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Introduction

Acknowledgments
This report is the result of the continuous international collaborative work developed by the EqUIP partners throughout the three years of the platform as a coordination and support action funded by the EC. Acknowledgements are due to the authors of all the reports that have fed into the development of this document and to past and present staff of EqUIP partners, Associates and Observers, expert participants and wider funding and support organisations whose experience and enthusiasm has helped shape the thinking and understanding outlined throughout. These are too numerous to name here but are detailed in the various reports publicly available via the EqUIP website (www.EqUIPproject.eu).

Aims and Outline of the Report
The Summary Report on Opportunities and Priorities for Future Research Collaboration (D3.3) is intended to provide a collation and reflection on the learning to date from the EqUIP projects’ activities to enhance the Europe-India research collaboration in the Social Sciences and the Humanities as the support from the European Commission through the FP7 coordination and support action comes to a close. EqUIP is a regional platform, rather than thematic, and this report not only outlines the thematic priorities identified through its bottom up scoping process, it also reflects on the implications of the learning from the various EqUIP activities for Europe-India SSH research collaboration more widely. In this way the report provides an opportune moment to take stock of what has been achieved to date, the lessons learned and their implications for the way the platform will shape its membership and future activities. The report therefore attempts to provide both a retrospective and prospective view on the EqUIP project, feeding into the future planning for the platform.

The report builds on, and develops, findings outlined in reports from the EqUIP activities that are publicly available online, and from internal documents to the platform developed during the life of the project. In particular it has drawn on reports outlining the activities to scope and refine some joint thematic priorities and to share learning and build a vision for the platform in order to highlight opportunities and priorities for the development of plausible scenarios and recommendations for future collaborative activities. As such, the report is intended to provide a broad working roadmap for the Platform going forward.

The first chapter provides an overview of the research collaboration landscape for the Social Sciences and the Humanities (SSH) in India and Europe, including an outline of the current landscape of Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences research funding in India, as well as evidence of researcher-led collaboration/co-publication, strategic inter-government agreements (bi-lateral and between the European Commission and the Government of India) and bi-lateral and multi-lateral research programme initiatives, such as the European Framework Programme. This chapter draws on the findings from EqUIP’s Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities (D.2.1), and its complement, the Final Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities (D.2.6), and presents an update to data on the Europe-India SSH collaboration presented in the Joint Learning Report (D.2.3). It also draws briefly on past and recent reviews of the research funding landscape for the Arts and Humanities and Social Sciences in India.

A second chapter concisely describes the bottom-up process of establishing priorities for research with added value for Europe-India collaboration in the Social Sciences and the Humanities, from the initial survey of the partners’ thematic priorities to the formulation, voting and ranking of the final priority topics in the concluding summary symposium. Its sources are of course the six Reflection Papers of the dedicated symposia, produced by their corresponding organisers.

The findings that emerged from the joint learning activities of EqUIP and the work to share experiences to develop a joint initiative makes up the content of the third chapter of the report. This chapter highlights key findings from discussions and reflections from the Staff Exchange Scheme Report (D2.5) and the Joint Learning Report (D.2.3) which are then summarised as general guidelines for future initiatives. It also reflects on the development of the pilot joint initiative and the learning for the platform drawn from it.

The final chapter provides a reflection on the implications of the learning from the development of the platform to date, particularly for the shape of the platform and its expansion going forward. This frames a set of suggested possible directions for the platform once the CSA funding comes to an end over the short, medium and long term.

Europe-India Platform for Social Sciences and Humanities (EqUIP)
The Europe-India Platform for Social Sciences and Humanities (EqUIP) brings together research funding and support organisations in Europe and India to build a stronger strategic partnership, increase opportunities for networking and dialogue amongst researchers, and explore ways of working together to enable future joint research programming.

In an ever changing world, global challenges require global solutions, science transcends national borders and the Social Sciences and the Humanities need to be at the centre of integrated approaches to tackle society’s most pressing issues in a sustainable and holistic way.

India is a growing research performing nation in terms of investment in science and technology, and within the FP7 SSH programme it was one of Europe’s major partners. India is also an important country in terms of global societal challenges.

The overall aim of the EqUIP is therefore to develop the right conditions for enhanced collaboration between Europe and India in the Social Sciences and Humanities, at the level of both research funders and researchers. In particular, EqUIP has four key objectives:

- Provide a more coherent overview of the current scope of collaborative activity between Europe and India in the Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Develop best practice approaches and identify challenges for research cooperation between Europe and India in the Social Sciences and Humanities.
- Identify, through the networking of existing projects,
opportunities and priorities for future research collaboration between Europe and India in the Social Sciences and Humanities, with a view to influence policy documents and future Horizon 2020 Work Programmes for the Societal Challenges.

- Establish networks of pan-European and Indian researchers in the social sciences and humanities conducting excellent research addressing cutting edge research questions.

EqUIP’s broader and long-term ambition is to provide the foundations for enhanced inter-agency cooperation between research funding agencies in India and Europe in SSH. In particular, EqUIP’s benefits will be:

- A stronger European Research Area and the building of new networks with India.
- A stronger position of arts and humanities and social sciences in the context of Horizon 2020.
- Better approaches to assess impact of Europe-India research collaboration.
- A path for future collaborations at EU and Member States level with India.

EqUIP Beneficiary Partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Council</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKA</td>
<td>Academy of Finland</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>National Research Agency</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRE</td>
<td>Agency for the Promotion of European Research</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>German Research Foundation</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Research Centre</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Council</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>Foundation for Science and Technology</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSSR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Social Science Research</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIZS</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Sport</td>
<td>Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWO</td>
<td>Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Research Council of Norway</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSI</td>
<td>Centre for Social Innovation</td>
<td>Austria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EqUIP Associate Partners – joined since 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Czech Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICHR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Historical Research</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Philosophical Research</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EqUIP Observer Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forte</td>
<td>Swedish Research Council for Health, Working life and Welfare</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>Irish Research Council</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCN</td>
<td>National Science Centre</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNSF</td>
<td>Swiss National Science Foundation</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC</td>
<td>University Grants Commission</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 1: Europe-India SSH research landscape

Europe-India Research Cooperation

India has been recognised by the EU as an increasingly important research collaboration partner as a rapidly growing research performing country. In 2013, 4.4 percent of the world’s scholarly output—106,065 papers—came from India, and the trend is accelerating. India’s research output across all disciplines is also far outpacing the world average, increasing by 14 per cent compared to a world average of 4 per cent.

This growth was evident in Indian researchers’ participation in the European Commission Framework Programmes for Research and Technological Development. Following the Science and Technology Cooperation Agreement (STCA) between India and the EU in 2001, India’s participation in the Framework Programme grew from 36 participants in FP4 (1998-2002) to 305 (in 181 projects) in FP7 (2007-2013), the latter including 19 projects with an Indian coordination role. Under FP7, India was the fourth most active Third Country in terms of participation and in terms of financial contribution (£35.8m) from the European Commission—behind only Russia, the United States, and China. Of this spend a small but significant proportion was successfully won in SSH-led research topics (see Figure 2).

This growing position as a research performing country, and Government of India increasing investment in science and technology, has been the driver for a shift in the European Commission’s strategic engagement with India, as with other merging science nations, towards securing inter-governmental strategic agreements to co-fund on an equal footing, rather than EU support for Indian researchers.

Europe-India Strategic Cooperation in Research and Innovation

The Europe-India Agreement on Scientific and Technological Cooperation (2001) was a major outcome of the launch of the European Research Area (ERA) at the Lisbon European Council in 2000, and continues to shape Europe-India S&T cooperation by means of 12 articles defining purpose, principles and instruments following renewal in 2007 and 2016 to 2020. This agreement was based on principles of reciprocity and symmetry and established a Strategic Forum which aimed to facilitate cooperative activities, identify new priorities and recommend joint initiatives, subject to available resources, which could include jointly funded/ coordinated projects, researcher mobility and access to data and equipment. The adoption of the European Research Area Vision 2020 in 2008, and the launch of India’s Decade of Innovation in 2010, in particular marked a shift towards reciprocity in Europe-India research cooperation.

While the value of international research cooperation with ‘third countries’, outside Europe, to EU competitiveness remained an important element of the European Research Area Vision 2020 (ERA), the European Commission took the decision, in its Horizon 2020 programme, not to automatically fund these third country researchers. Its calls would remain open to participation from researchers from those countries (bringing their own funding) and targeted activities could be developed where cooperation on particular topics was prioritised. However, the only calls on which Indian researchers could still receive automatic funding were through responsive mode applications to European Research Council (ERC), COST actions, Marie Sklodowska-Curie actions, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMW) funding, Erasmus+ scholarships, and mobility fellowships.

The removal of emerging economies from the list of countries eligible to receive automatic funding in the collaborative projects of Horizon 2020 has led to a marked decrease in their EU Framework Programme participation to date. In the first two
years of Horizon 2020 there were only 7 Indian participants, an 85% reduction since FP7 in the number of Indian participants, the number of projects with Indian participants, and the total value of those projects. While Brazil, Russia, China and Mexico were also included in the policy change, the greatest reductions have been in the participation of Indian researchers, and inter-governmental co-funding agreements have been slow to negotiate.

The 2012 Europe-India Joint Declaration on Research and Innovation Cooperation reaffirmed a joint intention to define a strategic partnership with the aim of finding solutions to societal challenges of mutual concern. This built on two joint Europe-India conferences (November 2010, and May 2012) held to identify S&T priorities and propose coordinated actions, to shape the India-EU and Member States Strategic Roadmap for Research and Innovation. The Joint Declaration called for a step change in cooperation to be supported by a biennial Group of Senior Officials (GSO) co-chaired by the director of DG Research & Innovation and the Secretary of the Indian Department of Science and Technology (DST) charged with steering the development of the “Europe-India Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA)”. The renewed Roadmap for Europe-India S&T cooperation in March 2016, which will guide the India-EU Strategic Partnership over the next five years, agreed to intensify Europe-India cooperation in STI and in addressing global challenges, and welcomed the setting up of mechanisms for jointly financing research and innovation projects. The Roadmap, in particular, included the 2015 Europe-India Joint Steering Committee agreement to explore cooperation in the following areas: Health, Water, Energy, Smart cities, Food Security, Sustainable Agriculture and Forestry, Marine, Maritime and Inland Water Research and the Bio-economy, Nanotechnologies, and Advanced Materials. Inno Indigo and Indigo Policy have been, and will continue to be shaped by delivery of this Roadmap agenda through multi-lateral co-funded calls.

While there are opportunities for cross-disciplinary work including SSH researchers in addressing these themes, the Roadmap has not to date included any SSH-led themes, in part because the agreement is negotiated with DST, which cannot fund SSH-led research. The Ministry of Human Resources and Development (MHRD), responsible for SSH-led research funding in India, has not been engaged in this process. Similarly while there have been agreements to co-fund the participation of Indian researchers in H2020 with DST, the Indian Department of Biotechnology (DBT) and the Department of Electronics and Information Technology (DeitY) there have been no such agreements with MHRD, and while some of the DBT calls were flagged by the European Commission as requiring inclusion of social science and humanities perspectives, there have been no targeted Indian calls in the Horizon 2020 work programme to date on topics that would be SSH-led.

This lack of SSH-led topics in the Strategic Agenda for Europe-India S&T cooperation is a significant gap, particularly as it means that the agenda does not accord with other relevant Europe-India priorities for cooperation that might benefit from joint Europe-India insights. The 13th Europe-India Summit, for example, alongside the Roadmap, endorsed the establishment of the Common Agenda on Migration and Mobility (CAMM) between the EU and India, also emphasising the importance of India as a strategic partner for the EU in the field of migration and mobility. The CAMM, as a framework for cooperation, was intended to be the beginning of a longer term process towards deeper cooperation on migration, a key global policy area. Similarly research to understand and address many of the Sustainable Development Goals, committed to by the EU member states and India, lend themselves to SSH-led, as well as cross-disciplinary, research and innovation.

EqUIP was established to, in part, address this gap in strategic cooperation in SSH, to better understand the challenges and to identify priorities for cooperation. As such it has developed in a very different way from Inno Indigo and Indigo Policy, its STI sister platforms, since, rather than beginning with a strategic steer, it needed to develop a thematic agenda while working to build new relationships and gain a better understanding of the Indian SSH funding environment. The next section will focus more specifically on the learning from EqUIP on SSH collaboration and the Indian funding environment, to set the context for Europe-India strategic collaboration in SSH.

Europe-India Cooperation in the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH)

There are high quality, world renowned social science and humanities (SSH) researchers, writers and artists in India, but the volume of SSH research activity is low compared to science and technology. Nevertheless, India ranked 11th globally for social science output in terms of published articles and was in close competition with Brazil in terms of output between 2009 and 2014.11 Of the total publication output in India in 2002-2015 recorded in Scopus, social science (SS) publications accounted for four per cent12 and arts and humanities (AH) publications for under one (0.69) per cent of the total — lower than the global share of publications (SS 7%; AH 4% of global publications). However, around 16% of this Indian SSH output was published with international co-authors in this period, reflecting an internationally engaged research community.

Although, SSH research activity and share of Indian international co-publication was relatively low in this period (SS 3.4%13; AH 0.65%14), just under half of these co-publications were with Europe.15 While collaboration with the UK is significantly stronger than other European countries (as with other Anglophone countries outside Europe), India and Europe have strong SSH communities and there are low level ad hoc collaborations across Europe that amount to more than that with the US, the country with greatest collaboration with India in SSH. The size and strength of the SSH research communities in Germany, Netherlands and France is also reflected in co-publication data.
It is notable that not all the European countries in the top 10 countries co-publishing with Indian SSH researchers are represented on EqUIP, which may point to some potential directions for future expansion of the platform in Europe, notably Switzerland, Italy, Spain, Sweden and Belgium.

![Figure 4: Europe-india collaboration, 2003-2015 (elaborated by ZSI based on Scopus data).](image)

SSH Europe-India collaboration with Europe is also increasing, outstripping the increase in Indian SSH international collaboration overall. This increase reflects a relatively long term trend since 2004 but there was a marked step-change which may relate to the tripling of national Indian social science research budgets in 2012 following a Government of India ‘Nayyar Review’ Inquiry into social science research. This growth also coincides with Indian participation in the EC Framework Programme, and the implementation of the first Europe-India multi-lateral programme in the social sciences, the Indian-European Research Networking Projects, which provided groups of researchers with funding to build collaborative networks (projects were funded 2013-16). It is notable that this increase has been in large part due to the increase in collaborative co-publication in the social sciences. However, although rising from a very low level the increase in collaboration is also evident within humanities co-publication figures for the same period. This context in the Indian SSH research funding environment and Europe-India SSH collaboration have marked a key moment of opportunity for the development of the EqUIP platform in 2014-17.

![Figure 5: Trends in Europe-India international co-publication (elaborated by ZSI based on Scopus data).](image)

This growth in Europe-India SSH collaboration is very much in spite of the changes in eligibility of Indian researchers to Horizon 2020 funding. While Europe-India SSH collaboration had increased, the level of collaboration was still low in FP7, with only nine Europe-India SSH projects funded in FP7. Although challenge-led EC research calls have fallen from this low level since FP7, Indian researchers have continued to submit a small number of SSH-led or cross-disciplinary proposals to the H2020 programme with good success rates (compared to the average). However, the numbers of these projects funded without direct funding for Indian SSH researchers were very low.

