



Framework Programmes – Our Experience

Paul Jenkins

Head of Strategic Programmes

Our History

- Involved in all FPs and other similar
- FP6 Projects
 - 28 Projects
 - 2 still closing
- FP7 Projects
 - 17 Projects
 - 1 Coordination Action
 - Coordinator for 4 Projects

Our View

- Framework Programmes are a useful tool
 - Very large challenges
 - Multidisciplinary projects
 - Working with supply chain
 - Working with potential customers
 - Working with technology leaders from industry and research institutions
- Expands the value delivered by an industrial research unit
- Integral part of a balanced research programme

.....but could be easier to work with

Experience of FP7 - bidding

- The cost of responding to calls remains very high
 - £30-40k per partner for an Integrated Project
 - Lost research opportunities
 - Invitations to “hopeless” hearings only serves to increase these sunk costs
- LEAR, PIC, etc
 - Inserts delay
 - Barrier to new entrants
- Grant Agreement (GA) “negotiation”
 - Letters of Bank Account
 - Letters of Authority
 - 5 day requirement for return of GA

Experience of FP7 - projects

- Communications inconsistent
 - Registered office address is not fastest, or sometimes possible, route for physical mail
- Amendments to Grant Agreements
 - PO discretion
 - Interplay of NEF and supporting documents leads to multiple revisions
 - Inconsistent approach to sub-contracting
- Financial control increasing
 - Greater emphasis on audits
 - Certifying bodies becoming nervous

Suggestions for FP8 - Programme

- Successfully addressing a Grand challenge will need a radical change to the current programme which:
 - Is a series of calls who's structure is driven more by Commission organisation than the challenges to be addressed
 - Often places emphasis on “point technologies” solutions at the expense of “end-to-end” solutions
 - Produces an incoherent set of stove-pipe projects that do not form a coherent programme.
- Linking EU and National funding programmes has some benefits but this is limited by the allocation processes.
- Consider some funding calls that do not have specific challenges identified

Suggestions for FP8 – Instruments

- FP7 has many good features
 - Retain 100% funding of administrative tasks. These are an overhead of participation.
 - Retain separation of partner funding levels
- However
 - Remove severe restriction of indirect costs for CSAs discourages industry participation
 - Clear support for the financial and legal support of the consortium, rather than the individual partners, would reduce the burden.

Suggestions for FP8

- In many ICT related areas key standards bodies are international. If the EU results are to be exploited they need to convince the international debate. This is made more difficult if key stakeholders are excluded from participating in the original work.
- Research measures are always difficult. Simple measures lead to poor behaviour. Often the results are not visible for many years.
- Greater weighting to exploitation rather than novelty during evaluation
- Joint management of programme must have balanced benefits – not just outsource of programme running costs