

Horizon Europe Co-design – Implementation

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

With a proposed budget of 100 billion euro from 2021 to 2027, the Horizon Europe framework programme represents the largest collaborative multinational research and innovation investment in Europe and is open to participants worldwide. The European Parliament and the Council have provisionally agreed on the Horizon Europe legislative package. Based on the agreement, a Strategic Plan will put forward the priorities for the first four years of Horizon Europe. In parallel, the Commission has begun designing the **Implementation strategy**, a tool to focus attention, planning efforts and resources to the rules, processes, systems, documents and guidance, so that they are ready in time for the programme start.

We invite you to contribute to co-designing the implementation of the future research and innovation programme by responding to this questionnaire. You can further engage by participating in the [European Research and Innovation Days](#) on 24-25-26 September 2019 in Brussels.

Prior to responding to the questions, please read the attached document: “[Orientations towards the Implementation Strategy of the research and Innovation framework programme Horizon Europe](#)”.

This consultation is linked to the ongoing “Horizon Europe Co-design 2021-2024” web consultation.

The questionnaire can only be submitted if you replied at least to the obligatory questions marked with an asterisk. Replying to all questions takes approximately 30 minutes. You can interrupt and resume at a later stage. **Please don't forget to save frequently.**

The extended deadline for replying is **October 4**.

About you

* You are responding:

- As an individual
- As a representative of a single organisation
- As a representative of an 'umbrella' organisation (a group of organisations)

* You are responding as:

- a researcher
- an entrepreneur
- an expert in research and innovation
- a citizen
- other

* You are representing:

- a university
- a research organisation
- a business or an industry
- an international organisation
- a national public authority
- a regional or local public authority
- a non governmental organisation including civil society organisations
- other

* Name of the organisation

150 character(s) maximum

BusinessEurope

Your name and last name

150 character(s) maximum

Carolina Vigo

* What is your country of residence or establishment?

Belgium

* Please select the option that best describes your interest in European Union Research and Innovation (R&I) framework programmes:

- I/my organisation is currently participating in at least one project funded by a European Union R&I framework programme.
- I/my organisation has proposed and/or participated in project(s) funded by a European Union R&I framework programme in the past, but I am/it is not participating in a running project at this moment.
- I/my organisation has not yet proposed or participated in projects funded by European Union R&I framework programmes, but would be interested to do so.
- I/my organisation currently does not intend to propose and/or participate in projects funded by European Union R&I framework programmes, but I may be interested in the results of the projects/programme.

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

- Anonymous**
Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.
- Public**
Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree to the [personal data protection provisions](#)

1. Work programme

The detailed allocation of Horizon Europe funding to calls will be decided through a strategic planning process resulting in multiannual work programmes. The way in which the priorities are translated into calls and topics may impact on the effectiveness of programme implementation.

See section [3.1 “Work Programme design”](#) (page 7) of the accompanying document.

1.1. In your view, how important are these elements for the preparation of a good proposal?

	1 (not important at all)	2	3	4	5 (very important)	I don't know
* Work programmes which are multiannual	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* No changes to work programmes unless there are urgent, previously unforeseen needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Multiannual topics which offer the possibility of submission for more than one deadline	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.2. In your view, how important are these elements for the preparation of a good proposal for the 'Global Challenges and European Industrial Competitiveness' part of the future Horizon Europe work programmes?

	1 (not important at all)	2	3	4	5 (very important)	I don't know
The applicant can decide which type of action is most appropriate for achieving the targeted impact (e.g. Research and Innovation Action [RIA], Innovation Action [IA] or Coordination and Support Action [CSA])	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Topics which distinguish between the short-term outcomes expected and the longer-term impacts targeted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Topics which allow for a wide range of possible pathways to achieve the targeted impact	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Indication of the TRL (technology readiness level) expected by the end of the project	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

1.3. What could be improved in the structure of the work programme and/or its calls to make it easier for applicants?

500 character(s) maximum

It would be important to have a plan that goes beyond one year. At the same time, it should be possible to change the plan based on new insights, even if there is no real urgency. Finally, multiannual topics allow for greater flexibility: they eliminate the need to meet a time window and allow for certain ideas to make more time to mature. Generally, a good balance between focused and impact-oriented call topics and open, non-prescriptive call topics should be found.