**Bi-lateral, Multi-Lateral and National SSH research Cooperation**

On behalf of EqUIP, the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC) conducted a *Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities* (D.2.1), which included the results of a survey to map the extent of existing Europe-India SSH research cooperation amongst EqUIP partners. The *Joint Learning Report* (D.2.3) and *Final Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities* (D.2.6) provided further opportunities to supplement this information.

These reports suggested a significant amount of cooperation activities although largely bilateral fellowship programmes or bilateral networking activities (with funders agreeing to fund travel, accommodation and fieldwork costs but rarely funding the staff costs for time spent on the project). However, there were some exceptions such as the German-Indian M.S. Merian - R. Tagore International Centre for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and the Social Sciences, which provided longer term investment in a research centre to facilitate greater collaboration. Programmes, bilateral and multi-lateral collaboration, were much more established (between 2010 and 2014) in the Social Sciences than in the Humanities. The most significant programmes in this period had been social science-led through programmes such as the ICSRR/ESRC Scholar Exchange scheme, the multilateral Indian-European Research Networking Programme, (ICSSR, ANR, DFG, ESRC and NWO) the Migration, Development and Conflict programme (ICSSR, NWO, Tata Institute of Social Sciences among others), and Social Science Scholar Exchange Application (ICSSR, NWO) and Samenwerking India - Social Science Cooperation India-Netherlands (SSCIN). AHRC’s programme level activity had been in Design which is not universally considered humanities.

Researcher-led project funding through funders’ responsive mode calls had also tended to be social science proposals: the “Norway - Global partner” (NORGLOBAL) call and ESRC/AHRC Global Challenges Research Fund and international co-investigator mechanism being significant funding mechanisms. But responsive mode, researcher-led projects had been funded in the arts and humanities (especially history, languages and design) by AHRC, AKA and TEKES (the Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation), and MIZS, without specific programme level activity, including Europe-India collaborations on cross-disciplinary projects that went beyond SSH boundaries.

The disparity in social science and humanities collaboration is likely to be due to organisational priorities and the funding landscape to which the design of EqUIP initiatives will need to be sensitive.
**The Research Funding Landscape for SSH in India**

In coming to an understanding of the funding environment for arts, humanities and social sciences in India and Europe it is important to acknowledge some wide differences in definition and remit. In India, for example, history has been considered at times part of the social sciences (part of an Arts versus Sciences division) and some subjects such as geography or architecture included in Sciences. Equally while some European funders are able to fund visual and performance artists and designers under an arts and humanities remit (AHRC, UK), others cannot. The lines between social sciences and humanities in India, as in Europe, are considerably blurred. For the sake of simplicity the following outlines information broadly describing the funding environment for Social Sciences and Humanities collectively and much of what is described in this chapter is taken from a recent review that broadly covered both, although described as reviewing social sciences.

**Government of India SSH Research funding**

The majority of funding for research in India is through central government, and in large part is administered through the Department of Science and Technology with additional funding from other affiliated Ministries such as the Department for Biotechnology. Funding for natural sciences represented 81% of the Government of India spend on research in 2012-13, of which a significant proportion has been invested in Natural Science and Agricultural Sciences and Engineering and Technology. While these Ministries can fund multi-disciplinary research with consortia that include social scientists and humanities researchers, these Ministries do not fund SSH-led research.

The most important source of funding for social science and humanities-led research in India is the Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD), through a number of subsidiary organisations, including: the University Grants Commission, Indian Council for Historical Research (ICHR), Indian Council for Philosophical Research (ICPR), Indian Council for Social Science Research (ICSSR), The Indian Institute of Advanced Study (IIAS), Project of History of Indian Science, Philosophy and Culture (PHISPC) and National University of Education Planning and Administration (NUEPA). While other ministries and state governments invest in social science research and data infrastructure, and the corporate sector, international donors and individual philanthropy are also sources of funding that are beginning to gain ground in India, MHRD remains by far the most significant SSH research funder. However, MHRD has a wide remit across the primary and higher education system, and skills, and its research budget represented only 0.53% of the overall MHRD budget in 2012-13, making research a lesser priority for MHRD than it is for the Department of Science and Technology, which funds science and technology research in India.

Of the potential funding bodies UGC has the largest budget but this is not a research project budget, as it has both a grant giving and regulatory body function for higher education. UGC supports a number of ‘Centres of Excellence’ and supports a number of bilateral international exchange programmes and provide funding for research projects. Around 30% of UGC’s research project funding is invested in SSH research, although its investment particularly in ‘major’ (large scale – 50-75 Lakh Rs) research projects has fallen slightly.

Of MHRD’s various councils, ICSSR is the main agency supporting social science research, receiving around 65% of the funding for SSH research from MHRD in 2012-13, and an increasing share of funding as other Council’s shares have declined. It was established on April 15, 1969 to promote social science research by providing funding for institutions and researchers in India. The Indian Council for Social Science Research also has a mandate for international research collaboration, particularly since the ‘Nayyar review’, which recommended an increase in funding to ensure that social science in India was not left behind science and technology. As a result ICSSR budget tripled (from a very low base) in 2012 and was increased by a further twenty per cent thereafter. These increases have been important to the support for social science research in India but are dwarfed by the rises in STI funding. The Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR), for example, had an increase from 1075 crore Rs to 2929 crore compared to ICSSR’s rise from 35 to 85 crore Rs over the same 2003-2011 period. Since 2014-15 the funding for ICSSR has remained static, but this increase in funding in 2012 has provided a basis for development of proposals to promote greater international collaboration, including multi-lateral international collaboration using ICSSR funds. ICSSR funding for International Collaboration rose from Rs 48 Lakh to 274 Lakh between 2003 and 2014.

A considerable portion of the ICSSR budget goes to supporting a number of research institutes, strategically developed originally to foster a social science research culture. This investment outside universities (or affiliated to them but separate) has proved enormously valuable in the context of massive and rapid growth of India’s higher education sector, in which maintaining teaching standards has overaken priorities to support a research culture. These institutes also get funding from other sources, such as state governments and private funders. Most of these are based in the north (in and around Delhi) and south of the country.

There is no single funder for the humanities in India. The Indian Council of Historical Research (ICHR) and the Indian Council of Philosophical Research (ICPR) were established in the 1970s to promote their disciplines but did not achieve the same status as ICSSR, and their budget and degree of international engagement is far lower, and reducing. The Ministry of Culture also provides a small amount of funding for fellowships and awards for researchers and artists, and a budget for international cooperation, but the research budget has also been reducing over time. Although some disciplines that might be considered ‘humanities’ in Europe might be included under the umbrella of the social sciences in India, national programmes, and UGC funds both social sciences and humanities, the small rise in SS funding does not make up for this reduction in funding in the arts and humanities in India, and the fragmentation of funding across these various organisations makes the feasibility of international collaboration on any scale challenging. Engagement on any scale would require collaboration between these organisations nationally, or potentially across ministries, as well as internationally, which to date they have not done.

**Strengthening SSH Collaboration in the Arts and Humanities**

In response to recommendations from the initial Scoping Report around the need for greater engagement with humanities funders in India, efforts were made to engage ICHR and ICPR. The engagement of ICHR and ICPR in EqUIP highlighted the disparity in experience of international engagement between ICHR,
ICPR and ICSSR. While these organisations had some bilateral agreements, these were less extensive and less active than those of ICSSR, reflecting smaller budgets. The circumscribed disciplinary remit of ICHR, in particular, can restrict the way in which they engage internationally to history-only projects. This presents some barriers to the engagement of ICHR in cross-disciplinary challenge-led research funding initiatives. ICHR and ICPR and ICSSR had also not, to date, collaborated to fund cross-disciplinary research, although they were funded by MHRD. However, both ICPR and ICHR have actively engaged in attending EqUIP’s Staff Exchange events and ICPR in particular attended all of the Symposia Series events. One of the outcomes of engagement in EqUIP has been the initiation of conversations between these organisations nationally around cross-disciplinary funding mechanisms, as well as a greater awareness and understanding of the potential for international engagement through mechanisms like EqUIP.

The weakness of international collaboration in the arts and humanities relative to social sciences is in large part a symptom of these structural weaknesses in the Indian funding environment. This presents considerable challenges for the development of joint funded multi-lateral initiatives in the humanities, which require considerable Indian contribution to balance those of European partners. The funding environment also limits the capacity of these organisations to participate on an equal footing with ICSSR or other European partners in a joint initiative for research projects. The next phase of EqUIP will need to consider whether and how Europe-India initiatives in the arts and humanities could be shaped differently to adapt to this challenging funding environment.

Non-governmental SSH Funding in India

International and private/philanthropic non-governmental funding agencies are an important part of the Indian research funding landscape shaping the social science and humanities research environment in India. These fund in thematic areas of interest and are usually strongly oriented toward societal and policy related research programmes and/or innovative methodology. Data on the funding for research (as opposed to implementation) from private funding organisations is difficult to accurately estimate, but there are a number of significant international donor investors, in particular the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (estimated 54% share of investment), followed by the International Development Research Council and the Ford and MacArthur Foundations. Philanthropic organisations such as the Tata Trusts (which have notably invested in the Tata Institute for Social Science), the India Foundation for the Arts (IFA), the Azim Premji Foundation, Infosys, the Observer Research Foundation, and the New India Foundation are also emerging as potentially significant research funders. Corporate funding possibilities have also increased since Corporate Social Responsibility rules came into effect in India, requiring companies of a substantial size/turnover to spend 2% of their profit on social-development-related activities (including R&D).

Indian governmental SSH funders have not collaborated with these organisations to date. However, there are precedents for partnerships in India to fund research between government and international non-governmental funders in STI research funding, from which it may be possible to learn. A number of European funders also have experience at a national level on which it may be possible to draw at an international level.

Researcher-led Multi-Disciplinary Sourcing of Funding

As observed in the Scoping Reports, there are indications of researchers taking advantage of funding sources beyond SSH to undertake cross-disciplinary research, apparent in responsive mode calls. The constraints of the funding environment for SSH may be encouraging cross-disciplinary working. This is also to an extent evident in Indian cross-disciplinary publication. Thorat and Verma (2017) examined data between 2009 and 2014 which saw a marked increase in cross-disciplinary SSH publication in India, with particular specialisation in social science related to engineering, sciences and allied disciplines, and agriculture and allied sciences.35

Given the disparity in funding for SSH and STI, there may be arguments in favour of EqUIP exploring the potential merits of cross-disciplinary collaborations with non-SSH funders on topics of common interest and strength. One potential opportunity that may be worth exploring is the leadership role of MHRD in funding IMPRINT36, a programme for investment in engineering education and research to address societal challenges, which has the potential to draw on SSH cross-disciplinary strengths, and with themes that have some synergy with those of the EC Roadmap. This may suggest some opportunities for international cooperation with MHRD on these strategic areas in the longer term.

Conclusion and Recommendations

There is significant ad hoc collaboration between the European and Indian SSH research communities, particularly in the social sciences, a reflection of the strength of the research communities in both sides. However, this happens very much in spite of the limited funding environment in India and in Europe. Given the limited funding available in India for SSH research, and the limited engagement of MHRD in inter-governmental strategic agreements between the Government of India and the EC, the change in eligibility of Indian applicants under Horizon 2020 has created a barrier for increasing European-Indian SSH research collaboration; a barrier greater than for those applying under Science and Technology-led Challenges whose access to Indian funds is likely to be greater. ERC and national funding mechanisms remain important in fostering European-Indian collaborative research on SSH-led societal challenges, particularly with larger research producing countries. However the number of projects funded through this route is small and unlikely to be a significant mechanism for widening European engagement with Indian SSH research communities. The European Commission may wish to revisit the decision not to fund Indian researchers in SSH-led calls given this national funding environment and the strength of the Indian research community, particularly on topics where there have been Europe-India strategic international commitments and cooperation agreements (e.g. CAMM and SDGs).

Most bi-lateral member state collaborative activity in SSH has been focussed on networking and fellowships to date, also reflecting the limited funding available in Indian organisations for multiple bilateral initiatives. In the context of limited eligibility for EC funding in H2020 and the lack of targeted exception calls in H2020, multi-lateral mechanisms like EqUIP provide a significant mode of fostering research collaboration between funders around projects to address societal challenges needing an SSH-led approach. In this sense, EqUIP remains an important mechanism for building capacity and experience in multi-lateral collaboration to facilitate research on challenges that would need to be
### Findings

- Among emerging economies, India participation has suffered the greatest reductions in the EU Framework Programme participation since the removal of automatic funding in H2020.
- There is significant ad hoc collaboration between the European and Indian SSH research communities (particularly in the social sciences), a reflection of the strength of the research communities in both sides.
- The lack of SSH-led topics in the Strategic Agenda for Europe-India S&T cooperation is a significant gap, as it means that the agenda does not accord with some relevant Europe-India priorities.
- There are more barriers for European-Indian SSH research collaboration than for collaboration under Science and Technology-led challenges whose access to Indian funds is likely to be greater.
- Joint initiatives are demanding in terms of the funding needed from Indian partners to balance the funding available from European partners.
- ERC and national funding mechanisms (although important in fostering Europe-Indian collaborative research on SSH-led societal challenges) are insufficient for widening European engagement with Indian SSH research communities.
- Most bi-lateral member state collaborative activity in SSH has been focussed on networking and fellowships to date, also reflecting the limited funding available in Indian organisations for multiple bilateral initiatives.
- There remains significant disparity in the level of funding between social sciences and humanities in India, which presents challenges for facilitating joint research project calls.
- The constraints of the funding environment for SSH may be encouraging cross-disciplinary working beyond SSH.

### Recommendations

- The European Commission may wish to revisit the decision not to fund Indian researchers in SSH-led calls, particularly on topics where there have been Europe-India strategic international commitments and cooperation agreements.
- A variety of approaches that consider smaller scale activities or collaboration with wider cross-sector and/ or cross-disciplinary funding organisations may be required to scale up SSH research collaboration activity.
- Lessons should be learned from previous partnerships in India to fund research between government and international non-governmental funders in STI research funding.
- EqUIP initiatives need to be sensitive to organisational priorities and the challenging funding landscape responsible for the disparity in social science and humanities collaboration in India.
- Engagement on any scale will require collaboration between humanities funders nationally, or potentially across ministries, as well as internationally.
- Given the disparity in funding for SSH and STI, EqUIP may wish to further explore the potential merits of cross-disciplinary collaborations with non-SSH funders on topics of common interest and strength.

SSH-led. There is a clear economy of scale for Indian partners in being able to work with multiple countries through a multilateral mechanism. Joint initiatives are, however, demanding in terms of the funding needed from Indian partners to balance the funding available from European partners. For Indian funders – humanities in particular – this presents some challenges and a different approach may be needed to scale up collaborative funding initiatives. There remains significant disparity in the level of funding between social sciences and humanities in India, which presents challenges for facilitating joint research project calls. It is recommended that in considering the broader goals of EqUIP and activities moving forward, particular attention should be given to this disparity, as a variety of approaches that consider smaller scale activities or collaboration with wider cross-sector and/ or cross-disciplinary funding organisations may be required to scale up activity.
Chapter 2: Europe-India Thematic Foci for the Social Sciences and the Humanities

Building Networks and Thematic Focus areas

Bottom-up expert-led development of strategic priorities

A core element of the EqUIP activities has been the identification of opportunities and priorities for future research collaboration, with the aim of establishing a Europe-India Strategic Research Agenda for the Social Sciences and the Humanities. EqUIP has followed a bottom-up, expert-led approach for the development of these strategic priorities. This bottom-up approach, even though informed by EqUIP partners’ priorities, was facilitated through the expert-led scoping process outlined in the initial Scoping Report and represents a very different approach to the development of strategic priorities than that of Inno Indigo, which has been shaped more by the EC-India inter-governmental strategic agreement.

