



## ***Submission to a Consultation***

European Plant Science Organisation

[www.epsoweb.org](http://www.epsoweb.org)

# **EPSO Submission to the European Commission consultation on “Ex-post evaluation of the 7<sup>th</sup> framework programme”**

---

*Brussels, 22.05.2015*

### **Information about the respondent**

EPSO is a registered organisation with the European Commission registrar:

Name: European Plant Science Organisation, EPSO  
Legal status: Non-profit academic international organisation  
Address: Rue de l'Industrie 4, 1000 Brussels, Belgium  
Website: [www.epsoweb.org](http://www.epsoweb.org)  
Contact: [epsos@epsomail.org](mailto:epsos@epsomail.org)  
Register ID number: 38511867304-09

EPSO is an independent academic non-profit organisation with more than 220 research institutes and universities from 31 countries mainly in Europe, and 3 100 individuals, as members, representing over 28 000 people working in plant science.

Country of location: EU level organisation

Remarks to the following pages:

Pages 1 to 17 belong to the online questionnaire.

Page 19 contains additional input and comments on the consultation made by EPSO which was uploaded as separate file to the questionnaire.



# Public consultation on ex-post evaluation of the 7<sup>th</sup> framework programme

Fields marked with \* are mandatory.

## Introduction

---

The Decision [1] setting up 'Seventh Framework Programme' (FP7) of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities' stipulates that "two years following the completion of this Framework Programme, the Commission shall carry out an external evaluation by independent experts of its rationale, implementation and achievements."

The evaluation is an important instrument for informing the European Parliament and the Council, Member States, the research community, the general public and other stakeholders about the achievements of FP7. It will also contribute to improving implementation of Horizon 2020 and provide a solid evidence base for designing future framework programmes. The evaluation will examine the effectiveness of FP7 implementation, the efficiency of resources used and the wider socio-economic impacts of the Framework Programme.

The evaluation covers the entire period of FP7 implementation in between 2007-2013.

The ex-post evaluation is carried out by an independent High Level Expert Group, supported by an extensive evidence-base. It will be completed by the end of 2015. This will be followed by a Commission Communication on the Ex-Post Evaluation.

In order to provide the experts with a range of opinion and views about the functioning, achievements, and impacts of FP7, this interactive consultation has been set up to allow for contributions both from those with direct experience with the FP7, as well as groups or individuals who wish to give their views. The results of this consultation will be made publicly available and will be taken into account in the Commission Communication reacting to the Evaluation Report of the High Level Expert Group.

[1] Article 7(3), see OJ L 412 of 30 December 2006, p1.

More information:

- [on this consultation](#)
- [on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#)

## Important notice on the publication of contributions

---

\*Contributions received are intended for publication on the Commission's website. Do you agree to your contribution being published along with your identity? ([on the protection of personal data regime for this consultation](#))

- Yes, I agree to my contribution being published under the name I indicate
- I do not want my contribution to be published

## 1. Information about the respondent

---

Please provide us with the following information on your identity and on the authority / organisation / company you represent (if any):

\*Name of the public authority / international organisation / organisation or company you represent, if any, or your full name as an individual if your reply as such:

**The information you provide here is for publication**

European Plant Science Organisation (EPSO)

\*Full name (first and last name) of the individual respondent:

**The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published**

Karin Metzloff

Email address of the individual respondent:

**The information you provide here is for administrative purposes only and will not be published**

karin.metzloff@epsomail.org

\*Are you replying:

- on behalf of an organisation
- as a private individual

\*Your role in the organisation:

- None - I am answering as an individual
- Senior Management
- Management
- Researcher
- Strategy/Policy function
- Specialist/Expert
- Other (please specify)

Please specify:

\*

Country of origin (of the organisation when relevant)

\*Your organisation's geographical area of activities (indicate your area of activities if answering as an individual person)

- Local
- Regional
- National
- European
- International
- Not applicable

\*Your organisation's type of activity (indicate your activity type if answering as an individual person)

- Higher or Secondary Education
- Research Organisation
- Private For-Profit (excluding education)
- SME
- Research and/or Innovation Funding Agency
- Ministry
- Other (please specify)

Please specify:

Independent academic non-profit organisation with over 220 research institutions and universities as members, 28,000 people in plant science.

Transparency Register ID number: 38511867304-09

## 2. Questionnaire

---

### Implementation of FP7

---

\*

Based on your experience has the implementation of FP7 been effective?