2. Submission and Evaluation

The system for proposal submission and evaluation under Horizon Europe will largely be based on the current approaches, but a number of improvements are envisaged.

See section [3.2 “Submission and Evaluation”](#) (page 9) of the accompanying document.

2.1. What aspects are most important to you in the submission and evaluation process? *(rank your answers by order of preference)*

	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
* Simple proposal templates	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Fast time-to-grant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Detailed feedback if unsuccessful	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Two-stage procedure to reduce initial burden	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other <i>(please specify below)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

Other - Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The administrative burden of submitting and executing a proposal remains high. In a world of fast innovation, the current average time-to-grant of 192 days is not aligned with companies' needs to drive innovation to the markets fast enough. The Commission must implement new ways of allocating funds, and therefore set an ambitious time-to-grant of <50 days, reverse-engineering the decision process and make sure the second stage has a good chance to succeed (>50%) to improve companies' involvement

2.2. How important are the following specific changes in your view?

	1 (not important at all)	2	3	4	5 (very important)	I don't know
Simplify the aspects to be considered under the three evaluation criteria (“Excellence”, “Impact” and “Quality and efficiency of the implementation”)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Simplify or remove assessment of project management structures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run a pilot for blind evaluation, for the first stage of two-stages calls	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Run a pilot scheme allowing applicants to react to preliminary evaluation comments, before they are finalised	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2.3. What other modifications to the submission and evaluation system do you consider necessary, and why? Would they entail trade-offs with other desirable changes?

500 character(s) maximum

New methods should be tried (e.g. crowd-voting within the scientific community), and more digital technologies should be used to accelerate the decision taking.

2.4. Where relevant (e.g. for missions), how should the evaluation process combine an assessment of the intrinsic quality of individual proposals with their potential contribution to a consistent portfolio?

500 character(s) maximum

A suggestion is to look at the way DARPA programmes are managed and include best practices in the Horizon Europe approach. In particular, a sufficiently empowered programme manager should have a strong role in designing and managing the programme portfolio. Another suggestion would be to take into account the SRIAs and roadmaps already established by the relevant stakeholders' communities.

3. Model Grant Agreement

Horizon Europe will make use of a standard model grant agreement (MGA) to be used by all EU funding programmes fully aligned with the [Financial Regulation](#). The MGA for Horizon Europe will cater for the programme specific needs/objectives as e.g. on Intellectual Property Rights, ethics, gender, recruitment and working conditions for researchers, research infrastructure, security, etc.

See section [3.3 “Model Grant Agreement”](#) (page 12) of the accompanying document.

* 3.1. Would the use of the same standard Model Grant Agreement for all EU directly managed funding programmes facilitate synergies between them?

- 1 (not at all)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (certainly)
- I don't know

3.2. Which provisions in the current Horizon 2020 Model Grant Agreement should be revised? (*rank your top 5 provisions by order of preference*)

	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Personnel costs provisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Internally invoiced goods and services provisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Equipment costs provisions	<input type="radio"/>				
Reporting provisions	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Termination and suspension provisions	<input type="radio"/>				
Amendment provisions	<input type="radio"/>				
Payment calculation provisions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other provisions <i>(please specify below)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other provisions - Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

The Commission should consider introducing a mandatory requirement of having a Consortium Agreement in place before the Grant Agreement is signed by the Commission and the Coordinator. Also, the Commission should grant flexibility to the very rigid accession system for participants, which is currently 30 days flat upon signature by the Coordinator.

3.3. Should the MGA contain a data sheet with key information on costs, forms of funding, reporting and payment schedules?

- 1 (not useful at all)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (very useful)
- I don't know

3.4. How can we improve the clarity of the [Annotated Model Grant Agreement](#) for Horizon Europe?

500 character(s) maximum

4. Dissemination and Exploitation

Horizon Europe will give more emphasis to the dissemination and exploitation (D&E) of the Research & Innovation (R&I) results, sharing the knowledge better and creating a higher impact.

See section [3.4 "Dissemination & Exploitation"](#) (page 15) of the accompanying document.