It was acknowledged that existing research links between India and Europe are still quite embryonic in some SSH disciplines and therefore network building and sharing of experiences would also be an important aspect of thematic agenda-setting process. EqUIP’s proposed strategic research agenda in this way drew on the knowledge and experience of academic stakeholders informed about the opportunities and challenges for research collaboration and the development of some thematic focus areas with potential for added value from Europe-India SSH collaboration.

Scoping the Symposia Series

As described in more detail in the initial Scoping Report, a survey was sent to all EqUIP partners, plus Indian Council of Historical Research (ICHR), Indian Council of Philosophical Research (ICPR) and University Grants Commission (UGC) in India in order to collect information on their short, medium and long term future research priorities; on their current collaborative activities with India/Europe and on their successful communication and dissemination (impact) activities. As a result, a total of 38 research priorities and strategic areas were identified, ranging from very narrowly defined research questions and problems to broadly defined areas of knowledge.

In a second stage, EqUIP partners were asked to suggest up to five names to help constitute an Expert Group that would lead the process of grouping and analysing the 38 research priorities. These were academics with wide experience on India-related research and Europe-India research collaboration, covering a broad range of disciplines within the Humanities and the Social Sciences. A committee of task leaders met by teleconference and selected a group of nine experts, maintaining a balance of countries, gender, and disciplines in both the Humanities and the Social Sciences. The members of the Expert Group were invited to participate in an online process of grouping of the priorities suggested by the partners, using the tool “Well Sorted”, developed by Heriot-Watt University. This online software allows the users to easily group different items based on their similarities. The combination of all the groupings performed by the experts was later automatically processed to produce a matrix where the similarity of any possible pair of items is verified. As a result, seven groups of high-level research themes were identified.

The Expert Group met in London on 15th January 2015 and conducted a second step in the processing of the priorities starting from the grouping that the “Well Sorted” software had produced based on the responses by the Expert Group during the first (online) step of the process. During workshop discussions in London, the groupings were refined, as some overlaps and linkages were identified, and several changes were applied to the original layout. Also each of the different groups were analysed in order to provide a title, a list of key themes/questions/topics, the degree of maturity of research, opportunities and/or challenges, relation to the Humanities and the Social Science, and relation with other groups. Keeping a broad view of the Europe-India research landscape, whilst identifying the key research priorities, was the main aim of this process. Therefore both Social Sciences and Humanities perspectives are included and combined, resulting in a multidisciplinary approach to the research questions where a wide variety of disciplines (history, languages, geography, sociology, anthropology, economy etc.) can be identified.

As a result of this bottom-up expert-led approach, five broad areas were identified as cornerstones for EqUIP symposia.

EqUIP Symposia series

The symposia series aimed to facilitate expert discussions to gain a full and nuanced view within broad themes and develop expert recommendations to the EqUIP partners of priority areas for a distinct Europe-India research agenda for future research collaboration. Five thematic symposia were organised between October 2015 and October 2016 to develop and refine these themes and foster networking among experts in the social sciences and humanities from across Europe and India. The table below outlines the details of the date, location and beneficiary partner engaged in delivery. A symposia-working group was established by partners engaged in delivering the symposia to facilitate learning from delivery of events and strengthen working relationships between partners through a number of tele-calls and side-meetings. Lessons from each event were shared following each event and used to develop practice. Other symposium planning meetings were held alongside Steering Committee meetings or via tele-calls. Each symposium organiser developed a concept paper outlining the key aims and objectives of the symposium and explaining the format and structure of the event. The development of the symposia concept papers was a joint effort among symposia-working group members who discussed and revised them before circulating them to participants.

Participants were invited to the symposia based on EqUIP partners’ nomination. Experts from the SSH disciplines, from both Europe and India, were nominated and invited to each event to discuss the opportunities and challenges in each thematic area and to explore the potential added value in addressing these societal challenges through a distinct Europe-India research agenda by identifying needs and priorities for future research collaboration. Symposia organisers ensured a good (gender) balance between European and Indian participants and of Social
List of the EqUIP symposium Series and corresponding broad thematic areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Area</th>
<th>Organiser</th>
<th>Time and Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inequalities, Growth and Place/Space</td>
<td>ICSSR</td>
<td>19-20 October 2015, Delhi, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Archives and Databases as a Source of Mutual Knowledge</td>
<td>APRE</td>
<td>05-06 May 2016, Rome, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Prosperity, Wellbeing and Innovation</td>
<td>AKA</td>
<td>09-10 June 2016, Helsinki, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Transformations, Cultural Expressions, Cross-Cultural Connections and Dialogue</td>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>28-29 June 2016, Gurgaon, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Structures, Conflict Resolution and Social Justice</td>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>13-14 October 2016, Gurgaon, India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Science and Humanities experts. Each symposium was chaired and lead by an academic convenor, nominated by the host organisation and approved by EqUIP partners. The convenor supported the symposium organiser to develop the symposium concept paper, led the discussions on the day, summarised the main outcomes and fed into the corresponding Reflection papers.

For each symposium, dedicated thematic sessions that explored these broad topics were organised, as well as inaugural and concluding sessions. The topical thematic sessions were aimed at assessing the current situation, identifying potential key research themes for future collaboration, prioritizing of subthemes and/or key questions in each topic. Typically these sessions consisted of both plenary conferences and group focused discussions (parallel sessions): at the beginning of each of these sessions, selected experts gave presentations that served as an introduction to the topic and discussions then continued in smaller groups.

This series of symposia brought together more than 200 European and Indian research collaborators working in common areas with the aim of establishing larger collaborative networks that could identify issues/areas on which there was potential for considerable benefit in facilitating greater engagement between Indian and European researchers. Corresponding Reflection papers captured the outcome of these discussions. They were written to guide future international research collaboration initiatives between Europe-India in the fields of SSH. As the Reflection papers are outlining in more detail the format and the structure of the symposia, the section below provides a short summary of the five symposia series (for further Information please also see Annex 1).

1. Inequalities, Growth and Place/Space
   Inequalities, growth and cities/urbanisation are key aspects of this theme, with the natural environment an important factor across all three focus areas – for example, the impact of environmental degradation or natural events on the movement of peoples. The notion of social or cultural ‘encounters’, and how they relate to communities within cities and regions, are also identified as an important consideration. This thematic area focuses more on inequalities in the context of economic opportunity, environmental change and changing demographics.

2. Digital Archives and Databases as a Source of Mutual Knowledge
   The focus of this thematic area is researchers’ access to primary sources, which requires both the political will to make them available and the technology to store, format and organise them in a repository that can be accessed remotely. Such a database would not only contain printed material, but also oral history sources, information on social and physical habitat, lived social and cultural practices, and tribal languages and practices. There is an important methodological component in this thematic area, strongly linked to the concept of ‘the digital’, metadata and the use of new media in research.

3. Sustainable Prosperity, Wellbeing and Innovation
   Health, sustainability, education and social innovation are the main focus areas within this theme. They are all closely interlinked – social innovation, for example, have links to both education and health. Gender is considered an important aspect across this theme. The topics in this area are all highly relevant for applied research addressing social challenges. ‘Sustainable prosperity’ reflects the broader notion of inclusion and prosperity (i.e. beyond economic) across the areas highlighted as priorities. ‘Wellbeing’ indicates that physical and mental wellbeing involves a range of economic, social, environmental and cultural factors.

4. Social Transformations, Cultural Expressions, Cross-Cultural Connections and Dialogue
   This thematic area has identity, language, shared histories, diversities and diasporas at its core. Both the past and future should be part of this thematic area ensuring a strong social science and humanities relevance. Creative practice, religion, languages and literatures are included in this thematic area, with cross-cultural connections as a unifying theme. Mobility of research communities from and to India and the appearance of new cosmopolitan societies and diasporas across Europe provide an opportunity to look at cultural dialogue and connections, not least through area studies.

5. Power Structures, Conflict Resolution and Social Justice
   This thematic area is concerned with enabling and understanding conflict resolution and social justice. It is organised around the topics of social diversity and structures, gender and conflict, with the latter including issues relating to peace – linking to themes 1 and 3. The theme should encompass different approaches to societal reform, whether through state processes (such as international law studies) or through bottom-up changes (such as activism). Some of the considerations in this theme are specific to India, such as the caste system, while other aspects, such as peace and conflict, have equal relevance internationally with opportunities for mutual learning.

In sum, the EqUIP Symposia Series facilitated expert discussions in order to gain a full and nuanced view within broad themes and to develop expert recommendations for EqUIP partners concerning priority areas for future research collaboration and how they might address societal challenges through a distinct Europe-India research agenda. Thus, the EqUIP Symposia Series has:

- Stimulated networking among experts from different
countries working in related areas;
- Explored state of the art research in the selected areas and identified themes for future research needs;
- Developed visions for improving the communication of research findings to policy makers and practitioners;
- Shared experiences of challenges in research collaborations between Europe and India, and developed ideas of how these might be overcome;
- Identified research priorities for possible future collaborative initiatives among research funders.

It is an outstanding achievement for EqUIP to organise a series of six thematic symposia within one year and to bring more than 200 academic experts from Europe and India together in order to identify and develop the strategic priorities for future research collaboration.

**Rationale for the Final EqUIP Summary Symposium**

The Final EqUIP Summary Symposium, held on 25th and 25th of October 2016 in Bled (Slovenia), was organised by MIZS with the support of DFG. To facilitate the successful design of the summary symposium event, a planning meeting was held in September in Bonn with symposia-working group members and the academic convenors. This final symposium was designed slightly differently to the others and brought invited convenors and invited expert participants who had attended the five thematic events together. They considered the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the previous five symposia and developed a Strategic Research Agenda outlined in the Summary Symposium Reflection Report.

As outlined above, the final Summary Symposium was organised mainly to develop a strategic plan for future research collaborations in EqUIP by collating and synthesising the outcomes of the previous five academic symposia events. This symposium brought together academic participants from Europe and India who had actively participated in at least one of the prior events and representatives of all EqUIP project partners.

During the first day, the highlights and conclusions from each of the previous five symposia were presented by the corresponding organisers and convenors. These were joined by the final symposium’s convenors, by five discussants (who provided additional feedback of the respective symposium they attended) and by the remaining participants of all the symposia (who added to the recapitulation of prior outcomes through closed discussion and were also given the task to identify differences and similarities between themes of the different symposia). All participants considered the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the previous five symposia and fleshed out a not yet systematised set of inputs and overarching research themes for further discussion and consideration.

The second day of the Final Symposium was focused on the identification and discussion of the priorities for future Europe-India research collaboration in the various fields of SSH. Based on the discussions that took place in the first day, the convenors presented a list of sixteen possible topics for voting (each participant was allowed four votes, which could be distributed to one or several different themes) and commenting (participants were requested to comment on the themes, explaining the reasons for their preferences as well as commenting on formulations). In order to allow for closer disciplinary scrutiny, representatives of the Social Sciences were given blue stickers and scholars of the Humanities orange stickers. The final plenary session reviewed the outcome of the voting and commenting and collected further feedback on priorities, synergies and wording.

**The Thematic Foci for future Europe-India research Collaboration**

The Summary Symposium Reflection Report outlined the sixteen cross-cutting research areas identified in discussions and the results of the voting to identify priorities. These are listed in Table 2. Discussions on the day suggested that some overlap existed between them.

The discussion did not result in detailed specification of these themes, rather they were intended to establish where there might be added value in Europe-India collaboration. Discussions were held at the workshop around some of the elements that should be considered in each topics’ framing but this should not be considered comprehensive. The following summary briefly describes the top cross-cutting thematic priorities identified during the workshop by expert participants which suggest likely avenues for a strategic research agenda for future Europe-India SSH research collaboration.

**Conflict and conflict resolutions – and how they travelled - across India and Europe**

Conflict resolution refers to different modes of non-violent or peaceful conflict resolution. There was an emphasis in discussion around how these have travelled between Europe and India. It was felt by expert participants that there was an urgent need to study examples of peaceful conflict resolutions and to analyse the consequences of violent conflicts. It was suggested that dialogical methods would be appropriate for this topic. This topic encourages micro-and macro studies, such as examining the exchange of experiences between Europe and India in the field of conflict resolution.

**Implications of migration in Europe and India (benefits, flows, diasporic engagement)**

Analysing the diversity and conflict in migration contexts from a comparative perspective (Europe-India) opens up new approaches. The benefits and risks of migration, the transformative effects of mobility and migration, the integration of migrants and diaspora communities, the mechanisms to cope with migration (at individual and societal level) and how migration ‘remake’ culture and memory can be examined under this topic.

**Re-thinking citizenship, state and the social contract in India and Europe**

Equality, and equal access to resources, are central to social and spatial mobility. This topic focuses on diverse forms of discrimination; on processes of segregation and access to services and rights; on the relationship between education and social policy; on studies of multiple forms of governance, and multiple sector providers; on the impact of global governance on citizenship aiming to ‘rethink’ and ‘re-activate’ citizenship through education and participation.

Discussions suggested that these issues are also closely related to the topics around health and education governance. i.e. Topic 14 and Topic 16, which participants felt should have been broadened to wider issues around provision, access and governance.

**Sustainable prosperity, equality, growth and well-being**

The topic potentially covers issues around education, health,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority theme</th>
<th>Total votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conflict and conflict resolutions and how they trav(elled) across India and Europe.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Implications of migration in Europe and India (benefits, flows, diasporic engagement)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Re-thinking citizenship, state and the social contract in India and Europe</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainable prosperity, growth and well-being</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Sustainability and the making of rural and urban living spaces</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Social movements, appeals to social justice and political alternatives (all different ideological outlooks)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Political economies of inequalities (historical constellation, gender, urban-rural, poverty)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Alternative modernity: new understandings of Modernities in the context of a globalizing world</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Creative expressions and arts across cultures</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Innovative approaches to heritage and communities (digitizing sources, preserving heritage, politics of preserving heritage, new methods of digitization)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gender – intersectionality. The changing nature of gender relations in India and Europe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Critical studies on data collections and access</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Everyday creativity and digital culture (technology, openness, digital literacy, innovation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Smart health governance (national and global) and issues of equitable distribution (technology as enabler)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Cartographies of vernacular cultures: language, memory and heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The critical relationship between education and social policy (private-public sector, teacher’s education, role of the state, ideology, migration)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment and livelihoods, sustainable urbanisation, migration, ecology and climate change. There is also a clear connection with issues included in Topic 5 which referred to the issues of how to improve the quality of life in places where people live both urban and rural/peri-urban, touching on issues of livelihoods, environment, water, sanitation, and soil usage. It has the potential to overlap with issues around migration and social movements and the mapping of local cultures and space-making.

**Social movements, social justice and political alternatives**

Social movements have been key drivers of social change. They have had emancipatory effects, and also promoted xenophobic tendencies, such as in populist/fascist movements. The topic could give voice to marginalised perspectives and challenge dominant discourses. Research could include the study of non-violent movements, the dynamics of right-wing fascist and populist movements, and alternative forms of protest and performance.

**Political economies of inequalities, equality and social inclusion**

Equality, inequality and social inclusions are key concerns across India and Europe, cutting across most of the topics outlined.

