



PLATFORM

Platform of bioeconomy ERA-NET Actions
(H2020 Grant number 652635)

REPORT

**Master Class on "ERA-NET Cofund Actions - tools and
methods for efficient call management"
June 7th - 8th, 2017, Copenhagen**

Organised by:

WP1 - Practice: Efficient, effective, and inclusive organisation of ERA-NET activities



Use of terminology for calls of ERA-NET Cofund Actions

<i>Allocated funds</i>	Funds that are reserved for an ERA-NET call in the preparation stage.
<i>Requested funds</i>	Funds that are requested by the applicants in their proposals.
<i>Committed funds</i>	Funds that are reserved for projects in an ERA-NET call after final negotiations have been finished.
<i>EU top-up funds</i>	European Union funds that are added to the national funds for transnational research projects.
<i>Consortium partners</i>	All the beneficiaries of an ERA-NET Cofund Grant Agreement
<i>Funding partners</i>	The organisations involved in funding a joint call.
<i>Applicants</i>	Researchers that apply for funding in an ERA-NET call.
<i>Black box</i>	Refers to the approach in which the consortium may decide to use part of the Union contribution to support activities related to the internal management of the ERA-NET as long as the corresponding costs are not declared as eligible and the Union contribution does not exceed 33% of partners’ funding of transnational projects and unit costs for additional activities. This means in practice that the consortium has to replace any Union contribution beyond the amount for the unit costs that is also used to support their internal management and additional activities with additional national contributions to the funding of trans-national projects.
<i>Unit costs</i>	Additional EU contribution to coordination costs of additional activities, with a maximum of 20% of the total Union contribution to the project. Per year per partner taking part in additional activities one unit can be claimed. One unit stands for EUR 29 000 for direct coordination costs of additional activities. With a flat rate of 25 % added for indirect costs and multiplication by the reimbursement rate of 33 % a unit yields EURO 11 962.50.

Organising team of Masterclass on ERA-NET Cofund Management 7-8 June and Workshop Monitoring, Evaluation, and Impact Assessment 8-9 June, Copenhagen

Ivana Trkulja, AU-ICROFS	Task leader for T1.2 Master Classes on implementing Cofund calls; Lead author for report Master Class, 7-8 June 2017
Niels Gøtke, DAFSHE	Task leader for T1.4 Workshop on evaluation and monitoring; Lead author for report Workshop, 8-9 June 2017
Per Mogensen, DAFSHE	Contact person meeting logistics; Rapporteur contributing to Workshop report
Brenda Kuzniar-van der Zee, WUR	Contact persons for programme Workshop; Contact person website and registrations; Editor for the reports
Christine Bunthof, WUR	PLATFORM Coordinator; Contributor to programmes; Contact for pilot impact assessment; Contributor to reports

July 2017

The report may be quoted provided that the source is acknowledged.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s
Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme
under Grant Agreement No 652635



Contents

1. Welcome and Introductions	4
2. Black box transparency – insights in ERA-NET Cofund funding scheme	5
3. Working topic A: Support tools for matchmaking and handling of applications and evaluation	6
4. Working topic B: Evaluation and ranking of applications	6
5. Working topic C: Selection of recommended applications, funding decisions and project negotiation	8
6. Working topic D: Dissemination and joint project monitoring.....	9
7. Closing speech “FP9 process and instruments for coordination networks such as ERA-NETs”	12
Annex I: Participant List	13
Annex II: Master Class Programme	14

The programme, participant list, report and all presentations can be downloaded in pdf format from the PLATFORM website www.era-platform.eu

1. Welcome and Introductions

The participants were welcomed by **Niels Gøtke** from the Danish Ministry of Higher Education and Research (DAFSHE). Niels recently chaired an Expert Group appointed by the European Commission to evaluate the ERA-NET Cofund instrument. Prior to his opening speech, Niels introduced **Martin Vive Ivø** as our host and Campus leader at the Aalborg University (AAU). Mr. Ivø gave a short presentation about the history of AAU Campus in Copenhagen opened in 2012 and in its main mission summarized under the slogan “Knowledge to the World”. The AAU has numerous undergraduate and postgraduate programmes that are conducted in both Danish and English. The university is internationally recognised for the development of an attractive study method known as “Problem Solving Method” (PBL) that successfully combines scientific methods together with the study of practical cases. The AAU is specialised in diverse disciplines as wireless technology, ICT, energy research, building research, etc. that offer a stimulating and innovative learning environment for the students ([presentation](#)).