4.1. What would be useful in your view to improve the dissemination and exploitation of projects results?

	1 (not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (very relevant)	I don't know
* Improved visibility and searchability of the results on the Funding & Tenders Portal at the project and individual level	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Easy-to-use search functionalities on the Funding & Tenders Portal for expertise of beneficiaries and /or follow-up activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Possibility for beneficiaries to complete their own public/private/project profiles in a dedicated platform with information they want to disseminate, including key needs for support	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Possibility for beneficiaries to complete their own public/private/project profiles in a dedicated platform with information on past affiliation to projects	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Improved guidance on D&E expectations at call and proposal stages	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4.2. Dissemination & Exploitation (D&E) is part of the evaluation criteria and constitutes a separate Work Package in the project's life cycle. How can beneficiaries' understanding around D&E be improved?

- Maintain D&E as subject to proposal evaluation
- Enhance training and raise awareness around D&E to applicants (using the Funding & Tenders Portal, existing networks such as EEN, NCPs, etc.)
- Create a follow up support mechanism on D&E for beneficiaries
- Prefill parts of the proposal with previous Framework Programme funded results of the applicant (where applicable)

4.3. How could the European Commission incentivise beneficiaries to report on dissemination and exploitation after the end of the project?

	1 (not relevant at all)	2	3	4	5 (very relevant)	I don't know
Keep the Horizon 2020 approach and provide tailor-made services through activities such as the Dissemination & Exploitation boosters	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Introduce and apply financial penalties for non-compliance	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Combine the obligation with financial incentives for further exploitation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Making platforms available for communicating results to potential users	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>				
---	----------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

4.4. Exploiting the full potential of R&I results for sustainable policy making is becoming more and more important. How could we strengthen the feedback to policy and decision making, based on R&I results, at EU, local, regional, national, international levels?

500 character(s) maximum

Exploiting the potential of R&I results is becoming more important. However, open access rules shall be handled with care and not jeopardise the legitimate stakeholders' interests and confidentiality constraints. As open as possible as closed as necessary should be the core principle when implementing the open science policy. Applicants for HEU funds who prefer to opt out should not be disadvantaged. Exploitation cannot be linked to market impact and compliance to WTO rules should be considered.

5. Data and Reporting

Project reporting in Horizon Europe should cover all the information and data necessary for project and programme monitoring, while keeping the reporting burden for beneficiaries at an acceptable level. Greater attention will be dedicated to information and data on the output and impact of the funded projects and on the dissemination and exploitation of the results. Data collected from projects will be enriched by linking to other data sources. Tools for accessing, analysing and visualising the data will be made available for Member States, policy makers, researchers and the general public.

See section [3.5 "Reporting and Data Collection"](#) (page 19) of the accompanying document.

5.1. Which parts of the Horizon 2020 reporting templates and guidance require improvements? (*rank your top 3 answers by order of preference*)

	1 (least important)	2	3 (most important)
* Financial reporting part	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Template for the technical report	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Data collection on publications, IPR, dissemination and communication activities, societal issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

5.2. Please give us one concrete suggestions for improving the project reporting:

500 character(s) maximum

* 5.3. Have you already used the Horizon 2020 Dashboard?

- Yes
- No

5.3a. Which parts of the Horizon Dashboard do you find most useful? *(rank your answers by order of preference)*

	1 (least useful)	2	3	4	5	6 (most useful)
Horizon 2020 proposals dashboard	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Horizon 2020/FP7 projects dashboard	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>				
Horizon 2020/FP7 project results dashboard	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Horizon 2020 country profiles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
European Innovation Council dashboard	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Seal of excellence dashboard	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5.4. On which other aspects would you like to have a specific dashboard?

500 character(s) maximum

5.5. The European Commission proposes to create a central EU R&I data hub on data from the EU R&I investments made at EU, national, regional and local levels. Do you consider this could support the definition of R&I policies in Europe at local, regional, national and European levels?

- 1 (not at all)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (to a great extent)
- I don't know

5.6. What additional orientations would you suggest for maximising the value and use of data from EU R&I programmes?

500 character(s) maximum

Industrial IPR and confidentiality constraints must be taken into account when publishing data on EU programmes 'especially to non-European competitors).

6. Control strategy

Ex-ante

Under Horizon 2020, the Commission made significant efforts to simplify and harmonize ex ante control practices. Consequently, there is strong emphasize on trust (of beneficiaries and their own control practices) that is combined with a risk-assessment based, lean and targeted control. Ex-ante control under

Horizon Europe will build on the foundations and achievements of the common ex-ante control strategy designed for the implementation of Horizon 2020.

