

**EARTO & IGLO Members Joint Feedback on  
the 1<sup>st</sup> Horizon 2020 Programme Calls for Proposals -  
Results of Joint Workshop held on 19 June 2014**

10 September 2014

On the occasion of a Joint Workshop between IGLO members and the EARTO Working Group Horizon 2020 Experts organized on 19<sup>th</sup> June 2014, IGLO and EARTO joined forces to provide a first feedback to the European Commission on their practical experiences in responding to the 1<sup>st</sup> calls initiated under the new EU Research & Innovation Programme Horizon 2020.

This document summarizes the main issues mentioned by the experts which the European Commission could further look at when implementing its next set of calls for proposals. Workshop participants looked at the different phases of the process, from preparing the calls to actually submitting proposals and getting evaluated. The feedback is given below following those different phases and recalls only the practical issues we feel could be solved for the next calls. Please note that this paper does not include feedback on calls which, at time on the Joint Workshop, had not yet been evaluated. Accordingly, IGLO and EARTO Members will continue their dialogue on such issues and are of course very much welcoming further dialogue on their suggestions with the European Commission.

### **1. Preparation of Work Programmes**

- Due to the timing and transition between FP7 and H2020, the consultation process regarding the preparation of the first Work Programmes did not always include the advices given by the advisory and programme committees. We hope that those will be better taken into account for the next work programmes currently under preparation, especially now that WPs are meant for 2 years.
- Updates made to the new versions of the WPs for 2015 should be made clearly visible.
- Within each WP, topics with only one call over 2 years should be visibly marked.
- Mentioning the expected TRLs within the calls text is seen as useful. However, it should be made sure that the TRLs are well understood by all. Here we would like to point out again the last [EARTO paper](#) on this.
- The relation between the different work programmes and also the links between the different pillars in H2020 and how research results should be used will have to be included in the next update of the work programmes taking into account what has been done in those first calls.

### **2. Calls for Proposal**

- Calls deadlines should also take into account the summer holidays (e.g. 2<sup>nd</sup> stage deadline placed in middle of August).
- The timing between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> stages proposals has been very short in some cases.
- More balance between calls specificity and proposal submission stages should be given: broadly defined calls could look at using 2 stages proposals while more focused calls could look at using only 1 stage proposal.
- For some calls with 2 stages, the evaluation of the 1<sup>st</sup> stage seems to have been somehow "too friendly" leading to a large number of proposals going to the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage, bringing a ~10% success rate for 2<sup>nd</sup> stage proposals in some cases (too low figure for a 2<sup>nd</sup> stage procedure).
- Call deadlines should be written in letters and not in numbers – especially the months – to avoid any confusion. As not all WPs have written their dates in a standardised manner, it seems to have brought errors.
- Some work programmes would be clearer if it specified whether proposals may cover only parts of the call or should answer the full call text.

### **3. Proposal Making and Submission**

- Participants very much welcomed the largely improved Participant Portal as well as the fact that generally less information is required to participants than in FP7 and that the forms to be filled are easier.

- The role of the National Contact Points (NCPs) is increasing due to the fact that the EC is now passing the implementation of the programme to its many agencies and does not have any longer the capacity in house to provide advice directly to proposal makers. This requires a better strategy towards informing and training the NCPs to make sure they are given enough time to treat all the information and have enough understanding of what is expected in each call. We understand that this process is in the making, but more attention should be given towards transferring such capacities from the EC to the NCPs on time, so the NCPs could effectively have a stronger supporting role to proposals.
- Clearer guidelines would be welcome on what proposers are allowed to change in their proposals between stage 1 and stage 2.
- The maximum page numbers for phase 1 should be consistent throughout all WPs.

#### 4. Evaluation

- The feedback given by the European Commission on the proposals evaluated is seen as insufficient. We understand this is due to oversubscription. However, better feedback could be given for example to the proposals having passed the 1<sup>st</sup> stage as it would have real value in preparing better proposals for the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage (combined to the previous point on having a tougher selection on stage 1, this would make very much sense).
- The European Commission should give clearer rules to Project Officers in charge of evaluation on how to deal with last minute conflicts of interests raising with the evaluators finally invited for calls' evaluation.
- The European Commission should aim at communicating results of evaluation as soon as available (not waiting for the allowed delay).
- Non-confidential information from the European Commission's eCorda database could be made available for stakeholders, with more detailed statistics on calls' results than what is today available in the calls' flashes.

In view of further discussing the above and upcoming feedback on Horizon 2020 implementation, EARTO and IGLO members would like to establish regular and open exchanges with the European Commission for the duration of the Programme. EARTO and IGLO are ready to serve as discussions platforms for this exchange bringing to the table experts in their membership involved on a daily basis with the implementation of the Programme as beneficiaries or NCPs. EARTO and IGLO members very much see the interest in supporting the European Commission services in implementing an impactful Programme and as such are hoping for an open dialogue with European Commission aiming at supporting such implementation in the coming years.

---

#### **Note to the reader:**

##### **EARTO - European Association of Research and Technology Organisations**

*EARTO is the European trade association of the research and technology organisations (RTOs), a non-profit organisation founded in 1999. EARTO groups over 350 RTOs with a combined staff of 150,000, an annual turnover of €23 billion, special equipment and facilities to a value of many €billions and more than 100,000 customers from the public and private sectors annually.*

*EARTO Working Group Horizon 2020: is composed of 58 EU Affairs Specialists working within our membership. Established in 2010, this Working Group has also produced many papers supporting the setting-up of Horizon 2020.*

**IGLO –IGLO is an informal association of Brussels-based non-profit R&D Liaison Offices.** *The aim of IGLO is to facilitate and enhance the interaction, information exchange and co-operation between Members of IGLO, their national research systems and the European institutions on issues related to EU RTD, in particular, the Framework Programme.*

*IGLO members who participated in the joint workshop are: CLORA, DANRO, ENEA, FNRS, HunOR, KoWi, Nether, SLORD, SOST, SwissCore, TuR&Bo, UKRO.*

<p><b>IGLO Contact:</b> Eric Foucher, IGLO Secretary <a href="mailto:efoucher@clora.eu">efoucher@clora.eu</a> Tel: +32 2 506 88 64 <a href="http://www.iqlortd.eu">www.iqlortd.eu</a></p>	<p><b>EARTO Contact:</b> Muriel Attané, Secretary General <a href="mailto:attane@earto.eu">attane@earto.eu</a> Tel: +32 2 502 86 98 <a href="http://www.earto.eu">www.earto.eu</a></p>
---	--