**Alternative modernity(ies): new understandings of modernity in the context of a globalized world**

There are multiple understandings of what constitutes modernity (or modernities), as well as alternative routes to modernity. This topic focuses on the different trajectories of modernity(ies) and aims to rethink the paradigm of “modernity”.

**Creative expressions, dialogue and arts across cultures**

The topic could include performance, film, visual arts, cultures of the body, embodiment and heritage, religious practices, and rituals, particularly the inter-sections between gender, ethnicity, sexuality and power relations. This topic could also examine the economic and social contribution of arts and performance, and the interchange between and the transformation within communities. It encourages the promotion of engaging with communities and the application of innovative research methods.

**Innovative approaches to heritage and communities and new methods of digitisation**

While this was felt to be an important topic, ‘digitising’ and ‘preserving’ heritage were not considered innovative. Research could focus on different notions of heritage covering local resources, multilingual materials and visual cultures. There was felt to be an urgent need to preserve cultural resources in the vernacular, local cultures, memories and oral history.

**Critical studies on data collections, access and digital cultures**

The terminology, metadata and cultural-linguistic varieties in data collection and dissemination were also considered central to increasing the accessibility of data for the public. Participants suggested the need for scoping exercises of current platforms for data dissemination in EU and India. A specific focus on data collection could produce new methods on data collection and dissemination of research results as well as critical studies of virtual communities on the web and digital cultural ecosystems.

These topics have the potential to offer a set of thematic priorities on which to build in the development of future joint initiatives both through EqUIP and through other multi-lateral and bi-lateral mechanisms. The themes may need further elaboration, specification and, in some cases, merging to be used for individual call topics. They represent directions for a research agenda that promises particular added value for Europe-India collaboration and for strengthening SSH collaboration. They potentially allow for:

- Mutual recognition of areas of interest: in order to avoid the risks of Eurocentrism or neo-Orientalism, a wide-ranging trans-continental balanced approach is crucial to encompass research on Europe as well as India;
• Inclusion of the different disciplinary fields: SSH is a broad domain that acts as an umbrella for a vast amount of heterogeneous research fields which need to be considered in their specificities, thus demanding across-the-board topics focused on potential common challenges;
• Both broad and narrow funding initiatives: a wide range of topics allows for a variable geometry project focused on differentiated objectives that may demand instruments of varied scope;
• Alignment with diverse potential partners: any future engagement with other funding platforms is likely to demand a flexible research agenda which may allow for strategic alignments according to potential areas of mutual interest that are usually more thematic or challenge-driven that disciplinarily defined;
• On-going thematic scoping: the research agenda needs to be kept open to possible reformulations and/or additions in the medium-long term in accordance with the development of the corresponding scientific communities and inter-governmental policy strategies.

Key findings

Europe-India Research Agenda for the Social Sciences and the Humanities

• The development of the strategic priorities for future research collaboration was led by a bottom-up expert-led approach and represents a very different approach to the development of strategic priorities than that of Inno Indigo which has been shaped more by the EC-India inter-governmental strategic agreement

• Five thematic symposia were organised between October 2015 and October 2016 to develop and refine these themes and foster networking among experts in the social sciences and humanities from across Europe and India. The symposia series facilitated expert discussions to gain a full and nuanced view within broad themes and develop expert recommendations to the EqUIP partners of priority areas for a distinct Europe-India research agenda for future research collaboration.

• The final EqUIP Summary Symposium synthesised the outcomes of the previous five academic symposia events and developed strategic research priorities for Europe-India future collaboration encompassing a number of overlapping thematic focus areas.

• These thematic focus areas for the future Europe-India collaboration have considerable overlap to the policy priorities outlined under Horizon 2020 Societal Challenges and the Sustainable Development Goals and can open new opportunities for alternative sources of funding in the future.
Core objectives of EqUIP have been to work towards effective, structured and coherent international research cooperation in the social sciences and humanities through closer collaboration between the beneficiary partners in EqUIP, and to offer wider opportunities to participate in these activities beyond the existing partners. All EqUIP activities were open to potential new funding partners and efforts made at various points throughout the project to reach out to other Indian and European organisations should they wish to participate. A number of these EqUIP activities were specifically designed to facilitate inter-agency learning. This chapter highlights the key learning from the reports of these activities, in particular for the development of EqUIP joint initiatives going forward. The chapter will outline the nature of these activities and the recommendations from them for the development of future joint initiatives. It will then outline how these recommendations have been taken forward in the development of a pilot joint funding initiative and the implications of the learning across these activities for the future shape and development of the platform.

EqUIP Joint Learning Activities

As detailed in Chapter 1, the Scoping Report had highlighted significant variation between partners’ degree of past and current collaboration with India on social science, and considerably weaker humanities, collaboration. Sharing learning across the existing partners and building trust and strong working relationships was therefore key to strengthening the relationships and understanding of working practices between organisations. It was also essential to the platform that there was a clear outcome from engagement in joint learning and other activities, in particular a joint-funded initiative. The joint learning activities in this way differed in aim from the development of the symposia events, and scoping of a thematic agenda, in that they were focused on raising awareness of working practices, and sharing best practices, between the research funding and support organisations, even though also shaped to inform decision-making around the development of research collaboration initiatives.

Joint Learning workshop

The Joint Learning Workshop (15-16 September 2015), hosted by the Research Council Norway (RCN) with the support of the Centre for Social Innovation (ZSI), was designed in the light of the first Scoping Report to be focused on engagement between funding organisations. This was a key event for the development of EqUIP as it both brought together over 30 participants from 22 existing and new partner organisations in 14 countries, with the goal of mobilising the various experiences of the Indian and European funding agencies to discuss best practices and identify potential scenarios for joint approaches to effective SSH research cooperation in the future. The scenario building was supported through several participatory and interactive group work methods and a back casting exercise to identify necessary steps towards achieving the desired future. This workshop highlighted many critical factors potentially relevant in the design and implementation of initiatives. The workshop also created an opportunity to gather new information on the collaboration activities of partner organisations with India and the activities of the new interested agencies that had attended beyond those in EqUIP. The event in particular facilitated the engagement of the Indian Foundation of the Arts and Czech funders, one of whom (Czech Academy of Sciences) later joined EqUIP as an Associate partner. The Joint Learning Report (D.2.3) presented the models and issues for effective multilateral funding formats outlined by participants during the workshop activities. Through these activities, the Joint Learning event provided momentum for the development of a multi-lateral funding initiative for EqUIP which was then taken forward by a small ‘Funding Futures’ working group of EqUIP partners. This funding Futures Working Group, in particular, conducted a survey of partners to identify preferences amongst the funders for different funding mechanisms, thematic priorities and strategic interests in alignment with other funding networks. This survey is not publicly available but results are included in the overall outline of preferences detailed in this chapter.

Staff Exchange Scheme

This event also accompanied the commencement of the Staff Exchange Scheme visits between funding agencies. The EqUIP Staff Exchange Scheme (SES), coordinated by the Academy of Finland (AKA), was aimed at sharing knowledge and experiences, facilitating understanding and building trust among research funding and support partners. The scheme helped to build professional networks and good relationships across the partner organisations, and consisted of EqUIP partners organising visits for staff members of other partner organisations to attend their institutions. Between September 2015 and October 2016 a total of nine visits were organised, two of which included visits to two different organisations, with 45 different staff members participating in the programme. The trips to the Indian partner, ICSR, also included visits to the Indian associate member organisations (ICHR and ICPR) as well as the Indian University Grants Commission.

These visits were developed to maximise the opportunities for inter-agency learning and to feed that learning into the development of collaborative approaches. The Report on EqUIP Staff Exchange Scheme (D2.5) detailed the development and delivery of this Scheme and, in particular, highlighted feedback on good ideas, thoughts or best practices from those attending the visits that they felt they would like to introduce either in their own organisations or in EqUIP. Visitors expressed the importance of meeting representatives from different organisations in order to gain an understanding of the context, approaches and priorities from different country perspectives, as well as a more holistic understanding of how the organisations operate, and in turn how mutual learning and collaboration could be achieved through engagement in EqUIP. It was evident that the visits benefited reciprocal learning between organisations and participants noted that enabling colleagues to visit each other’s organisations and the mutual learning that resulted from this was crucial for future engagement and collaboration within EqUIP.

Visitors were especially interested in learning about funding schemes, instruments and mechanisms of other organisations, other organisations’ peer review systems and international and national SSH-related activities. In both hosts and the participants’ opinion, the most important things discussed and learned were...
related to the following matters: information provided about host organisation, political changes/atmosphere, funding models and landscape, governance and structural changes, history of collaboration towards India, learning about host country and its culture, new ideas about how to effectively involve the scientific community in conceptualising a joint call, call practices, processing of applications, strengthening the understanding of similarities/differences in proposal evaluation and project follow-up as well as in application processing, selection criteria, peer review models and how to engage the ‘reviewers’ college’, organising panels and selecting reviewers, national research funding system, new ideas about impact, how to measure it and use of research, business engagement, engaging the community as co-producers. A number of specific initiatives developed by partners are included as boxed inserts in the Staff Exchange Report for reference.

**Series of Symposia**

In addition to these activities and their findings/recommendations, experts who attended the Series of Symposia described in Chapter 2 were given the opportunity at each event to highlight challenges encountered when undertaking research collaborations between Europe and India and for examples and ideas for how these challenges might be overcome. These discussions and recommendations are outlined in the *Symposia Reflection Papers (D3.2)* and provide an additional insight into the challenges for funders to address in designing initiatives for Europe-India SSH research collaboration.

This Chapter will not repeat the information detailed in these various reports, which are publicly available, but will highlight key findings and recommendations from these reflections for the development of future collaboration and joint funding initiatives. It will outline the key challenges and opportunities for the development of initiatives raised variously through these activities, and some of the recommendations and good practice examples highlighted for consideration in the development of EqUIP collaboration initiatives going forward.

**Challenges and Opportunities for SSH Collaboration through EqUIP**

The Joint Learning Workshop discussions focussed around the development of models for multi-lateral joint funding, in particular inspired by the positive experiences many European partners had of engaging in multi-lateral European Research Area networks of funders. The discussions acknowledged the complexity and length of time that these mechanisms required to develop joint initiatives, but stressed the benefits in terms of...
efficiency and new configurations of researcher collaboration that such initiatives can foster. The important and significant challenges for Europe-India SSH multi-lateral collaboration were also highlighted, in particular, the fact that that will require adaptation to the SSH funding landscape in India as well as Europe.

The discussion groups were invited to assess the strategic strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) for development of multi-lateral funding initiatives for Europe-India collaboration. Table 1 summarises the issues raised that specifically related to adapting a multi-lateral initiative to the Europe-India landscape, rather than multi-lateral/bilateral mechanisms more broadly. This table also incorporates learning to date through other activities and the review presented in Chapter 1. The strengths and the opportunities identified mainly relate to the recognised benefits of multilateral cooperation mechanisms for many partners, the weaknesses and threats largely relate to financial resources and maintaining commitment of partners.

**Considerations and Recommendations for the Development of EqUIP Joint Activities**

Discussions throughout the various activities have drawn on a wealth of knowledge, experience and ideas to help practically resolve and adapt to these strategic challenges and opportunities to strengthen collaboration and develop future joint initiatives. These are too numerous to detail in depth but the following provides a summary of some of the key suggestions, and are offered as practical guidelines to help shape the development future cooperation initiatives. The various suggestions included those for the development of funding initiatives and wider activities over the longer term. Some are recommendations that could be taken forward by stakeholders beyond those engaged in the EqUIP platform or that would require engagement with new partners. These suggestions are broadly outlined below:

**Supporting Researcher Networks**

- Networking activities could provide a first step towards greater collaboration where relationships and researcher networks are weaker, e.g. in humanities, before funders consider larger research funding programmes.

- Networking needs should be recognised although the main goal should be supporting research excellence. In some areas of SSH there are relatively weak collaborative networks which has implications for building project consortia. This needs to be taken into account in the call schedule (e.g. longer time frames from call launch to submission to help build consortia) and infrastructure to support consortia building (e.g. networking tools and databases of interested researchers). Timing of calls should take into account difference in availability to dedicate time to develop proposals due to geographically different university and holiday calendars.

- EqUIP should look at how it could build on existing programmes and provide a legacy for the Symposia series by promoting researcher networks between the countries.

- Future EqUIP networking activities in India should consider engaging institutions beyond the dominant Delhi and Indian large city institutions in remote areas.

- EqUIP networking events in thematic areas could build wider stakeholder engagement.

**Supporting International Engagement of Early Career Researchers**

- Funding should be targeted mainly to researchers already holding a PhD. The projects should, however, involve early career researchers and provide them with the opportunity to gain experience and build networks through international collaboration.

- Proposals could be encouraged to include early career researchers, potentially with mentors in another country.

**Capacity Building Initiatives to Support Proposal Preparation**

- Learning and exchange initiatives could be considered through cost-effective e-learning platforms, virtual classrooms/skype, etc., as well as exchange schemes (for scholars and young teachers).

- Capacity-building activities could be considered by funders and national institutions (e.g. how to write a proposal for researchers less experienced in proposal writing).
### Thematic Development of Joint Funded Calls

- Research priorities should always be mutually decided and the process should involve different types of funder stakeholders.
- Although thematic priorities should reflect fundable areas of common interest for partners, development of joint initiatives should be informed by expert discussions around topics that represent the cutting edge areas of common strength and/or gaps in knowledge.
- The thematic areas for the calls need to be broad enough to attract high quality proposals but at the same time narrow enough to manage demand and to ensure timely implementation and sufficiently high success rate.
- Funding should be channelled to multidisciplinary social sciences and humanities projects and address the limited SSH collaboration to date, although being open to cross disciplinary. Inter-disciplinarity should be considered in the development of call text to ensure it is meaningful to social scientists and humanities researchers.
- Expert reviews of the state of different disciplines are a potential resource both nationally and internationally for strategic planning processes.
- Indian humanities funders have relatively narrow remits (ICHR and ICPR). Processes for development of thematic priorities need to be shaped by, or be able to accommodate these remits so that these organisations may fully participate (in funding a subsidiary element of a cross-disciplinary project, or in shaping a topic of a call).

### Recognition of Activity to Promote Influence/ Impact/ Knowledge Exchange

- Objectives of joint funding initiatives should be around enhancing excellent SSH Europe-India cooperation and support research to tackle societal challenges.
- Research projects should be funded because they are scientifically excellent, but mechanisms for funding should also recognise and support activities to engage non-expert and policy/practice stakeholders in the development and use of the research to foster policy and practical impact and influence – and should include mechanisms in joint funded activities to encourage researchers to evidence activities and their intended outcomes.
- EqUIP could include a joint activity amongst partners to share approaches to impact, influence and knowledge exchange to develop practice for future initiatives.

