and HEIs (2007); introduction of Higher Education Area Structural Funds (2011) |

| | |
|---|---|
| *References:*<br>University of Vienna (2016), Inventor Renumeration, website, Available at: http://techtransfer.univie.ac.at/en/technology-transfer/exploitation/inventor-remuneration/ (Accessed 07 November 2016).<br>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Response H4. | |
| **Q.3.8.** Which **reforms** to institutional autonomy have been important to enhance the impacts of public research? | The University Act (2002) granted full autonomy to universities with regard to financial, organisational and personal affairs. The funding model was also completely changed, bringing in elements of performance based funding (introduction of performance agreements 2007). Since then, the funding model has been altered several times (e.g. introduction of Higher Education Area Structural Funds in 2011).<br><br>The internal governance of universities has also been modified: there are now university councils which act as governing boards and the position of the rector has been strengthened. Beyond university autonomy, the Act of 2002 aimed at increasing efficiency using the profiling of institutions and steering by performance contracts to avoid the duplication of small research and teaching areas.<br><br>To better align national goals and institutional actions and allow some governmental steering, new communication steering instrumentsstructures have been established through thesuch as the e.g. National Development Plan for Higher Education (Nationaler Hochschulplan) and performance agreements (2002, reformed in 2007). With the National Development Plan the BMWFW, in cooperation with universities, sets goals for the further development of the higher education system. |
| *References:*<br>EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Austria. Response H4. | |

# Annex. Additional notes on performance contracts in Austria

This annex contains additional information on performance contracts in Austria. It refers to question 1.3.

*Do performance contracts determine institutional block funding of HEIs and PRIs? (Question refers to **1.3.a**) What is the share of HEI budget subject to performance contract? (Question refers to **1.3.b**)*

In Austria, funding of HEIs is based on agreements on future performance of institutions. Between 2007 and 2012 universities were funded by a global budget that consisted of a basic budget and a formula budget. The formula-based budget which was competitively distributed among universities was calculated by the BMWFW based on a number of indicators (about 20% of the total budget for universities). Since 2012, universities receive a global budget that consists of a basic budget (94-96%) and the so-called Hochschulraum-Strukturmittel (4-6%), which replaced the former formula budget in 2012. The basic budget, i.e. 94-96% of institutional funds is allocated based on the performance contracts (De Boer et al., p. 42-43).

The performance agreement is a public contract that runs for a period of three years. The first funding period was from 2007 to 2009, the second from 2010 to 2012, the third from 2013 to 2015, and the current period started at the beginning of 2016. The negotiations between universities and the BMWFW start a year in advance.

Performance agreements are linked to the National Development Plan for universities that runs for a period of six years and covers two university funding periods, as well as goals regarding "outcome orientation" (Ziele der Wirkungsorientierung) as set out by the Federal Ministry of Higher Education:

– Progress in the number of students in different disciplines (ISCED level 3);

– Improvement in the percentage of students who are active students;

– Improvement in the number of graduates;

– Improvements in student-staff ratios;

– Quality assurance.

– Study programmes (ISCED level 3) for which universities are allowed to restrict access, including the number of eligible students.

First, the BMWFW formulates the national development plan and the outcome orientation for higher education, which informs the universities' development plans. The performance agreements are based on these institutional development plans as well as on the regulations in the University Act.

Based on the national development plan for higher education, university rectors receive a letter asking for a first draft of the performance agreements. This letter indicates to prepare draft performance agreements that set out general strategic goals for the upcoming funding period and specific goals for the individual university. A special task force at the BMWFW is responsible for the negotiations with the universities and the development of a simplified scheme allowing for comparisons of universities' performance agreements with their

development plans. Finally, there is the establishment of an internal paper for the ministry, the so-called expectation paper that includes different goals for the universities.

The fulfilment of performance agreements is monitored by intellectual capital reports and accompanying talks.

Moreover, in the current funding period, 15 out of 22 public HEIs agreed to develop regional/location concepts ("Standortkonzepte") in relation with their internationalisation strategy and development plans. Standortkonzepte position institutions within a self-defined area of geographically close co-operations, thus presenting them as important local actors with a strong local impact (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Denmark, Response C11).

*What are the main priorities and criteria used in performance contracts? (Question refers to **1.3.d**)*

Performance contracts do not contain quantitative indicators but they include qualitative objectives. According to the current version of the University Act the universities have also to address the following issues in their performance agreements (cf. sec. 13 University Act):

- Strategic goals, profiling, further development of the university and its human reReferences;
- Research, advancement and appreciation of the arts;
- Teaching and (postgraduate) training;
- Policies to reduce drop outs among students;
- Improvement of student/staff ratio;
- Part-time studies, special offers for working students;
- Societal needs (knowledge transfer);
- Strengthening of international orientation and mobility of staff and students;
- Cooperation with other universities;
- Number of students which successful complete 16 ECTS per academic year;
- Number of graduates;
- Student-teacher relation;
- Quality of teaching;
- Matching related to the supply of programs of study;
- Basic research;
- Career paths for young academics;
- Social inclusion of subscribed students at universities;
- International linkages between the Austrian higher education and the European Research Area (ERA).
- The criteria include (De Boer et al., p. 45):
- Number of students which successful complete 16 ECTS per academic year;

- Number of graduates;
- Student-teacher relation;
- Quality of teaching;
- Matching related to the supply of programs of study;
- Basic research;
- Career paths for young academics;
- Social inclusion of subscribed students at universities;
- International linkages between the Austrian higher education and the European Research Area (ERA).