See section [3.6.a “Ex-ante control strategy”](#) (page 22) of the accompanying document.

6.1. Are you largely satisfied with the current Horizon 2020 approach for financial reporting i.e. the level of details required in the financial statements (FS) and the prompted details on the so called ‘use of resources’ section?

- Yes
- No

6.2. Under Horizon 2020, the Certificate of Financial Statement (CFS) is an important element of the trust-based ex-ante control approach. Given that it is intended to continue this approach under Horizon Europe, would you have ideas for improvements of the CFS system or suggestion for changes (e.g. in the content, level of details of the CFS)?

500 character(s) maximum

Ex-post

The Commission proposal for Horizon Europe provides for a high level of continuity, based on the principles of common implementation, equal treatment, consistency and better alignment with international audit standards. Under Horizon Europe, a new approach on Systems and Processes Audits (SPAs) will be explored through a review of the main internal control systems and processes of beneficiaries. The objective is to flag risks and to perform audit procedures and walkthrough test in line with the International Standards on Auditing.

See section [3.6.b “Ex-post control strategy”](#) (page 23) of the accompanying document.

6.3. What type of benefits would you expect from a Systems and Processes Audit (SPA)? *(rank by order of preference)*

	1 (least important)	2	3	4	5 (most important)
Fewer ex-post audits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Less intensive ex-post audits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Fewer ex-ante Certificates on Financial Statements	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Less intensive ex-ante Certificates on Financial Statements	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Reliability for other EU audits	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6.4. The Systems and Process Audits (SPA) should be valid...

- until a change in the methodologies of the auditee
- for maximum 3 years after completion for the HE framework programme
- for the whole Horizon Europe framework programme

6.5. What are the limitations to a SPA?

- Lack of homogeneity of systems and processes inside the same organisation (e.g. when different locations have different internal processes)
- Nature of processes: some (e.g. subcontracting) are more system approach than others
- Other *(please specify below)*

6.6. Would it be useful to seek synergies with national research and innovation funding bodies in the audit field? How could this be implemented in practice in your view and based on your experience if applicable?

500 character(s) maximum

Synergies can only occur when similar set of rules are applied. Horizon Europe could rely on personnel costs audited by national price reviewing authorities when the usual accounting principles and practices of the beneficiaries used in national funded projects are accepted. This would simplify the determination of the eligible personnel costs for Horizon Europe funded projects.

7. Extended use of simplified forms of costs

Significant steps were taken under Horizon 2020 towards the use of simplified forms of costs, through the wider use of unit costs and flat rates and, notably through the first pilot on lump sum project funding in 2018.

See section [3.7 “Extended use of simplified forms of costs”](#) (page 26) of the accompanying document.

* 7.1. Have you been involved as applicant and/or beneficiary in a lump sum pilot project?

- Yes
- No

7.2. Do you think lump sum project funding will make R&I Framework Programme more accessible to...

	1 (not at all)	2	3	4	5 (to a great extent)	I don't know
* New participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Experienced participants	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Smaller actors	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7.3. To what extent will the abolition of cost reporting and auditing in projects funded by lump sums make project management and administration easier?

- 1 (not at all)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (to a great extent)

I don't know

7.4. What is your perception of the system of payments for lump sum project funding?

500 character(s) maximum

The focus on deliverables within the payment systems is welcome. However, the time for the Commission to review the deliverables should be limited. The system should require a different approach to collaborative research - whereby each WP has to be autonomous with specific deliverables and consortium partners work in full solidarity and trust. Project officer must be knowledgeable of the content to evaluate whether WP participants have collectively delivered or not and are eligible for payments.

7.5. What is the impact of lump sum project funding on the internal management of the consortium (compared to cost-based funding)?

- 1 (will become way more complex)
 2
 3
 4
 5 (will become easier)
 I don't know

8. Outreach

Feedbacks received from stakeholders consultations, the Horizon 2020 interim evaluation, as well as recommendations by the European Court of Auditors underline that more could be done to better communicate and engage with stakeholders.

See section [3.8 "Outreach"](#) (page 29) the accompanying document

* 8.1. With which support services have you interacted, if any, during the course of Horizon 2020?