- Yes
- Generally yes, but with some problems
- Generally no, although with some successes
- No
- Don't know

Has the implementation of FP7 been effective? - Comments (optional)

- The implementation of FP7 has been effective in general.  
- In some projects administrative operation procedures took an exceptionally long time which caused insecurity in the projects, like for example decisions on applications for cost-neutral project extensions.  
- The research topics were quite narrow, too focused, too much application-oriented, allowing in most cases the support of only one project.

In case you have not been participating FP7, please specify here the reasons for non-participation (optional)

n.a.

### Simplification

---

Which of the following FP7 simplification measures generated most impact?

Out of the 11 FP7 simplification measures listed below, please select the 5 FP7 simplification measures which, in your view, generated most impact and rank them accordingly (5 generating most impact)

	Certification of costs (fewer audit certificates)	Participants Guarantee Fund (fewer ex-ante financial checks)	Unique Registration Facility (URF)	Certification of methodology	Web-based electronic system for negotiations (NEF)	Project reporting – streamlined guidelines and structure of reports	Grant amendments – streamlined rules and procedures	Research Participant portal	Simplification of recovery process (flat rate corrections)	Wider acceptance of average personnel costs	Flat rate system for SME owners and natural persons without salary
* 5	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## To what extent have the FP7 simplification measures been successful? - Comments (optional)

- There has been considerable improvement as a result of these changes.
- Especially the participant portal was a huge improvement, as well as the project reporting.
- For institutions which are working on a full cost basis, the acceptance of the full cost model was of major advantage for covering the major part of the personnel costs and the simpler structure and certification of costs overcame a major constraint to efficient reporting in FP6.
- The flat rate of overhead introduced in Horizon 2020 is by far the biggest step forward.
- Many members had negative experience with FP7 grant amendments rules and procedures, causing an enormous administrative effort, neglecting the benefit for impact.

## Achievements and impact

---

### Impacts of each Specific FP7 Programme

In which of the following areas did each Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas per specific programme listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

In which of the following areas did **COOPERATION** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
* 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In which of the following areas did **IDEAS** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
* 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In which of the following areas did **PEOPLE** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
* 3	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

In which of the following areas did **CAPACITIES** Specific Programme of FP7 generate most impact?

For each of the 6 areas listed below, please select the 3 areas which in your view generated most impact and rank them accordingly (3 generating most impact)

	Impact on scientific excellence	Impact on Technological or social innovations	Economic impact	Societal impact	Environmental impact	Regional impact
* 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Impacts of each Specific FP7 Programme – Comments (optional)

Please specify the reasons for the ranking given in previous question and/or refer to any further evidence on impact (scientific, behavioural, technological, innovation, structural, policy, and other) FP7 has had.

- The IDEAS programme is a huge success pulling up and attracting excellence of individual scientists.

- The CAPACITIES programme generated a strong societal and regional impact.

- The PEOPLE programme provided good training opportunity for young researchers and establishment of networks of future cooperation.

- Collaborative projects in both, basic as well as applied research are essential to maintain the competitive advantage of Europe in research. Especially at the beginning the COOPERATION programme produced a huge impact on scientific excellence, technological and social innovations by funding of collaborative, multidisciplinary projects in basic as well as applied research. Collaborative projects in basic research were much less supported towards the end of FP7 (e.g. in FAFB). A trend which should be reversed.

\*Based on your experience to what extent did FP7 research activities produce enduring impact?

- High
- Medium
- Low
- I don't know

\*To what extent did FP7 research activities produce enduring impact for you as FP7 beneficiary (e.g. networking, benchmarking, joint agenda setting, harmonisation of peer review systems)? –  
Comments

- Basically FP7 was an important tool for benchmarking research, establish networks and for joint agenda setting. It provided good training opportunities for young researchers.
- At the beginning FP7 had a real impact in promoting multi-disciplinary networking, opening health and nutrition programmes to plant science contributions.
- Collaborative research including third countries is a unique benefit in Europe. Unfortunately towards the end of FP 7 (in FAFB) there was a tendency towards more applied and innovation research, neglecting this unique benefit for collaborative basic research and losing their competitive advantage. This tendency has become stronger in H2020 (in SC2) and therefore should be corrected urgently to a more balanced approach.

## Contribution of FP7 activities to the European Research Area (ERA)

To which of the following ERA areas did FP7 activities contribute most? Please rank the following areas on a scale from 1 – 5 (5 being the area to which FP7 activities contributed most).