### Funding Mechanisms for Europe-India SSH Collaboration

- The planning of the scheme shall be based on a realistic and achievable budget, taking into account the limited resources for SSH research funding in many of the countries involved. In order to take into account the concrete situations of each partner, there is a need for flexibility when establishing common initiatives.
- Funding mechanisms should be designed to take account of the limited international engagement in the humanities to date.
- Several EqUIP partners can only fund research projects, since organisational mandates prevent them to fund other types of capacity building or networking/exchange activities. These remit differences mean that there is a need for variable geometry in the development of activities (not all partners must engage in every activity).
- Funding should be based on a virtual common pot model, in which each funding agency will fund its own successful participants within its own normal eligibility.
- European partners favoured pursuing contribution from the European Commission to make the collaboration more cost-effective and to facilitate wider participation.
- Contributions should be understood in terms of resource matching. Funders should be able to fund different elements of a project according to their organisational remit.
- Funders should look at ways in which funding joint calls may encourage the involvement of non-academic stakeholders. Public-private partnerships should also be encouraged.
- Initiatives could include funds for innovation, particularly if aimed at benefiting the most deprived groups’ well-being, prosperity, happiness and quality of life and focus on using and generating sustainable and renewable energy and resources.
- India and European institutions have different and sometimes conflicting processes when funding research. Gaining ethical approvals was given as an example, as Indian institutions do not usually have ethics committees.
- Non-academic researchers should be funded where possible in research proposals.
- Programmes should have enough duration (>2 years) for building sustainable cooperation.
- Funders should explore how complexities in gaining visa permissions to conduct collaborative research could be made simpler and less time-consuming.
Facilitate Data Access and Open Access Publication

- Investment in data infrastructure and access to data (e.g. digitisation of historical collections, longitudinal survey/ datasets) should be facilitated to support research able to take the long view in addressing global challenges. ICSSR and ICHR have a clear interest in developing data infrastructure. This may present some important areas for collaboration in the future where this aligns with European funders’ interests.

- Access to data infrastructure, open access to contents and mutual sharing of international data and information should be pursued through policy development around privacy, data security and intellectual property.

Evaluation/Peer Review Procedures

- Joint evaluation procedures should always be collectively agreed and grounded in independent peer review assessments, and decisions should always be taken on the basis of clear ranking of proposals by anonymous international independent peer review panels.

- In addition to research excellence, evaluation panels could consider aspects such as originality, added value of collaboration, innovative content, reasonable costs, action plan, compliance with programme objectives, activities to foster use and impact of research. Guidance for reviewers should be prepared to help in assessing value-for-money of projects.

- Evaluation panels could include multidisciplinary evaluation teams, experts who have successfully promoted innovations and specialists with broad views of methods.

- If demand proves high, a two-stage process may be preferable. A potential model to foster new collaborations could be a stage-gated approach (providing seed funding for a smaller project at first stage, which is then developed for application to full research projects). This, however, requires considerable commitment of funds over a longer period of time.

- The reporting requirements enforced by funding organisations should be kept to a minimum. Monitoring should focus on knowledge exchange and dissemination of project results, allowing for increased visibility for SSH.

Joint Learning Activities Between Partners

- Tacit knowledge is difficult to share, and therefore knowledge exchange, communication and sharing best practice are vital (staff exchange schemes and joint learning activities are models for building future collaboration inside EqUIP).

- Partners recognize the need for flexibility when establishing common initiatives. Staff exchange helps in building awareness and tolerance and aware of intercultural diversity and understanding the political situation of the other side.

- Further engagement of Associate Partners new to the platform, and for some, new to multi-lateral cooperation is needed.

Governance of Joint Initiatives

- It is necessary to agree on common purposes, to establish clear roles and responsibilities, and to develop transparent and inclusive methods for all of those involved, including any applicants. The value of time spent on relationship building and identifying common interests and a common purpose is part of the good experiences and should not be underestimated. As there is no binding legal framework between national funding agencies, consortium agreements are advised.

- Multilateral cooperation should build on an active and committed core group, which could be organised, for example, as a platform of funders or an SSH interest group. The core group should meet at least annually to exchange experiences and information on national policy developments, to discuss possible joint multilateral activities, and to ensure the sustainability of the collaboration.

- For managing possible joint calls, a secretariat should be established. The participating countries could take turns as a secretariat or the secretariat could be established with the financial support from the European Commission.

- A pilot joint call, possibly with a more limited scope, should be organised to facilitate learning and testing the structures and processes set up.

- Depending on the length of the evaluation process (and committed funding), joint calls should be organised annually or at least in regular intervals.

- A Europe-India core group is important, but EqUIP could consider opening up EqUIP to non-EU actors when considered appropriate.

- Commitment to the funding programme or a single call is a timing issue for many funding agencies. Establishing commitment to make the platform financially sustainable will need to be explored further.
Developing Proposals for a Pilot Joint Initiative

The Joint Learning workshop discussions suggested that partners were interested in the development of a multilateral funding scheme, as a concrete outcome for the platform activities. The development of such an outcome was crucial to maintain the commitment of partners in delivering the diverse and demanding timetable of activities. There were some outstanding differences amongst partners as to what such a scheme might look like. In particular, while some partners favoured a preliminary networking call as a first step, others wished to see the development of a joint call to support excellent and collaborative research projects. Other suggestions such as applying for EC funding and alignment with other platforms had also been proposed, but these will need further exploration.

The 4th Steering Committee meeting (October 2015) approved the establishment of a smaller working group of partners, called the ‘Funding Futures’ working group, in order to maintain momentum and direction from the Joint Learning Workshop in identifying key milestones and activities to develop a realistic timeline for post-EqUIP joint programming and consider funding sources and models. Meetings were held predominantly virtually and the following agencies were involved: AKA, ESRC, FCT, ICSSR, MISZ, NWO and RCN.

Seven main actions points had been identified in the JLW which guided the working group’s activities:

1. Define the funding models to be used
2. Define funding sources
3. Define partners
4. Form a core group/funders platform (define the structure of the core group, align objectives to EU/India research priorities)
5. Decide core group and call governance structure and administrative responsibilities
6. Define topic or theme
7. Define call rules, procedures and documents

The group agreed that the timing of the H2020 2018-20 work programme could delay the development of a pilot initiative funded with EC co-funding, and that there was a need for a clear sense from partners around their position to run a call with or without contribution from the European Commission. There was also a need for a clear sense of priorities in terms of the topic, type of funding and whether there was long term interest in alignment with other platforms. ICSSR and ESRC jointly conducted a survey of partners (February-March 2016), partly based on a similar survey conducted by Inno Indigo in the early days of its development and on the basis of discussion with the working group. The survey (Annex 2) was structured to explore views on:

1. Participation in a pilot joint call with/without European Commission funding;
2. Participation in other research collaboration initiatives and alignment with other international thematic collaborative network;
3. Future of EqUIP.

All partners (with the exception of ZSI and APRE, which are not funding organizations) plus ICPR and UGC completed the questionnaire. The results of the survey were collated by ICSSR and analysed by ESRC and formed the basis of discussions at the 5th Steering Committee meeting (Hague, April 2016) to shape agreements, without suggestion of commitment at this stage, as to the kind of initiative that they would be interested in exploring and to decide a remit for the Funding Futures working Group to develop proposals further. The outcomes of these discussions were as follows.

Negotiating the development of a multi-lateral initiative

The survey results enabled a transparent process of decision-making, in particular establishing that in principle European funding could proceed without EC funds. As Indian participants cannot be funded under Horizon 2020, the issue of whether or not partners could proceed without EC funding was largely an issue for European funders. Although the European funders would have preferred to have EC funding in the future to co-fund projects and/or to contribute to coordination costs, the survey suggested that partners were interested and able, in principle, to participate in a pilot call solely with national funds (i.e. without EC funding). The survey also confirmed that there was potential for an initiative to be launched as early as 2017.

The survey also established a clear preference amongst partners for a joint call for research projects. Although some partners were interested in funding further joint workshops/seminars/conferences, networking between research centres, new uses of data and/or digital resources and other smaller scale networking activities, there were a number of partners who were unable to fund such activities, and they were considered to represent a continuation of existing levels of engagement with India, rather than representing a step up in collaboration. The need to include networking, and particularly consortia-building opportunities in the call was also recognised. For this reason, the ESRC initially proposed a stage-gated call by which a networking call could run and deliver small projects building collaborative networks and applying at second stage for research projects. While it may represent a model for other calls, this was not feasible for the Indian partner as it would have required a considerable outlay of budget that was not available at this time. Nor would all European funders have been able to consider this model. A simpler model of a call for research projects only was therefore agreed to be developed.

The survey also indicated that partners preferred a virtual pot model (i.e. each country funding their own researchers according to their usual eligibility criteria) in the absence of EC funding or other top up funding, although where there would be more than one national funder involved, the corresponding partners may agree a common pot for their country for simplicity. There were concerns that without top-up funding from the EC this could present significant problems for countries with smaller research communities in justifying their engagement to their boards (given likely low spend) and potentially blocking by partners with smaller budgets during funding decision-making. This agreement to virtual pot and variable geometry (partners would choose whether or not to join the call rather than unanimous participation) gave the platform maximum flexibility, although this model presents some challenges for platform coordination going forward, to which we return below.

The survey also suggested that most partners had a preference for a single theme for a call for proposals to manage demand. However, there were some considerable differences of opinion amongst partners who highlighted concerns that this could be too narrow and limit facilitation of collaboration between the best consortia of researchers. However, for many partners, European and Indian, a thematic focus was important for Ministerial/Board approval to fund and demand management. As demand was an unknown in a pilot with challenging consortia building
requirements, there was general consensus that more than one strand to be explored with cross-disciplinary themes that would cover both the Social Sciences and the Humanities could be a good compromise way forward. This was based on the precedent of this approach in the early days of the development of HERA. It was agreed that the Symposia series outlined in Chapter 2 would be a legitimate basis on which to develop a call based on expert insights. However, only the first of these events had been held by this point in call discussions. The survey suggested that the most preferred topics amongst partners were from three of these symposia events: ‘Inequalities, growth and place/space Inequality’, ‘Sustainable prosperity, well-being and innovation’ and ‘Social transformations, cultural expressions, cross-cultural connections and dialogue’. While there was a relatively clear preference for ‘Inequalities, growth and place/space’, it was agreed that the Funding Futures working group would develop proposals for a joint call in light of the discussions at these three symposia events – in particular drawing out themes that were prioritised from them in the Summary Symposium, once these had taken place.

In the light of the discussions at the Steering Committee in April 2016, it was agreed that proposals for an initiative would be developed with the following guidelines:

1. That the pilot call would be developed assuming that only national funds would be available
2. A virtual pot would be the funding model in the absence of Commission funding or other top up funding, although where there is more than one national funder involved, these partners may wish to agree common pot for their country for simplicity
3. The pilot call would include more than one strand with cross-disciplinary themes that cover both the Social Sciences and the Humanities to manage demand and enable excellent collaborations to be funded
4. The Funding Futures working group would develop proposals for a pilot call for discussion with partners in the light of the symposia, potentially drawing out cross-cutting elements
5. It was generally agreed that the Spring 2017 showcasing event could be a challenging deadline but broadly feasible as a pre-call announcement.

The agreement to develop a call for research projects is a significant step forward for SSH collaboration with India, and specifically with ICSSR, as this will be the first such multi-lateral call with India, with a requirement that the shape of any prospective consortia would need to include a minimum of 2 European countries and 1 Indian institution. To facilitate this major initiative, ESRC offered to administer the secretariat for this call in kind. The participation of ICSSR in this joint initiative was announced in Delhi in March 2017 shortly before this report went to print. Details of this call will be available in the Summer of 2017.

**Implications of the Pilot Development for the Future of the Platform**

With the agreement to develop a call, partners entered into more detailed agreements on specific terms, process, procedures and funding that will not be detailed here. However, three issues in particular were highlighted that have some potential implications for the future of the platform.

The first of these issues is around the differences in understanding and approach to asking researchers to take steps to engage research users/possible beneficiaries and increase the use, influence and impact of their research. Funders have some differences in ethos, understanding and willingness to incorporate these considerations into calls for funding. This is not unique to EqUIP but it presents some challenges for collaboration with other types of funders, such as private/philanthropic funders, who would generally require tangible outcomes for the beneficiaries or users of the research findings. There would be value in partners sharing their understandings, approaches and practice in this area as the platform goes forward with a view to developing shared approaches in multi-lateral collaboration through EqUIP, and potentially other multi-lateral platforms.

The second of these issues is around the achievement of a balance of funding for joint initiatives where the call is intended to facilitate Indian collaboration with several European countries, therefore requiring Indian partners to fund every funded project – their budget determining the number of projects that can be funded – while competition may be such that some European countries with smaller research communities may not spend the budget they allocate. The far stronger links between the UK research community with India than other European countries (highlighted in Chapter 1 Figure 4) is also potentially problematic if UK budgets are used up faster than other partners as funders work their way down the ranked list of peer reviewed projects, or this dominance is off-putting for other partners with large research communities who would thereby anticipate lower success rates than their bilateral arrangements. This may suggest the need for a strategic and coordinated approach to expansion of the platform and development of initiatives to ensure a good balance between resource commitment and success rates, necessary for longer term participation, and to avoid competing for limited Indian resources.

The third related issue has been the limited engagement of humanities funders in the joint funding call. This does not reflect the interest of Indian humanities funders in the platform, but potentially reflects some internal changes in those organisations during the period and their limited remits and budgets. Co-publication data presented in Chapter 1 also suggests that their networks of researchers are weaker than between social scientists. This may suggest that activities focussed around humanities collaboration, at the scale of networking activities, and more suited to current humanities funders budgets, might be a preliminary step to strengthening Indian humanities collaboration, particularly outside the UK.

These challenges of balancing the platform are likely to be ongoing and will require a strategic approach to addressing them. Chapter 4 will begin to outline some directions in which the Platform may consider developing its activities based on these joint learning activities and on the pilot, as well as on the basis of its thematic priorities and better understanding of the funding landscape.
### Key findings

- Europe-India multilateral research cooperation will require adaptation to the SSH funding landscape in India as well as Europe. Time spent on relationship building and identifying common interests and common purposes should not be underestimated.

- Staff exchange schemes and joint learning activities are models for building future collaboration inside EqUIP.

- EqUIP partners are interested in the development of a multilateral funding scheme as a concrete outcome for the platform activities, even if EC funding is not available.

- Most partners prefer a joint call for research projects as a pilot initiative.

- Networking activities should also be considered, namely where relationships and researcher networks are weaker.

- Collaboration with other types of funders, such as private/philanthropic funders, and with other multilateral platforms should be prepared in the near future namely to tackle the handicap in terms of humanities funding mechanisms.

- Mechanisms aimed to achieve matching resource efforts in the European and Indian sides are needed, as a means to avoid excessive competition for limited Indian resources.

- Impact, influence, innovation and knowledge exchange should also play a major role in future funding initiatives.

- Access to data infrastructure, open access to contents and mutual sharing of international data and information should be pursued.
Chapter 4: Consolidating and Developing a Sustainable Model for Europe-India SSH Collaboration

The following chapter brings together reflections from Chapters 1 to 3 and exploration of other activities to strengthen Europe-India collaboration to outline some of the challenges for the development of the platform going forward. The negotiation of the EqUIP Pilot call described in Chapter 3 has, in particular, brought into relief a number of challenges for multi-lateral SSH collaboration between Europe and India in balancing the financial contribution to joint initiatives where there are multiple countries engaged on one side and only one on the other. While this challenge would be surmountable with large and coordinated SSH research budgets for international collaboration on the Indian side, this presents some particular challenges going forward for EqUIP given the limited and fragmented Indian funding environment for SSH, particularly for the humanities. Nevertheless the success of the platform in securing agreement to fund the first Europe-India multi-lateral call for SSH research projects is testament to the motivation of partners to facilitate greater collaboration between these two strong research communities.