Following welcome words, Niels gave an [opening speech](#) to the Master Class under the title “**Evaluation of ERA-NET Cofund Actions under Horizon 2020**”. Niels presented the approach and results of the Expert Group who made the report “Analysis of ERA-NET Cofund actions under Horizon 2020” this is an assessment of all 27 ERA-NET Cofund Actions approved in 2014/2015 and should serve for decision making related to ERA-NET Cofund starting later in Horizon 2020, and the use of the instrument in future Framework Programmes (FP). The assessment was based both on the desk research and on conducted interviews where its main results have indicated following:

- **CHALLENGES** – related to: financial management; improvement of coordination and synergies among different ERA-NETs; ERA-NET integration into the national policy framework; necessity to decrease operation costs;
- **EFFECTIVENESS** – positive feature of ERA-NETs is their ability to mobilize national resources;
- **EU ADDED VALUE** – ERA-NETs have ability to contribute to the alignment of national policies, but this feature needs to be further developed;
- **RECOMMENDATIONS** – ERA-NETs need to be integrated both into H2020 instruments and into national mechanisms in order to step-up on the learning curve and ensure sharing of the knowledge. The long-term recommendation related to the ERA-NET in the FP9 is that the work should continue but maybe elements from the previous Coordination and Support Action (CSA) mechanism will also be used. The focus of the European Commission (EC) will be on separating consolidated ERA-NET Cofunds from newer initiatives after the “Evaluation”.

As a part of introduction to the Master Class, **Christine Bunthof** coordinator of “PLATFORM of bioeconomy ERA-NET actions” from Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands introduced “**Achievements and Ambitions of PLATFORM**” ([presentation](#)). Christine presented the structure of the Coordination and Support Action, funded by H2020 for 3 years (till February 2018). PLATFORM as a “network of networks” is organised around three principal aims: forum for mutual learning, forum for joint dissemination and strategic forum. Christine presented the main PLATFORM activities related to the past Master Classes, Newsletters that are sent out about 10 times a year, PLATFORM DB (in cooperation with ERA-LEARN 2020) and reports based upon this data repository, covering more than 1100 transnational projects funded under ERA-NETs in the bioeconomy area, and finally the PLATFORM Annual Events of which the next one is planned on 5-6 October 2017 in Rome, Italy. The **Tour de table** was incorporated in Christine’s presentation and using an interactive method she invited all the participants (Annex I) to present themselves by identifying with numerous ERA-NET logos visualized on the screen.

After the introductory session, **Ivana Trkulja** (ICROFS, ERA-NET Core Organic, Denmark) as a Chair of the Master Class, introduced the programme and the working methods (Annex II). The first expert **Roland Brandenburg** (ERA LEARN, FFG, Austria) presented an overarching topic relevant for all ERA-NETs that is the Cofund funding scheme and the functioning of the “Black box” mechanism. The presentation was followed by four separate expert presentations specifically engaging with the ERA-NET Cofund call management prepared by: **Christian Breuer** (CoBioTech, Jülich, Germany), **Daria Julkowska** (E-RARE, ANR, France), **Anna Gossen** (ERA-NET Neuron, DLR-PT, Germany) and **Ivana Trkulja**. Each of these four presentations introduced one of the Working topics A-D of the Master Class. The presentations were planned for about twenty minutes each with an interactive sessions allowing question from the participants. During the Master Class, this model was slightly changed as the participants were actively asking questions already during the presentation time and experts were providing an immediate feedback. This working methods resulted in an active knowledge exchange with the topic experts and also fruitful exchange among the participants referring to different practices from their own ERA-NET contexts. The methods used in relation to the working topic D envisaged also a role-play as a part of the interactive session.

2. Black box transparency – insights in ERA-NET Cofund funding scheme

Roland Brandenburg (ERA LEARN, FFG, Austria) presented the “**Black Box Transparency – Insights in ERA-NET Cofund funding scheme**” ([presentation](#)). The speech was related to two different options in the Cofund programme implementation. The options are: 1) *Cofunded call only*, 2) *Cofunded call + Additional activities*. The Consortium is responsible for taking decision regarding the preferred funding scheme. The second option is of particular interest to the ERA-NETs as consortium becomes eligible for unit costs and additional funding from the EC. In this context, the EC contribution is not available for loans, structural funds or third countries. The main aspects related to the option two were described as following:

- **UNIT COSTS** – the unit cost is calculated following the number of partners involved in the additional activities. The unit cost is estimated as a flat rate of 11,962.50 Euro per participant. The additional activities can be related to: the joint calls, workshops, creation of databases or specific surveys. In the reporting on unit cost it is essential to include the participants’ lists, as it is the only justification reference considering that person-months approach is not acceptable. There is a difference between total cumulative spending and reporting on additional activities. The technical reporting is done using the Participant Portal and Sygma system.
- **REPORTING ON ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES** – it is essential that only substantial activities are planned and that appropriate records are kept regarding the partner participation.
- **EC TOP-UP FUNDING** – there is a consideration that there are various options in dealing with the EC top-up funds.
- **RANKING LIST** – there is a consideration related to the eligibility of the full-proposals and keeping of the “safety buffer”.

The detailed outline of Cofund management can be found in the ERA-LEARN website: <https://www.era-learn.eu/manuals-tools>. The next ERA-LEARN Workshop for “Implementing of Cofund” is planned on 21-22 September 2017 in Berlin, Germany.

3. Working topic A: Support tools for matchmaking and handling of applications and evaluation

In relation to different call management systems **Christian Breuer** (CoBioTech, Jülich, Germany) presented the submission system used by ERA-NET Cofund CoBioTech ([presentation](#)). The system is developed by an external company “Logicworks” in Germany that is subcontracted for this service. The system provides an electronic forum where applicants submit their proposals, the call office performs an eligibility check and then only the approved proposals are made accessible to the evaluators in order to perform an initial topic matching with their own expertise. An administrator from the call office gives permission to the evaluators to see the project summaries and express within a week their individual preferences for applications to evaluate. Following this initial phase, the administrator assigns the proposals in the submission system whose features allow rapid distribution of tasks ensuring that expertise and personal commitment of the evaluators were considered. A fact book is prepared for the peer review panel meeting compiled by extracting data from the submission system (i.e. proposals, scores, comments). The budget table in the submission tool permits to include comments. The data protection is ensured through password controlled accounts and confidential e-mails. The main concerns and recommendations:

- **PRESERVE DIVERSITY** – The importance to preserve diversity of expertise among the selected evaluators in the online systems. The possible methods are related for example to the development of colour codes.
- **OPTIMISATION** – The optimisation of ERA-NETs operational costs by having one shared submission and evaluation online system. The EC online tool is not accessible to the ERA-NETs, but some of the programmes have developed autonomously their own submission tools. For example the Jülich call office shares its online tool with their own partners, and ICT-AGRI has developed a meta-knowledge database based on Open office with free access. The recommendation is to identify good practices regarding already existing online systems in different ERA-NETs and to propose to ERA-LEARN to organize the forum where the issue of a common system can be discussed, assessed and decided.

4. Working topic B: Evaluation and ranking of applications

Daria Julkowska (E-RARE, ANR, France) explained about evaluation and ranking in the Cofund evaluation process ([presentation](#)). It is mandatory to follow EC rules requiring the “Two steps selection procedure”:
 Step 1 – national/international evaluation following the decision of consortium and,
 Step 2 – respecting predominately Horizon 2020 criteria, including international peer-review, participation of three scientific experts and independent expert observer.

The main features of the Step 1 procedure:

- National administration is responsible for eligibility check (not scientific evaluation),
- National (scientific) eligibility check;
- International peer review conducted by independent experts.

In this context the selection process can be supported through the following aspects:

- Consortium needs to take into account that the oversubscription rate should be limited to three times per budget per partner;
- Possibility to limit a number of the proposals;
- Set the score threshold (only proposals above ten points can be invited to the second stage);

- Applicability of widening (inclusiveness) concept relevant for the low performing countries with low success rate (acceptable on in step one).

The main features of the Step 2 procedure:

- The single international peer review – organized as a fully remote evaluation (consensus monitored by the Call secretariat) or as a combination of remote evaluation and panel discussion;
- A rebuttal opportunity in which the applicants may write a short reaction to the individual review reports. The application, reviews and rebuttals are provided to the panel members before the consensus meeting.

In this context the following selection criteria are important to consider:

- Along with the EC criteria, each ERA-NET can develop and add sub-criteria in line with individual scope (i.e. impact related factor – encouragement of participation of EU 13 countries),
- It is recommended to use the whole number scores in the step 2,
- There is the obligation to follow the ranking list as long as EC Cofunds are involved in the selection process and to take into consideration the following scoring (please note that this scoring is based on the example used in the presentation and not necessary means that this can be applied to other calls):
 - 11 points meaning that project is recommendable but not fundable
 - 12 points meaning that the project is in the flexibility zone
 - 13-14 points meaning that project is allowed in the selection
- The last two groups of projects are eligible to receive from the EU top-up funds as excellent projects and the remaining funds can be reserved for other activities (i.e. Black box – additional call, administration, etc.).