More information on ERA: [http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/research/era/index_en.htm)

	More effective national research systems	Optimal transnational co-operation and competition	An open labour market for researchers	Gender Equality and gender mainstreaming in research	Optimal circulation, access to and transfer of scientific knowledge
* 5	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 4	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 1	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## Contribution of FP7 activities to the European Research Area (ERA) – Comments (optional)

- The Marie Curie Actions give excellent opportunities for early and mid-career researchers.
- The FP7 activities contributed in many ways to build up the ERA. It provides incentives to
  - attract and maintain excellent, not only senior but as well junior researchers in Europe. The collaborative programme at the beginning of FP7 guaranteed an optimal integration and networking of researchers all over Europe, including those from new Member States. But as
  - said before the reduced funding of basic research in collaborative projects at the end of FP7
  - reduced this positive effect and diminished these communities, especially in life sciences.
- Attempts to streamline national research systems in some Member States has led to a further
  - fragmentation of national funding systems.
- Gender equality and main streaming are improving, but there is still a long way to go. For
  - example, in some areas still only a few projects were funded which are coordinated by
  - women.

## European Added Value

---

## EU added-value of FP7

In which of the following dimensions of EU added-value has FP7 been most successful?

Out of the 9 EU added-value areas identified below, please select the 3 which in your view have been most successful and rank them accordingly (3 being the EU added-value dimension in which FP7 has been most successful)

	Tackling pan-European challenges	Coordination of national research policies	EU scale of dissemination of research results	Pooling of resources (achieving critical mass; economies of scale and scope)	Reduction of research risk / of commercial risk	Increase competition in research	Leverage on private investment / on public investment	Improving of S&T capabilities	Enhance researchers' mobility
* 3	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* 2	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* 1	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## EU added-value of FP7 – Comments (optional)

n.a.

## Final questions

---

### \*What are the key achievements/strengths of FP7 in particular?

- Promoting transnational and multidisciplinary research, development of novel and strengthening of existing R&D networks, especially at the beginning of FP7.
- The full electronic management of projects and reporting in the Participant Portal is a huge step forward.
- The increase in budget for European Research (compared to FP6). Acceptance of the full cost model.
- The start and successful implementation of the ERC.

\*Are there shortcomings in FP7 that you think should be corrected? According to your experience have these already been addressed to in the Horizon 2020 Programme?

- ERC and Marie Curie Actions are excellent approaches and programmes.
- At the beginning of FP7 there has been a balance between basic and applied research which ended in mainly applied research and innovation frame support, hardly collaborative basic research projects. This tendency has not been corrected, but even been increased in H2020.  
For not losing Europe's unique global benefit of a transnational research area, this trend should be urgently corrected to a more balanced collaborative research programmes between fundamental knowledge-driven as well as applied research.
- Tendency towards broader themes was welcomed (state the goal, leave approaches open to proposers), but formulation of the call topics often appears to be a collage of expressions of interest that often don't fit together too well.
- The administration should focus on impact/ benefit of a project, supporting an easy way to shift budget as long as this generates better or equal impact of the project.
- A major shortcoming was that for many calls only one research proposal was selected. This has been addressed by the broader remits of the calls in Horizon 2020 and that several projects can be funded.

\*Do you intend to participate again in future?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

\*Did you know your partners in the project before?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

\*Did you participate for the first time?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

\*Do you intend to stay in touch with the partners of your project after the end of the research work?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

\*How quick do you think the result of your research will lead to marketable products and services?

- Within 1 year
- 1 - 5 years
- 5 - 10 years
- In more than 10 years
- Don't know

\*Overall are you satisfied with FP7?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Moderately dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
- Don't know

Should you want to provide additional input on the subject of this consultation or raise specific points not covered in the questionnaire, please upload your additional contribution here:

• [52a3953d-4b55-4120-ab25-cd2e424adb23/Additional input\\_comments on FP7 consultation\\_EPSO.pdf](#)

## Contact

✉ [RTD-FP7-EVALUATION-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu](mailto:RTD-FP7-EVALUATION-CONSULTATION@ec.europa.eu)

---

Brussels, May 2015

## **Additional input and comments on the subject of the public consultation of FP 7 and specific points not covered in the questionnaire**

IDEAS (ERC): very successful

PEOPLE (MC): very successful

COOPERATION:

- Balance again support for collaborative basic research to the level of support for collaborative applied research and demonstration (specifically in FAFB).
- Broader themes stating the goal and leaving the way to achieve this open to the applicants, supporting several approaches per goal (topic).

CAPACITIES:

- Life sciences not yet supported in a balanced way vs. exact sciences (e.g. physics)

Comment on question on partners in the project (because only 1 selection possible):

- members had equal numbers of known as well as new partners in their projects.

Comment on question on time to marketable products ((because only 1 selection possible):

- members answers varied between 1 to 5, 1 to 10 years and not known.

Technical comment on questionnaire:

- in the future a editable questionnaire (e.g. editable word or pdf file) would be very helpful to be used by organisations inviting and compiling input from all their members in a time efficient way.