Moreover the two coordinating organisations, ESRC and ICSSR, have agreed to continue to coordinate the platform without EC funding for a further 2 years (EqUIP Phase2) which speaks to the mutual strategic interest in strengthening the relationships between them and other funders, and in consolidating the platform and supporting it in going forward. The coordination of a multi-lateral platform is, nonetheless, expensive in terms of internal staff resources and the strategic benefits and likely outcomes need to be in balance with the costs. This is as true for wider partner engagement, in committing their resources to the platform, actual and/or in kind, and strategic interests and issues vary considerably amongst existing partners. Going forward the platform will need to consider the current balance between the strategic benefits to partners (and to the research communities they represent) and the costs to those engaged, if it is to find a sustainable model for multilateral collaboration. In particular it will need to explore how these issues might influence decisions around how to shape the activities and membership of the platform. The first part of this chapter will therefore outline some directions in which the platform could work in terms of expansion of membership, development of activities and influencing Europe-India SSH research collaboration over the next two years. These were discussed in Brussels at a workshop of partners and interested funders prior to the EqUIP Steering Committee, in April 2017. The Chapter will then consider the possible directions for the platform over the medium to long term beyond EqUIP Phase 2.

**EqUIP Phase 2: Developing a Strategic Approach to Expansion of the Platform**

**Balancing Strategic Benefits and Administrative Costs**

A decision whether or not to take part, and how actively, in a multi-lateral activity is likely to depend on a variety of different factors for different funders at different times. Nevertheless any judgement whether to engage and to what extent is, in most situations, likely to be based on judgements of the probable strategic benefits for the funder/academic community they represent versus the administrative costs to the organisation in taking part. This section reflects very broadly on how these have shaped the EqUIP platform to date and might shape its development in terms of membership going forward.

**Coordination: Sharing the Benefits and Costs**

For Indian coordinating partners there are some clear economies of scale in multi-lateral collaboration, one activity/process facilitating engagement with researchers in many countries, with a good balance of spend-to-effort as every project funded would have Indian funding. The commitment of ICSSR has been vital to the outcomes for EqUIP. Nevertheless, large funding initiatives require considerable programme spend to enable sufficient projects to be funded for success rates to be acceptable to participating European funders. This clearly puts a strain on resources, potentially forcing hard decisions to be made in other areas unless further funds can be secured.

Similarly for the ESRC, undertaking the coordination and secretariat delivery, the administrative costs need to be outweighed by the strategic benefits in terms of relationship building and leadership in call development, and the likely success rate of its academic community and spend. While a pilot might be considered an investment in the long term development of EqUIP, a sustainable model for secretariat provision and coordination of the platform is likely to rebalance some of those costs through actual contributions and/or provision of in-kind resource from partners. The variable geometry model adopted in the pilot provides hugely beneficial flexibility, but increases the risks to the coordinator, as it increases the administrative hurdles to contributing to coordination costs (as not all partners can contribute to administrative costs if not participating in a call).

In return, it is important that the benefits that come with leading activities, and from greater direct collaboration through development of an activity, are shared with wider partners through a governance and work package structure that ensures partners work directly with one another rather than always through coordinating organisations. The introduction of Working Groups during EqUIP to date has been beneficial in this respect and is likely to be worthwhile going forward.

**Strategic Coordination: Larger Funders/Larger Research Communities**

Similarly for partners of the platform the strategic benefits will generally need to outweigh the costs of participation in the governance of the platform as well as the activities it undertakes. These judgements of costs/benefits will depend considerably on the partner. Where there is an imbalance in funding (several countries but a small number of projects to be funded), success rates could be judged likely to be too low compared to the likely administrative costs of engaging in a call. There are also risks that these costs may be higher in a pilot call where partners are not familiar with all the procedures. Where research networks
are already relatively strong, bilateral activities may, in such circumstances, be judged preferable. Once established, and costs/procedures judged reasonable, the multi-lateral benefits of the calls may begin to outweigh these issues if the balance of funding on the Indian side is balanced sufficiently to ensure acceptable success rates for all funders. Given the breadth of topic of the pilot, and unknown demand, it has been useful in these respects that the larger funders/larger SSH research communities from Germany and Netherlands did not take part in the pilot call, although of course EqUIP may wish to aim for their greater participation in the future.

Equally, there may be a need for partners to share greater information about bilateral and other initiatives, to facilitate greater strategic coordination between funders and to ensure that European partners are not competing for limited Indian funds. While partners may wish to retain a mixed portfolio of activities with India, there may be a need, as trust between organisations grows, to coordinate activities in order to ensure that bilateral activities do not always limit the ability of Indian partners to commit sufficient funds to support acceptable success rates through a multi-lateral mechanism.

Smaller Spenders/Smaller Research Communities: Widening the Benefits and Spreading the Costs
While this is a simplification, the more limited networks of smaller SSH communities with India also make multi-lateral mechanisms high cost, relative to likely success rates. Nevertheless they can also be attractive in providing mechanisms that can be joined with minimal administrative resource commitment, particularly in a variable geometry scenario, allowing decisions whether to participate to be more ad hoc. The engagement of funders with smaller SSH research communities is, for these reasons, likely to be easier once a joint funding call is being negotiated. While there is a trade off in influence, this allows potentially ‘small spenders’ to participate at minimum cost. Where existing networks with India, and demand from their research community, is unknown, this is likely to be particularly attractive.

Variable geometry, in this respect, provides an opportunity to further engage European funders in calls – increasing the strategic benefits of multi-lateral engagement. Wider engagement also increases the potential funding imbalance between European and Indian funders. There will be a need to evaluate the way this could be managed in future calls in the light of the learning from the call delivery.

Variable geometry also creates some considerable problems for sharing the benefits and costs of coordination of the platform such as future call development/administration. There is a risk that such funders may join a call with limited commitment to the platform, which could mean an unwillingness to undertake activities in kind or to contribute to costs. Equally, however, a larger pool of funders could reduce the potential for burn out. Particularly in the wake of delivery of the large number of events for the EqUIP Coordination and Support Action there may be some benefit in engagement of new funders who wish to take an active role where other funders may have committed considerable resource to date and wish to step back slightly. There would be advantage in increasing the strategic benefits of commitment by actively engaging such new partners in Phase 2 and identifying partners likely to have strong demand from their research community for SSH collaboration with India. To date, scoping work through a survey has not proved successful as a means of identifying interest, but co-publication data and other informal networks have generated new links that are currently being explored.

Developing a sustainable model for multi-lateral collaboration
The next phase of EqUIP will need to establish a sustainable model for collaboration for partners, in particular for those partners leading the coordination of the platform. ESRC proposed a model to the Steering Committee in October 2016 that suggested a potential membership contribution from partners to administration costs of the platform. This presented problems for some partners unable to pay such costs if not taking part in a call. Partners accepted the case for contribution but a number of partners cannot fund administration costs if not associated with clear deliverables, such as a secretariat. Furthermore, a clear work programme could justify payment for some organisations, but not all. Where partners are not taking part in calls this presents a significant hurdle for the platform. If call secretariats were hosted by a separate partner from the coordinator this again would create the same problems. The next phase will need to establish a mode of collaboration that ensures that a variable geometry platform is financially and strategically sustainable. Initial discussions have established that a membership fee for the platform is unlikely to be acceptable if out of proportion to likely spend. A small contribution may argue in favour of a larger membership for the platform, subject to addressing the concerns around limited commitment outlined above. Nevertheless there may be a need for some partners to be able to play a peripheral role at times, but to stay engaged in the platform where their resources are stretched. There may be opportunities to learn from other platforms addressing similar issues of stabilising and sustaining platforms once EC funding has come to an end, such as Inno Indigo and the Trans-Atlantic Platform.

The offer from ESRC and ICSSR to coordinate the platform ‘in kind’, without actual cost contributions from partners, gives in effect the platform some time to develop and agree a sustainable model going forward. This will form part of the work plan for Phase 2, alongside other activities to consolidate and strengthen the sustainability of the platform.

Possible Activities Focus during EqUIP Phase 2
The main focus of EqUIP Phase 2 will be the implementation of the pilot Joint Call (Chapter 3), which has been in preparation for the past year by the Funding Futures working group. The call has been pre-launched at the two EqUIP showcasing events, in the spring (March and April) of 2017, but its full implementation (including the submission and evaluation procedures, the funding decisions and procedures, both at consortium and national level, and the monitoring of the funded projects) will extend beyond the lifetime of the first stage of the platform.

ESRC has agreed to provide the secretariat in kind to facilitate the delivery of the call but the challenge of sustainability without EC funding is an urgent matter for EqUIP partners, to provide the foundations for development of future calls building on the development of the thematic priorities outlined in Chapter 2 and to continue to build on this foundation to strengthen Europe-India SSH research cooperation. In the Funding Futures questionnaire to partners (outlined in Chapter 3) a number of partners expressed a willingness, in principle, to consider delivering a future secretariat and tasks/work packages, and there was some support for the suggestion of a rotating secretariat, but the terms of such an arrangement would need
to be developed. The survey suggested that, at that stage of the platform development, most partners favoured EqUIP branded activities, at least in the short-term. One significant activity over the next two years could therefore be the development of a follow-on call from the pilot.

**Development of a Follow-on joint EqUIP research project call**

Throughout EqUIP, partners have expressed a preference for EC ERA-NET Co-fund top-up funding to facilitate a joint call. Partners agreed at the 6th Steering Committee meeting to explore the feasibility of proposing such funding to the Commission within the Challenge 6 Horizon 2018-20 Work Programme, under the theme ‘Forced Migration, Conflict Resolution and Peace building’, given large scale forced displacement in the region, in the past and ongoing, contributing to understanding of the current European crisis and drawing on international expertise around the longer term challenges ahead. There were a number of technical issues on which the platform needed clarification before making such a proposal, during which correspondence the Commission informed the Platform Coordinators that actions with third countries (outside Europe) were not at that time being prioritised under the draft work programme. This prevents EqUIP from securing EC funding for a follow-on call in 2020, unless future opportunities are presented. However, there are some potential opportunities for alignment between the EqUIP research priorities and H2020 Challenge 6, particularly around those identified in Chapter 2 around: ‘Conflict and conflict resolutions and how they travel(led) across India and Europe’ and ‘Implications of migration in Europe and India (benefits, flows, diasporic engagement)’, and ‘The critical relationship between education and social policy (private-public sector, teacher’s education, role of the state, ideology, migration)’. Migrations are a particular topic of common concern for the EU and India that should be carefully considered by the International Cooperation Unit for possible direct funding of Indian partners. Furthermore, an expansion of the focus context for comparison and collaboration with South Asia/India and South East Asia seems vital for the achievement of the goals and rationale of Horizon 2020. Given the strength of the research community but the restrictions in SSH budgets and the time needed for negotiation with Ministries, the platform recommends consideration of an exception to fund Indian researchers on such topics. This has been fed through to the Challenge 6 Programme Committee.

There remains an important role for EqUIP partners in keeping this communication open with the Commission in the medium term should such opportunities arise in future and in particular in the discussions of the next Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development. Nevertheless current Commission policy suggests that planning to develop a follow-on call without co-funding in the short term to be most realistic. There are also a number of potential avenues that the platform could consider in addition to instead of a follow-on ICSSR/ European research funding call.

**Strengthening Collaboration in the Arts and Humanities**

While ICSSR had both the international cooperation experience and the mandate to participate in a joint funding call, their Indian humanities counterparts have proved less able in terms of funding remit and budget and resources to participate in negotiations to develop the pilot call. While the engagement of Indian humanities funders in the platform has been initiated, there is a clear need to explore how to further involve these partners in the platform, on a more active footing than heretofore and potentially in rather different activities than a large research project funding call. As Chapter 1 indicated, the platform activities going forward need to be sensitive to the restrictions in the funding environment for humanities in the Indian research funding environment and explore both the extent to which Indian humanities funders could collaborate at a national level to fund a multi-lateral activity, and/or what kind of funding initiative represents a realistic opportunity. In particular, limited budgets and remits might suggest some narrower networking and exchange activities in the humanities, rather than research calls at this stage.

EqUIP has been successful in encouraging the Indian Council for Philosophical Research (ICPR) and the Indian Council for Historical Research (ICHR) to join the platform as Associate Partners. In Phase 2, there may be opportunities to further engage these funders, and potentially other governmental stakeholders such as the Ministry of Culture, in the development of a humanities activity. There may also be opportunities to engage Indian arts and humanities funders beyond governmental funders. The Indian Foundation for the Arts has already been engaged in the platform and other private/philanthropic funders could be approached to explore interests. In addition, there may be regional governments in India with an interest in such activities. A first step for the platform could be to try to bring these various humanities stakeholders together with European funders to explore the interest and challenges/opportunities for collaboration in the arts and humanities, not only cross-nationally but also cross-sector.

The Funding Futures survey, described in Chapter 3, suggested some partners were in favour of small scale funding as a first step to stronger collaboration. It also revealed, however, that a considerable number of the current European platform funders did not fund networking and exchange activities, which could present some barriers to the development of such smaller scale activities amongst current partners. To undertake such activities, there may be a need for the platform to widen its membership for incorporating additional European organisations that are able to fund networking and other smaller scale activities in order to undertake a humanities-focused action.

**Exploring Cross-Sector and/or Cross-Disciplinary Funding Partners**

The limitations of Indian SSH funding environment beg the question of whether the Platform should explore the potential to establish closer links with other Indian funders beyond SSH, and possibly other sources of funding to facilitate a larger number of projects to be funded. Without assuming what these projects could look like, there are two key sectors with whom the platform could consider beginning to build links – the Science, Technology and Innovation funders in India, and private/philanthropic funders. Chapter 1 highlighted the increasing role of the latter in the Indian research funding environment and the emerging cross-disciplinary strengths within the Indian research communities. There may be opportunities to explore SSH-led cross-disciplinary issues through MHRD’s engagement with IMPRINT. ICSSR has also had some collaborative activity with ICMR which may provide a useful precedent should there be interests in common. While DST and other Indian STI funders cannot currently fund SSH-led research, there may be scope to begin conversations for exploring their interests in cross-disciplinary research where an SSH perspective may strengthen research outcomes.
The complexities of establishing such conversations or activities may be such that the next two years may be spent in developing such a proposal with a funder and it may be useful for such a work-stream to begin with an exploration of the feasibility of such collaborations. The Steering Committee may wish to express a preference as to proposed directions, or ask for first steps to establish a more feasible direction depending on possible partner interest and synergies of interest.

**Strategic alignment with Other Multi-Lateral Platforms**

The Funding Futures working group began to explore whether partners would have an interest in exploring alignment with other multi-lateral SSH funding mechanisms, particularly in the medium to long term. The survey of partners described in Chapter 3 suggested only limited interest in short-term explorations of activities with other funding platforms (e.g. JPI Urban Europe, Inno Indigo, NORFACE/HERA) compared to an EqUIP branded activity. But alignment – in terms of thematic interest and research collaboration policy and practice – remains a potential direction for collaborations in the future. Not all partners are currently engaged in all these platforms, but membership may not be necessary and, once experienced in multi-lateral mechanisms, Indian partners could consider engagement outside of an EqUIP activity in the longer term.

Any third country can in principle participate in the co-funded calls of ERA-Nets and JPIs as well as in other related activities. Depending on the interest, the third countries can participate in the calls or have a more strategic role in the instruments and collaborate in setting the agenda for the instrument.