- Research Enquiry Service
 National Contact Point
 EU programme support office, or similar, in your organisation
 Professional consultant
 Outreach events in Member States
 Coordinator days
 Training to beneficiaries
 Other (*please specify below*)
 None

8.2. For each service you indicated, what would you propose to improve?

1000 character(s) maximum

9. Digital transformation

A radical simplification of grant management procedures was introduced in Horizon 2020 with, at the heart, a Web interface – the [Funding & Tenders Portal](#) – providing a user-friendly one-stop shop for thousands of beneficiaries. Horizon Europe will come with a number of novelties that will need a dedicated IT support.

See section [3.9 “Digital transformation”](#) (page 31) of the accompanying document.

* 9.1. What do you think about having all the EU funding programmes available in a single Portal?

- It is simpler to find funding opportunities across all EU funding programmes, in just one place
- It provides all potential beneficiaries with a single door to submit their proposals
- It allows for a corporate electronic management of all EU funding programmes
- It is more complex, if I am interested only in one programme
- Other (*please specify below*)
- I don't know

* 9.2. Which additional features of the Funding & Tenders Portal would you find useful?

- Partner search at the level of individuals (in addition to the existing organisation based partner search) for finding potential partners for your project ideas
- Person profile page for individuals involved in projects, linking to other data sources (publication databases, social platforms for researchers...)
- Extended interactive programme reporting platform (Horizon 2020 Dashboard)
- Other (*please specify below*)
- I don't know

9.3. How can we improve the functions of the Funding & Tenders Portal?

- Optimise the search functions
- Make the dashboards more user-friendly
- Revise the system of notifications
- Improve compatibility with different browsers
- Increase system response speed
- Other (*please specify below*)

10. European Partnerships

Horizon Europe will support European Partnerships to deliver on European and global challenges, through concerted research and innovation efforts with the Member States, the private sector, foundations and other stakeholders. European Partnerships will be established only in cases where they will more effectively achieve the objectives of Horizon Europe than the Union alone and when compared to other forms of funding under Horizon Europe. Horizon Europe will support a more rationalised, strategic and impact-oriented approach to partnerships. It will also put forward a number of simplifications to ensure a better participant experience, notably central management of financial contributions, common set of rules, use of Commission IT tools and better access to information and results from partnerships.

See section [3.10 “European Partnerships”](#) (page 34) of the accompanying document.

* 10.1. Have you received funding from a Joint Undertaking or Article 185 initiative under Horizon 2020?

- Yes
- No

* 10.2. Have you been a partner in a Joint Undertaking or Article 185 initiative under Horizon 2020?

- Yes
- No

10.3. How to most effectively improve the experience in participating in the calls and activities in the context of European Partnerships?

	1 (strongly disagree)	2	3	4	5 (strongly agree)	I don't know
By ensuring that the calls would be accessible on the Funding & Tenders Portal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
By ensuring better communication of opportunities for funding in the context of partnerships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
By ensuring a single set of rules for participation and for funding (i.e. application of Horizon Europe rules for participation without or with very limited derogations)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
By harmonising and centralising submission, evaluation, and reporting procedures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
By ensuring better dissemination and exploitation of results	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other <i>(please specify below)</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other - Please specify:

500 character(s) maximum

Rules for dissemination and exploitation of results shall be clear and not subject to interpretation. If this is the case, more companies would be interested in participating in the activities of the European Partnerships. Furthermore, there has to be a tangible benefit for companies to join the Partnerships, e.g. the opportunity to shape European research funding without jeopardising access to these funds.

10.4. How could we make European Partnerships more attractive for prospective partners?

500 character(s) maximum

The budget to Partnerships shall be adequate to their technology content, objectives and expected impact. Structured dialogues with the business community on future needs and challenges are essential to make partnerships attractive for companies. Involving stakeholders from different sectors right from the beginning and all along the process in the programming would enhance the synergies and success of the programme. Partners shall have the possibility of contributing in-kind commitments.

11. Synergies

Horizon Europe is designed to be implemented in synergy with other Union funding programmes, from their design and strategic planning, to project selection, management, communication, dissemination and exploitation of results, to monitoring, auditing and governance.

See section [3.11 “Synergies between EU funding programmes”](#) (page 35) of the accompanying document.

* 11.1. Are you familiar with other EU funded programmes?

