



The ERA-NET scheme

From FP6 to Horizon 2020

Jörg NIEHOFF
DG Research & Innovation
Unit B2 – ERA Policy and Reform

FP6: ERA-NET

Funding of costs related to the coordination of national research programmes, 100% reimbursement rate for coordination and management costs



FP7: ERA-NET and ERA-NET Plus

ERA-NET: as under FP6
ERA-NET Plus: co-funding of a single joint call for trans-national proposals, 33% reimbursement rate for the costs of funding the projects



Horizon 2020: ERA-NET Cofund

Co-funding of a single joint call for trans-national proposals, in addition other joint activities including other joint calls without Union co-funding, 33% reimbursement rate

ERA-NET Cofund – main features

ERA-NET Cofund: implementation of a co-funded joint call for proposals (compulsory, one co-funded call per Grant Agreement)*

EU contribution: mainly a proportional contribution to total public funding of the joint call

Additional EU contribution to coordination costs on the basis of a unit costs for additional activities including additional calls without top-up funding

Stable reimbursement rate: ERA-NET Plus reimbursement rate from FP7 (33%) applies

Co-funded calls: proposal evaluation and selection according to Horizon 2020 standards

* ERA-NETs based on a Coordination and Support Action (CSA) are no longer possible. Only in exceptional cases it might be considered to support the preparation and structuring of specific emerging P2Ps that demonstrate clear European added value.

New approach well received and well understood by the applicants

- Most proposals fully comply with the ERA-NET Cofund requirements
- Many very good descriptions of work received high scores
- Some proposals did not fully comply with call requirements and need to be corrected during grant preparation
- All but one proposal foresee additional activities
- Most of the proposals foresee up to 4 additional calls (exception: 2 of the proposals related to JPIS), some of them with substantial indicative financial commitments for the additional calls
- Proposers introduce a wide range of additional activities, with no general difference between ERA-NETs with or without JPI background
- Many proposals include strong international collaboration

But:

- High level of maintenance required
- Risk of underspending if call budget is just sufficient to justify Union contribution
→ high risk of loss of Commission budgets in many cases!
- Some technical aspects not well understood (budget tables) or not yet well explained (information on cumulative expenditure)
- Rigidity of proposal template not always appreciated
- Standard deliverables should be pre-defined
- Template for mandates of programme managers/owners need revision
- Simplification of interface with the Commission leads to increased complexities for consortia (need to agree on many financial aspects outside the Grant Agreements)

But:

- Limitations to grant programmes
- Limited synergies with structural funds
- Uncertainty on the side of the beneficiaries about reporting and related issues (audits, justification of unit costs ...)
- Test cases for in-kind ERA-NETs and mixed approach still have to be implemented and assessed
- Material made available via ERA-LEARN (CA template, budget examples, template for observes report etc.) not always well known

A look backwards: user recommendations at previous events

- Call implementation is the core activity and important linking element for consortia, with ERA-NET plus clearly as incentive, but complexity of contractual implementation
- Other activities: equally important, need to keep networks alive and provide networking budget for all partners
- Need for more flexible type of ERA-NETs, allowing users to adapt it according to their needs and evolve on their way
- Partners/ associated partners to join in for specific activities/periods of time
- Continuous funding for networking a reduced level to give long term perspective
- Simplify and limit reporting requirements
- Strong preference for costs reimbursement: Output based for the call and unit costs for networking

A look backwards: user recommendations at previous events and **situation under H2020**

- Call implementation core activity, important linking element for consortia, ERA-NET is an incentive, but complexity of contractual implementation
→ **Emphasis on co-funding of calls, simplified contract**
- Other activities: equally important, need to keep networks alive and provide networking budget for all partners → **Consortia decide**
- Need for more flexible type of ERA-NETs, allowing users to adapt it according to their needs and evolve on their way
→ **Flexibility to define activities beyond co-funded call**
- Partners/ associated partners to join in for specific activities/periods of time
→ **Variable geometry for activities over duration**
- Continuous funding for networking a reduced level to give long term perspective → **Unit costs for networking**
- Simplify and limit reporting requirements
→ **Default 2 RP, single financial reporting**
- Strong preference for costs reimbursement: Output based for the call and unit costs for networking → **Approach chosen under H2020**

Thank you for your attention!

Any questions?

Contact

Jörg Niehoff

joerg.niehoff@ec.europa.eu

DG Research & Innovation

Unit B2 – ERA Policy and Reforms