Among the thematic ERA-Nets, HERA and NORFACE operate in the field of SSH; among the JPIs, this applies to the Urban Europe, More Years Better lives and Cultural Heritage initiatives. There are already experiences in Indian participation in JPIs: India has currently participated in an international call for proposals with the Belmont Forum and JPI-Climate: Climate predictability and Inter-Regional Linkage. See Annex 3 for descriptions of these mechanisms.

Several European EqUIP partners (AHRC, AKA, ANR, ESRC, FCT, MI2S, NWO and RCN) (associate partners (CAS) and observers (IRC, NCN, SNSF) are either part of the HERA or NORFACE partnerships or of both, which may facilitate longer-term alignment/cooperation. Both networks are exploring international opportunities and EqUIP could potentially provide a means to build connections with India. Like HERA and NORFACE, JPI Urban Europe is exploring international opportunities and EqUIP could potentially provide a mechanism for such engagement with India, with very closely aligned thematic priorities.

Although joint calls and projects funded under the Indigo initiatives are oriented towards S&T areas of research and do not fund Social Sciences and/or Humanities led topics, the Indigo projects have been in close contact with EqUIP partners as a source of shared learning (the findings from New Indigo, SI House and Inno Indigo) have been presented in the Scoping Report (D2.1), as well as in the Joint Learning Report (D2.3) and workshop. Inno Indigo’s coordinator attended the 5th meeting of the EqUIP Steering Committee in April 2016 and ESRC attended Inno Indigo Funders Group. Some of the EqUIP partners (APRE, DLR, FCT, RCN, CAS and ZSI) are already part of one or both of the Indigo projects. However, there has been little engagement between Indian partners involved in EqUIP and Inno Indigo. This is also true of the Indian Ministry of Earth Sciences (MOES), which is a member of the Belmont Forum, although there is some overlap in European partners (DFG, NWO and RCN). There may be considerable benefits for these platforms in sharing learning around engagement in multi-lateral mechanisms between Indian participants.

**The Future of EqUIP: short-term, medium-term and long-term actions**

Partners have expressed a desire for EqUIP to continue to meet and develop joint activities. Without funding from the EC, the platform now enters a new phase both in terms of developing a self-sustaining financial model for its continuation and in shaping its future configuration and activities. The period over the next two years is likely to be focused on consolidation of relationships, delivery of the pilot joint call and shaping the platform in terms of its membership and activities to ensure its longer term sustainability. The work programme for the platform will be developed in collaboration with partners and will be led by partners’ strategic interests and expertise and likely to be focussed around the development of proposals for specific funding initiative(s). We would also envisage an important element of EqUIP’s development, both at shorter and longer term, will be in expanding the membership of the platform.

In the longer term (3-5 years) exploring further synergies and funding opportunities in association with other networks and platforms –such as HERA, NORFACE and JPI Urban Europe could provide an effective rationalisation of collaborative mechanisms and widen their international scope. Alignment with Inno Indigo could result in cross-disciplinary collaborations between the platforms. Such activities are however predicated on successfully establishing mechanisms or relationships with funders that could provide sufficient funding for reasonably balanced multi-lateral initiatives.

Also in the medium term, there is a clear incentive to consider initiating the dialogue with non-governmental funders in India that could provide funding for SSH research activities. Engagement of these organisations presents challenges in terms of working cross-sector and would be likely focussed around research with social impact around a thematic policy-relevant theme.

The main challenge for international collaboration with government humanities funders in India is the relatively small scale and distinct remits of these organisations, which currently restrict their international engagement. However, there remains considerable potential for ongoing, longer term dialogue with these organisations, particularly if their practice develops at a national level to facilitate greater cross-disciplinary working. At a policy, rather than funder, level it may be worth exploring the possibility of engaging in activities to establish collaborative relationships between Indian and European data services (e.g. CESSDA, CLARIN, DARIAH). This might mean other funders investing in digitisation or collaborating on new or improved data storage and security practices over the longer term.

Long term actions (5 to 10 years) are harder to predict. The commitment to International Cooperation and SSH in the next Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development will be influential in providing an environment for EC-supported Europe-India SSH Collaboration.
Developing an India international ‘interest group’, aiming at the development of sustainable, multilateral research collaboration without EC funding, should be considered. The interest group could launch collaborative funding initiatives and share experiences of collaboration. This could facilitate engagement of European countries without an existing STI agreement to open dialogue, learn from other country’s experiences and to potentially foster cross-disciplinary collaboration. This model has been implemented for example in the case of European interest groups on Korea\textsuperscript{41} and Japan\textsuperscript{42} following up on prior ERA-Net experiences.
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Annex 1: Outcomes of the five EqUIP symposia series

The identified priority themes and key research subthemes for each one of the five broad initial thematic areas are presented below and described in more detail in the corresponding symposia Reflection Papers.

### Inequalities, Growth and Place/Space

Thematic sessions were dedicated to each one of the main topics described above. These included plenary addresses and parallel group focused discussions for the identification of key subthemes which were afterwards prioritized by the participants. Some overlaps and linkages were identified among the three thematic areas, i.e. some of the sub-themes for each of the thematic areas can be connected to different areas. Both Social Sciences and Humanities perspectives are visible and replicated in the themes, where a wide variety of disciplines (History, Geography, Sociology, Anthropology, Economy, Culture etc.) can be identified. Exploring these research themes implies pursuing an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research agenda with a wider scope in reflecting on our own epistemological, ontological and methodological assumptions and contexts for understanding growth, inequality and place/space through their diverse dimensions.

**Priority themes and key research subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration:**

1. **Growth and Inequality**
   - a. Diverse Meanings/Concepts of growth
   - b. Relationship between Education and Social policy
   - c. Relationship between Social policy and Inequality

2. **Economic Growth and Discrimination**
   - d. Changing relations between the State and Citizens
   - e. Social Dynamics of Discrimination
   - f. State and Public Goods

3. **Urbanisation, Migration and Cultural Heritage**
   - g. Urbanization and Inequality
   - h. Cultural Heritage and its Preservation

### Digital Archives and Databases as a Source of Mutual Knowledge

Thematic sessions were organised around three groups: ‘Research and technological infrastructures supporting facilitated access and sharing in SSH’, ‘Digitizing (Multi) Cultural Heritage’ and ‘New digital research methods for SSH in a digitalized world’. Cross-cutting issues derived from the different group discussions were identified. A final selection of priorities from each group was then presented and discussed during a final plenary session where the common potential research themes for future Europe-India collaboration were decided.

**Priority themes and key research subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration:**

1. **Enabling Data Sharing and Promotion**
   - a. Expand formal Policy frameworks for data sharing across the data access spectrum, from open to controlled data
   - b. Critical studies on data collections
   - c. Survey, mapping and identification of major gaps of digital datasets, existing projects and centres of excellence to promote wider availability of data

2. **Data Retrieval and Repurposing**
   - d. Create new data through data retrieval and digitisation e.g. repurposing and encoding existing data to exploit new knowledge to better understand social phenomena and tackle societal challenges (for example: tracking migration and displacement flows using administrative data or; exploiting historical sources of data to capture and monitor environmental change) Intangible heritage of Delhi, holistic approach
   - e. Understanding the opportunities and quality of national and localised administrative data sources to create high quality socio-economic indicators at sub-national level

   - f. Create a shared knowledge database on techniques and tools for processing and analysing data

4. **Good data management practices**
   - g. Promote digital literacy to foster a knowledge society by uplifting professional skills in the area of data collection, management and use of data, including soft skills linked to assessing opportunities and limitations of big data

5. **Data Curation Infrastructure Best Practices**
   - h. Best practices in curating and providing continued access to large-scale sustainable digital archives
Sustainable Prosperity, Wellbeing and Innovation

Priority themes and key research subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration:

1. **Education and Innovation**
   - Education for sustainable development
   - Comparative research of institutional set-ups of education and practices of pedagogy in the EU countries and India (including politics and ideology)
   - Changing the political economy of education

2. **Health, Wellbeing and Innovation**
   - Health system responses to sustainable development goals
   - Social determinants of health and well-being
   - (Smart) health governance (national and global)

3. **Sustainable Prosperity and Innovation**
   - Political economy of innovation for sustainable prosperity and well-being
   - Imagining (socio-economic and political) futures - with two subthemes:
     - Resource conservation with social innovations for equal opportunities
     - Sustainable livelihoods, (social) innovation and design

Plenary addresses and topical working group sessions were dedicated to each one of the main topics described above. The larger overlapping themes brought to the groups and potential focus areas were identified and a synthesis of proposed research priorities was selected for each topic. In one session participants were also asked to imagine a research funding scheme incorporating the research priorities discussed in the previous sessions using the World Café method.

Social Transformations, Cultural Expressions, Cross-Cultural Connections and Dialogue

Priority themes and key research subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration:

1. **Historical, economic, social, political and religious linkages between Europe and India across time and space**
2. **Cross-cultural communication and creative expression**
3. **Migration, Diaspora and cultural diversity**

The academic participants discussed these three broad priority themes and identified the following sub-thematic priorities:

- Multiple routes to modernity
- Governance: architecture, mechanisms and engagement
- Understanding alternative voices and perspectives of creative expressions

Three thematic sessions were held, which covered the above listed research topics. These included plenary addresses and parallel group focused discussions. During the final plenary session of the symposium, participants were asked to reflect on the research areas identified on the group discussions, with the aim of prioritising key questions and subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration in SSH to be taken forward by the EqUIP partners and funders.

Power Structures, Conflict Resolution and Social Justice

Priority themes and key research subthemes for future Europe-India research collaboration:

1. **Social justice, power and identity**
2. **Gender and conflict**
3. **Peace and conflict resolution**

Under the priority themes discussed above the symposium identified five key research priorities for future Europe-India research collaboration within the topics of this symposium, taking into consideration both disciplines – Social Sciences and Humanities. These priorities were:

- Reinventing the Community: Politics and Belonging in India and Europe
- Rethinking Statehood, Citizenship and the Social Contract in India and Europe
- Social Justice, New Movements and Political Alternatives
- Global Challenges and Local Scenarios: Contesting the «Traditional»
- Gender Inter-sectionalism: The Changing Nature of Gender Relations in India and Europe

Three thematic sessions were organised, one for each of the topics under discussion, including keynote addresses and World Café discussions. Syntheses of challenges and opportunities from each of the sessions were identified and presented to the audience. This was followed by two cross-cutting open space sessions, designed to identify and formulate key research priorities in the topics of the symposium of mutual interest for future collaborative research initiatives between India and Europe in SSH. The final goal of the exercise was to vote and select five top research priorities among a number of recommendations proposed by the symposium participants.
Annex 2: Funding Futures Working Group

Funders Questionnaire

The Europe-India Platform (EqUIP) for the Social Sciences and Humanities brings together research funding and support organisations in Europe and India in order to develop a stronger strategic partnership for multi-lateral research collaboration.

The Platform has convened a working group of EqUIP funding partners to develop feasible proposals for joint funding initiatives. The working group has agreed that the symposia series is important in guiding decision-making for a Strategic Research Agenda in the longer term but there is a need to push forward pilot activities using national funds (given Commission funding timelines and some initial steps needed to establish the legal framework for cooperation between India and the European Commission). This work includes:

1. **Long Term (throughout 2016):** To lay the groundwork for future negotiation with the Commission around possible ERA-NET Co-fund initiatives by exploring the steps to establish a legal framework for cooperation between the European Commission and the Ministry of Human Resources and Development which funds Social Science and Humanities research in India.
   a. The working group will also be exploring synergies with other EU funding mechanisms where there are opportunities for funding and support in lobbying for Commission funding.

2. **Short term:** developing proposals for a pilot call without Commission funding to be presented at the EqUIP Steering Committee April 2016.

3. **Commission funding** to be presented at the EqUIP Steering Committee April 2016.

To inform the development of the proposals of a pilot call we need a clearer understanding of the position of existing EqUIP partners to run a call for research collaboration in social sciences and humanities without contribution from the Commission, and what shape that call might need to take to enable partners to participate. Please respond to this short series of questions by March 1st 2016.

**The Survey is structured to explore views on:**
A. Participation in a Pilot Joint Call Without Commission Funding
B. Participation in other research collaboration initiatives and alignment with other international thematic collaboration networks
C. Future of EqUIP

**Section A. Participation in a Pilot Joint Call Without Commission Funding**

1. **Ability to participate in a pilot call without Commission funding.**

   Please state whether your funding organisation
   • is highly interested and wants to participate
   • is less interested but might still participate
   • does not want to participate at all
   in a joint international call without the participation of the European Commission? (subject to answers in following questions)
   within the following financial years (begin April – end March)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Highly interested and wants to participate</th>
<th>Less interested but might still participate</th>
<th>No interest to participate at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 2016-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 2018-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Are there any particular circumstances that might prevent your organization from participating or facilitate participation in a call without Commission funding? *No*

   Given responses above what level of financial contribution do you envisage would be possible to commit to a call without Commission funding in the financial years identified above. This of course is not binding but we would like as accurate a picture as possible on which to make proposals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>Amount in Euros</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Would this be different were European funding available in future? *No*
2. Pilot Call without Commission Funding Scenarios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario 1: A pilot call covering all or a number of the themes being explored through the symposia (please note this would mean delaying the pilot till beyond EqUIP funding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2: A pilot joint call on a single thematic area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Priority for Pilot of single Thematic call without Commission Funding

If a pilot call (whether research or mixed activities) were to focus on one theme at this stage please indicate the priority for your organisation:

- **Highly interested and wants to participate (in order of preference 1 (high) to 5 (medium))**
- **Less interested but might still participate (in order of preference 6 (medium) to 10 (low))**
- **No interest to participate at all / Could not participate (x)**

| Sustainable Prosperity, Well being and Innovation |
| Inequalities, Growth and Place/Space |
| Social Transformations, Cultural Expressions, Cross-Cultural Connections and Dialogue |
| Power Structures, Conflict Resolution and Social Justice |
| Digital Archives and Databases as a Source of Mutual Knowledge |
| Other based on elements from across these themes (please specify) |

3. Pilot Call funding instruments.

Please state for each of the following funding mechanisms whether your funding organisation
- is highly interested and wants to participate
- is less interested but might still participate
- does not want to participate at all

If your responses relate to your responses to Question 1 please indicate the year of participation in the box for the activity.

1. Joint Research Projects
2. Joint workshops, seminars, conferences
3. Networking between Research Centers
4. Study cum travel grants
5. New uses of data and/or digital resources
6. Any Other (please describe)

Would these responses be affected by whether there were additional Commission funding? **No**
4. Funding Arrangement Preferences.

To give us a sense of your organisational preferences going forward (with or without Commission funding) please state for each of the following funding mechanisms whether your funding organisation would be:

- highly interested and wants to participate
- less interested but might still participate
- does not want to participate at all

*see explanatory notes at the end. Further Explanatory notes for different funding models can be found here: https://www.era-learn.eu/manuals-tools/call-implementation/call-planning/call-process-and-administration/funding-modes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Mechanism</th>
<th>Highly interested and wants to participate</th>
<th>Less interested but might still participate</th>
<th>Does not want to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Virtual pool of Funding (without Commission funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Virtual pool of Funding (with Commission funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Real/common pot of funds (without Commission funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Real/common pot of funds (with Commission funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Mode pot (Currently being used for NORFACE and HERA calls) (with Commission or other source of additional funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mixed-Mode pot (without Commission funding, assuming no additional source of funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would there be any circumstances that might affect this (e.g. topic of the call)? No

Section B. Participation in other research collaboration initiatives and/or alignment with other international thematic collaboration networks

There may be other additional, or alternative, international collaboration activities that EqUIP could explore further.