- Yes
 No

11.1a. Please specify the programme(s) you are familiar with (CEF, COSME, Erasmus +, European Regional Development Fund, Interreg, LIFE...):

500 character(s) maximum

CEF, COSME, Erasmum+, cohesion funds

11.1b. Would you consider that synergies between different EU funded programmes could be useful to promote the deployment and uptake of research results?

- 1 (not useful at all)
 2
 3
 4
 5 (extremely useful)
 I don't know

11.2. What areas and/or types of projects require adaptations in order to improve synergies amongst EU funded programmes? What would be the key enabling features for making these synergies happen (joint calls between different EU programmes, sharing implementation data, etc.)?

500 character(s) maximum

EU funding programmes should give preference to funding proposals which directly or indirectly support RDI. For this, a cross-departmental taskforce shall be created inside the Commission to map and ensure stronger synergies among the different EU RDI-related funding schemes. Synergies with cohesion funds should be fostered to reduce geographical, economic and social disparities, whilst the excellence criteria should be maintained in all EU research programmes.

* 11.3. Have you received a Seal of Excellence under Horizon 2020?

- Yes
 No

11.4. Do you think that simplified State aids rules will enable stronger uptake of Seal of Excellence projects by national and/or regional public authorities?

- 1 (not at all)
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5 (to a great extent)
- I don't know

11.5. To which extent do you agree with the following statements?

	1 (strongly disagree)	2	3	4	5 (strongly agree)	I don't know
To preserve the chances of obtaining alternative funding, Seal of Excellence should be issued only for a limited type of calls under Horizon Europe	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Information on proposals receiving the Seal of Excellence should be shared with interested financing authorities (with prior consent of the applicants)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. General input

Please provide here further general input regarding the implementation strategy for Horizon Europe:

5000 character(s) maximum

Companies find several advantages in applying for European RDI funding: EU programmes – from the drafting phase to the publication of the calls and submission / evaluation of the proposal – are broadly transparent. They bring together teams across countries and scientific disciplines and strongly support collaboration. The principle of excellence guarantees that only the best projects are supported, based on competitive calls. Also, EU funding has been helping European academia to remain internationally competitive and support talent development in Europe, especially through the internationally recognised work of the European Research Council. Finally, the impact of the European RDI programme appears to be sound.

Despite these promising results, Europe still fails short in being strong in inventions and weak in innovations. The following factors explain the declining attractiveness of EU programmes for companies:

- The administrative burden of submitting and executing a proposal remains fairly high;
- The current average time-to-grant of 192 is not aligned with companies' needs to drive innovations to the markets fast enough;
- Oversubscription of the programme reduces the chance of winning a proposal to 14%. Companies therefore need to make significant efforts that especially smaller entities can hardly afford;
- Current efforts to promote open science, which is increasingly understood not only as a novel way to publish results, but also as an obligation to make all research results public regardless of their potential business value lead to a shift from market-driven to academic research. Companies fear that proposals submitted with an "open access opt-out" have a reduced chance of being accepted.
- The complexity and diversity of EU funding programmes and formats are a growing barrier, especially for new-comers. Thus, a clarification of the governance (e.g. EIC/EIT) is required.
- Due to their pre-competitive focus, EU programmes do not address the most significant challenge in RDI – overcoming the infamous "valley of death" and bringing novel offering successfully to a competitive market.

To address the above-mentioned challenges, please consider the BusinessEurope priority paper on Research, Development and Innovation - follow the link <https://www.business-europe.eu/publications/research-and-innovation-new-european-political-cycle>. This includes policy recommendations on both Horizon Europe implementation and generally RDI policies. In particular, an adequate budget for Horizon Europe is essential to achieve a real impact. Thus, within the next European Multiannual Financial Framework, at least €120 billion need to be allocated to Horizon Europe. This financial ambition will be key to unlocking private funds and helping reduce the gap in R&D spending to other regions. Also, the second pillar – the true collaborative one – should be strengthened with a minimum budget allocation of at least 60% of the total HEU budget. This is essential to enable ambitious collaborative RDI projects, bring technologies to industrial maturity and help to tackle global challenges.

Thank you very much for your input.

An analysis of the results of this co-design consultation will be available after September 2019. The replies will also feed into the organisation of the debate in the co-design sessions at the [European Research and Innovation Days](#) on 24-25-26 September 2019 in Brussels.

Contact

Olivier.MARGANNE@ext.ec.europa.eu