*From 2005-16, were any changes made to funding of HEIs and PRIs? (Question refers to **1.3.h**)*

The budget for the Hochschulraum Strukturmittel is calculated based on five indicators: Number of enrolled and active students (60%) (weighted by discipline) where active students are those students that achieve at least 16 ECTS in the study year under review and spent at least 8 hours per week on their study; number of graduates (10%) (weighted by discipline); revenues from knowledge transfer (14%) (i.e. revenues from the European Union, the Austrian federal states, municipalities, the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), the Anniversary fund of the Austrian National Bank, and private funds by foundations); revenues from private donations (10%); and funding of Cooperation (14%) (i.e. joint R&D with industry) (De Boer et al., p. 43).

Between 2007 and 2012, the universities' global budget included a basic budget based on performance agreements and a formula-based budget that was calculated by the BMWFW based on a number of indicators. The formula-based budget was intended to steer the profiling of institutions by setting competitive incentives. About 20% of the total budget for universities was dedicated to formula-based funding, which was competitively distributed among universities.

In 2011, the selection of indicators for the formula-based budget was evaluated after criticism that the indicators were not adequate for all kinds of universities, in particular for the art and music universities, and that size-effect of universities benefited bigger universities. The evaluation report stated that the formula-based budget did not have a strong impact on the universities' global budgets (Unger et. al. 2011, p. 134).

Though the evaluation revealed that universities were improving, the funding model was not identified as the main factor steering universities to improve their performance. The evaluation led to the abolishment of formula-based budget and its replacement by the Hochschulraum-Strukturmittel.

Moreover, in the current funding period, 15 out of 22 public HEIs agreed to develop regional/location concepts ("Standortkonzepte") in relation with their internationalisation strategy and development plans. Standortkonzepte position institutions within a self-defined area of geographically close co-operations, thus presenting them as important local actors with a strong local impact (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Denmark, Response C11).

Since 2007, performance contracts have had a positive steering effect on the Austrian universities (Österreichischer Wissenschaftsrat, 2013, p. 35). They have contributed to the

clear positioning of the individual universities. In particular, the performance agreements have contributed to improvements in profiling and research, as measured by e.g. the share of top cited publications and European Research Council (ERC) grants received (De Boer et al., 2015, pp. 53-62).

In 2011, the selection of indicators for the formula-based budget was evaluated after criticism that the indicators were not adequate for all kinds of universities, in particular for the art and music universities, and that size-effect of universities benefited bigger universities. The evaluation report stated that the formula-based budget did not have a strong impact on the universities' global budgets (Unger et. al. 2011, p. 134). Though the evaluation revealed that universities were improving, the funding model was not identified as the main factor steering universities to improve their performance. The evaluation led to the abolishment of formula-based budget and its replacement by the Hochschulraum-Strukturmittel.

The budget for the Hochschulraum Strukturmittel is calculated based on five indicators: Number of enrolled and active students (60%) (weighted by discipline) where active students are those students that achieve at least 16 ECTS in the study year under review and spent at least 8 hours per week on their study; number of graduates (10%) (weighted by discipline); revenues from knowledge transfer (14%) (i.e. revenues from the European Union, the Austrian federal states, municipalities, the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), the Anniversary fund of the Austrian National Bank, and private funds by foundations); revenues from private donations (10%); and funding of Cooperation (14%) (i.e. joint R&D with industry) (De Boer et al., p. 43).

Performance contract were introduced in 2012 between the BMWF and the Austrian Academy of Science (OEAW). The performance contract includes the objective to promote gender equality (e.g. the Gender Equality Action Plan); measures regarding Open Access; and internationalisation (e.g. Alignment with the Mobility strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area). In 2015, the BMWFW concluded a performance agreement with the Institute of Science and Technology Austria (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Denmark, Response B11).

Regarding PRIs, performance contract were introduced in 2011. The performance contract between the BMWFW and the Austrian Academy of Science (OEAW) includes the objective to promote gender equality (e.g. the Gender Equality Action Plan); measures regarding Open Access; and internationalisation (e.g. Alignment with the Mobility strategy 2020 for the European Higher Education Area) (EC/OECD STI Policy Survey 2016 for Denmark, Response B11).