1. Alignment with European Joint Programming Initiatives and other thematic international platforms/ funding networks may be an additional way in which EqUIP could inform international research agendas and foster Indo-European research collaboration. This may depend on EC funding. However, in principle, taking into account responses to Section 1, Question 1 (funding year), would you be interested to seek alignment with.....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International Collaboration Initiative</th>
<th>Highly interested and wants to participate</th>
<th>Less interested but might still participate</th>
<th>Does not want to participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JPI Urban Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inno Indigo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section C. Future of EqUIP

1. Future of the Platform.
We would like to take this opportunity to ask you how you see the future of EqUIP going forward beyond the current EqUIP Coordination and Support Action funding from the European Commission.

a) Please could you outline how you would like to see EqUIP go forward in future and your organisation’s potential role in that? (e.g. its structure, governance, kind of activities, relationships between partners etc).

Possible scenarios for EqUIP:

1. Sustainable Platform (without COM contribution) with a rotating Secretariat (in kind contribution per partner);
2. Creation of a single Euro-Indian Platform (ERA-NET Inno INDIGO + EqUIP) since most of the European Funding Agencies are the same in the process;
3. Integration of EqUIP in NORFACE (European Platform on Social Sciences) and/or HERA (European Platform on Humanities);
4. ERA-NET Cofund Topic.

N.B. We will of course discuss these issues more fully collectively but ideas for its future shape and how you see your role in taking that forward would be welcome.

b) Please indicate whether your organisation would be interested in taking part in a Secretariat for an ongoing platform and/or work package leadership.

- [ ] Yes Secretariat
- [ ] Yes work package and/or task delivery
- [ ] No
- [ ] Maybe

Further comments (e.g. existing initiatives, opportunities for expansion of existing initiatives)
2. Commission Funding for further development of EqUIP: Second Round Co-ordination and Support Action Funding.

Would your organisation/Council support a second application to the European Commission for a Coordination and Support Action to continue to develop EqUIP?

Explanatory Notes

1. **Virtual pool of Funding:** Each participating funding organisation will fund its own successful participants. Funding will not be available from one participating funding organisation for successful participants from other participating funding organisations, there is no cross border funding involved. Evaluation of proposals is undertaken by an international expert committee, whereas funding decisions and funding is undertaken by individual national organisations, in accordance with their own standard rules and procedures.

2. **Real/common pot of funds:** This funding mode is suitable for participating funding organisations which wish to engage in a transnational joint call with an agreed research theme, with evaluation undertaken by an international expert committee, and where funding decisions are based on a joint ranking list. The participating funding organisation accepts that funding decisions are made by the designated joint decision-making body to ensure funding of the best quality proposals, in accordance with joint standard rules and procedures, and irrespective of nationality or place of residence.

3. **Mixed-Mode pot:** This mode is designed for networks wishing to engage in a transnational joint call with a pre-defined research theme, with evaluation undertaken by independent international peer review, and with financial topping up by the EC. The participating funding organisation accepts that funding decisions are made to ensure funding of the best quality proposals, irrespective of nationality, in accordance with joint standard rules and procedures. The participating funding organisations must agree on a joint ranking list for funding of projects, and must formally commit to finance the successful projects.

**An Example:** ERA-NET Plus and co-funded ERA-NET Cofund joint call may receive a European Commission (EC) financial contribution to top up the call budget. The topping up may reach 33% of the total cumulative funding of the joint call budget provided by the ERA-NET partners.

Further information may be accessed through URL link:
Annex 3: Multi-Lateral Mechanisms

HERA and NORFACE

HERA – “Humanities in the European Research Area”43 is a network of 24 European research funding organisations from 23 countries, who are committed to the continued growth and development of collaborative and transnational humanities research across Europe. Over the past ten years, HERA has grown from 13 partner countries to a network of 24 countries, and is the most important transnational funder for Humanities research in Europe. In addition to supporting excellent Humanities research, HERA aims to increase awareness of the impact of funded Humanities research beyond academia and promotes knowledge exchange.

HERA is now preparing a five-year HERA strategic plan for 2016-2021 entitled “HERA Vision 2021”. Although the document is not yet published, it includes sections on devising a framework for HERA’s role in building the ERA and global Humanities and on devising a framework for HERA’s contribution to debates and developments in research policy-making on issues such as the nature and value of Humanities, inter-disciplinarity, knowledge exchange, etc. HERA’s five-year strategic plan for 2016-2021, which is expected to contain guidelines for middle and long term planning, may offer interesting opportunities for a thematic alignment with EqUIP, as well as for a definition of the strategies for international cooperation of the Humanities research in Europe.

NORFACE – ‘New Opportunities for Research Funding Cooperation in Europe’44 is a partnership between eighteen European research organizations to increase co-operation in social science research and research policy in Europe. Launched in January 2004, the NORFACE network has funded four joint calls for funding to date and was at time of writing in process of funding a fifth. The NORFACE Roadmap 2015-2020 contains three strongly interlinked work packages to support interdisciplinary transnational research programmes, responsive to events, expanding the network and scaling up the discourse around the impact of the social sciences.

Overall, and as successful and well-established partnerships, both platforms can provide significant inputs on how EqUIP may thrive towards a new level of maturity and robustness in SSH collaboration.

Belmont Forum

The Belmont Forum45 is a group of some of the world’s major and emerging funders of global environmental change research. It aims to accelerate delivery of the environmental research needed to remove critical barriers to sustainability by aligning and mobilizing international resources. It pursues the goals set in the Belmont Challenge46, by adding value to existing national investments and supporting international partnerships in interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary scientific endeavours.

The Belmont Forum has agreed to develop Collaborative Research Actions (CRAs) which have included calls for proposals. International consortia of researchers should bring together natural scientists, social scientists, humanities researchers and research users (policy makers, regulators, NGOs, communities, and industry).

Previously, the Belmont Forum has collaborated with the G8-HORCs (Heads of Research Councils of G8 Countries) and FACCE-JPI (Joint Programming Initiative on Agriculture, Food Security and Climate Change) to fund CRAs through an International Opportunities Fund. It is currently jointly engaged in a call for proposals with NORFACE.

INDIGO Projects

New Indigo was a horizontal ERA-Net with India (2009-2013) funded by the European Commission under FP7 to strengthen Indian and European STI research collaboration. Aiming at continuing the fruitful cooperation and further fostering the multilateral STI cooperation two projects started in November 2013. On the one hand, Inno Indigo focussed on bringing together funders in order to implement calls for proposals. On the other hand Indigo Policy supported inter-governmental policy dialogues through analysis and activities. Both project47 work closely together to maximize their impact and exploit synergies.

Indigo Policy’s mandate also includes supporting the Group of Senior Officials (GSO) by assisting the GSO Working Group with organisational support and as a Secretariat for its Thematic Groups. Since the definition of the “Europe-India Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRIA)" is part of the mission of the GSO, and the research areas of SSH are not specifically focused on the current activities of the SRIA, the involvement of EqUIP in the activities of Indigo Policy could have been considered of major strategic importance in potentially facilitating greater engagement of MHRD in this process over the longer term.

JPI Urban Europe

JPI Urban Europe is one of the initiatives of the EC’s Joint Programming instrument. Similarly to other JPIs, JPI Urban Europe aims to promote strategic cooperation between EU Member States and associated countries, namely in the fields of urban innovation and technological development, to tackle the challenge of transforming our cities into more sustainable, resilient, and liveable places.
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3 The broad legislative framework for Europe-India research cooperation prior to this had been defined by the Joint Political Statement (1993) and by the Cooperation Agreement (1994). The 2001 agreement was followed by Joint Action Plans (2005 and 2008) and a Memorandum of Understanding on the Multi-Annual Indicative Programme (2011-2013).
4 There were a number of Europe-India co-funded research calls under the aegis of the Europe-India Agreement on Scientific and Technological Cooperation between 2007-13 (on Computational Material Science, New & Renewable Energy and Solar Energy and more recently on biotechnology water-based challenges and chronic diseases (through the Global Alliance for Chronic Diseases) but there have been no SSH-led topics.
5 The Government of India declared 2010-2020 the ‘Decade of Innovation’. With the aim of building an Indian model of innovation, the National Council of Innovation provided recommendations and methodologies to boost innovation performance. The key concept has been inclusive growth: a pattern of growth able to ensure income and livelihood to all strata of population. Innovation is defined as a process which produces inventions that have an impact on economy and society, fulfilling needs not yet met. The emphasis is on frugal innovation created by frugal engineering, which produces quality goods and services affordable by more people at low level of income.
6 The EU Country Strategy Paper for India (2007-2013) also shaped EU policy on cooperation.
7 The 2012 European Commission Communication Enhancing and focusing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: a strategic approach (COM(2012)497), cements international cooperation as one of the strategic goals of the ERA (European Research Area) in order to 1) strengthen the EU’s excellence and attractiveness in research and innovation and its economic and industrial competitiveness; 2) tackle global societal challenges and 3) support the EU’s external policies, making research and innovation an integral part of a comprehensive package of external action. The European Research Area (ERA) Roadmap 2015-2020 reiterated this strategic commitment to international cooperation.
8 The GSO is supported by a GSO Working Group (GSO-WG) co-chaired by DST and DG R & I, INCO, , advised by expert Thematic Groups (TG)
10 The CAMM addresses four pillars in a balanced manner: better organised regular migration and the fostering of well-managed mobility; prevention of irregular migration and trafficking in human beings; maximising the development impact of migration and mobility; and the promotion of international protection.
12 The data presented in this section presents an update on data present in the EqUIP Joint Learning Report (D.2.3), pp. 11-15. The data presented here is based on Scopus data only and over a slightly different period, but also updating the data to 2015.
13 5661 publications
14 1087 publications
15 5540%; AH48%
17 In 2012-14 there were 121 Indian co-investigator proposals submitted to Horizon 2020, of which six were to SC6; one was successful - a success rate of 16.67%. The overview and details of research projects funded under Horizon 2020 can be found in: EqUIP Scoping Report (D.2.1) and Final Scoping Report (D2.6).
19 EqUIP (613236), Joint Learning Report (D.2.3),
20 EqUIP (613236), Final Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities (D.2.6)
21 Summary tables for both programmes and projects were in both the initial and final scoping reports (D2.1 and D2.6).
22 http://www.esrc.ac.uk/research/international-research/global-challenges-research-fund-gcrt/
23 Multi-disciplinary projects spanned across other fields of study such as ICT, education, linguistics and game development, medical sciences, natural sciences and ICT.
24 This section is based on data presented in Thorat, S. and Verma S. (2017) Social Science Research in India (Oxford University Press).
26 Ministry of Culture, Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change were the largest investors in 2004-5 but the Ministries of Commerce and of Women and Child Development have sharply increased their investment in research in the 2003-14 period. There has been a reduction in the share of spend as a result from the Ministry of Culture and Ministry of Planning.
27 The most comprehensive data available is for 2010-11 which suggests total funding available for social science and humanities research at around Rs 485.82 crore, of which 49% was spent by MHRD. A further 34% was spent through other Ministries but increasingly in data collection and processing, rather than core research and investment is declining. State governments, in particular Assam, West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Kerala, also have invested in social science research activities such as institutes, research and training, representing around a further 17% in social science research activities. (Thorat and Verma: p 444)
28 Announcements are regularly advertised http://www.ugc.ac.in/ugc_ic.aspx
29 Definitions differ as to what constitutes social science and humanities between European and humanities organisations so these lines are somewhat blurred.
30 ICHR and ICFR were established later in the 1970s as autonomous organisations and have small budgets to support minor (small scale 10-25 Lakh Rs) research projects, fellowships, workshops and conferences/courses.
31 Ministry of Human Resource Development (MHRD) (2011)
32 Thorat and Verma (2017 p.159)
33 Funding for these institutes from state governments increased from 13% to 18% in 2009-13.
34 Tagore National Fellowship for Culture Research (commenced 2009) and 2 year fellowships for Senior and junior fellows. The National Culture Fund also provides funding for artists and performing artists. It also funds the Sahitya Akademi but this does not have budget for funding research.
36 http://imprint-india.org/
37 The Report on Opportunities and Challenges for Extending the Network, the Scoping Report on Existing Collaboration and Future Interests and Opportunities for Europe-India research cooperation and The Report on the Staff Exchange Scheme
As this work programme is not public, details of this alignment will not be outlined here.

In the FP7 programme, there was experience in opening Infect-ERA for Indian Participants, funded by the Department of Biotechnology. http://www.infect-era.eu/

New INDIGO International S&T Cooperation Foresight: A study of S&T cooperation future(s) between Europe and India (D4.5), the Europe-India SI House mapping as well as the implementation of the INNO INDIGO project’s multilateral collaboration scheme.


The European Interest Group for Japan was established in December 2014 as a flexible platform for communication among STI agencies in Europe and Japan that are interested in cooperating together. Its informal membership includes the organisations that participated in the ERA-NET CONCERT-Japan Project, and it will provide the framework for communication towards sustained continuation of the cooperation established through that project, hence the new name of this collaboration: “EIG CONCERT-Japan”. (https://www.era-learn.eu/network-information/networks/eig-concert-japan)


https://www.norface.net/

https://www.belmontforum.org/


https://indigoprojects.eu/
### Annex 5: List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHRC</td>
<td>Arts and Humanities Research Council, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AKA</td>
<td>Suomen Akatemia, Academy of Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANR</td>
<td>L’Agence National de la Recherche, The French National Research Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRE</td>
<td>Agenzia per la Promozione della Ricerca Europea, Agency for the Promotion of European Research, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>Akademie věd České republiky, Czech Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, German Research Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLR-PT</td>
<td>Forschungszentrum der Bundesrepublik Deutschland für Luft- und Raumfahrt, National Aeronautics and Space Research Centre, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EqUIP</td>
<td>Europe-India Social Science and Humanities Platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRC</td>
<td>Economic and Social Research Council, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERA</td>
<td>European Research Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Foundation for Science and Technology, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP7</td>
<td>European Research Framework Programme 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSO</td>
<td>Group of Senior Officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2020</td>
<td>Horizon 2020, the 8th European Research Framework Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZU</td>
<td>Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICHR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Historical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Philosophical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICSSR</td>
<td>Indian Council of Social Science Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHD</td>
<td>Institute of Human Development, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>The Irish Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JLW</td>
<td>Joint Learning Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIZS</td>
<td>Ministrstvo za izobraževanje, znanost in šport, Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, Slovenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCN</td>
<td>Narodowe Centrum Nauki, National Science Centre, Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWO</td>
<td>Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, The Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCN</td>
<td>Norges Forskningsråd, The Research Council of Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>Staff Exchange Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFIC</td>
<td>Strategic Forum for International S&amp;T Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STI</td>
<td>Science, technology and innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSH</td>
<td>Social Sciences and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UGC</td>
<td>University Grants Commission, India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEF</td>
<td>Zentrum für Entwicklungsforshung, Center for Development Research, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSI</td>
<td>Zentrum für Soziale Innovation, Centre for Social Innovation, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Package:</td>
<td>WP3 Opportunities and Priorities for Future EU-India Research Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Beneficiary:</td>
<td>FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td>Gonçalo Zagalo Pereira (FCT) with ESRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Version:</td>
<td>First Draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Agreement:</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme:</td>
<td>Coordination and Support Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme:</td>
<td>SSH.2013.4.3-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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