The main concerns and recommendations:

- **SECTOR EXPERTS** – Involvement of sector experts in Step 1.
- **DROP-OUTS** – Drop-out of the partners and consequences, the replacement of partners is allowed with exactly the same profile of the previous partner and national contact points should check before submission if all partners eligible.
- **DIFFERENCES IN PRIORITIES** – National regulations and implications for evaluation of scientific criteria – some countries give priority to scientific dimension, but it becomes challenging to evaluate properly this criteria. This issue is also present when there are two types of funding bodies, one scientific and one not, that consequently have different institutional priorities even within the same country.
- **HIGH OVERSUBSCRIPTION RATE** – It requires agreement among the partners respecting the aim that each funder has at least one proposal funded (i.e. to match budgets and research community; state to the oversubscribed partner that it cannot participate; decrease 10% on all projects of this partner in Step 2.
- **A-PRIORI CALCULATIONS** – Expected a-priori calculations are not always reflected during the selection process. In some cases the single partners can receive a limited amounts of funds and process can be described in the Consortium Agreement as a separate close.

5. Working topic C: Selection of recommended applications, funding decisions and project negotiation

Anna Gossen (ERA-NET Neuron, DLR-PT, Germany) focused on the selection of recommended application and presented their network experience ([presentation](#)). Anna highlighted following additional features of the project selection:

- Recommended proposals following the scientific experts ranking list (A,B,C groups);
- Use of the Excel Spreadsheets;
- Keep in mind the legal status of the partners with non EU contribution;
- In case the selection process gets blocked already at pre-proposal stage there are the following options: financial cuts in the projects, increase the national budget (partners can prepare with how much they can increase budget on the national level), and prepare to deal with an oversubscription in stage two;
- Total EC grant – it is important to consider that the total EC grant is 33% of eligible national invested budget supplemented with unit costs. The “Black box” can be considered as a “virtual common pot” where the objective is to facilitate funding of maximum number of the projects from the total grant. There is a significant portion of funds required for the management and consequently there is a necessity to decide how many projects need to be funded in order to implement the programme (i.e. ERA-NET Neuron ~9 M€ national project costs, minimum of 12 projects);
- The “Flexibility zone” related to the equally funded proposals can be organised having the selection done e.g. by starting with the funders that still have funds and then filling-in gaps of the single partners funds, prioritization of underrepresented countries;
- Recommend to have a reasonable time in the selection process – some partners have two weeks in between for raising additional funds on national level, some only few hours;
- Mixed model – fixed amount and top-up funds;
- Different selection scenarios to be assessed by the consortia:
 - No partner can increase budget
 - Cuts in the projects, linear cuts, review recommendation
 - Cuts in the management costs
 - Waiver reimbursement
 - Exchange of the personnel between the countries (negotiation between founders and PIs)
 - Other measures

The overall aim is to maximize the EU contribution in the call but also to fund as many projects from as many countries as possible. The main concerns and recommendations:

- **OPTIMIZE** – Optimize the use of EU funding; deploy various approaches in between the pre-proposal and full proposal step to foster participation inclusiveness target countries and to optimize between request and allocated budgets and differences therein between countries.
- **ALTERATIONS** – To include additional partners or to shift national financial distribution, to change consortium structure or to shift Work Package is permitted only in Step 1;
- **TIME MANAGEMENT** – The preparation takes time!

6. Working topic D: Dissemination and joint project monitoring

Ivana Trkulja (ERA-NET CORE Organic, ICROFS, Denmark) presented the specific case of ERA-NET CORE Organic and its practice related to dissemination and systematic project monitoring. The presentation gave an overview of CORE Organic Programme history since 2004 (CORE Organic I, II, Plus and Cofund) indicating that project dissemination and joint monitoring practices are integral part of the Programme implementation involving CORE Organic Secretariat, funding bodies and project partners ([presentation](#)). The project dissemination activities include publication of academic articles, specialized videos, organizing of events with the stakeholders, uploading of the project documentation in the specialized electronic database "Organic Eprints" (www.orgprints.org) and are conducted throughout the implementation of the project. These dissemination activities together with an overall scientific research work are presented in the standardised reports and assessed during the mid-term and the final monitoring meetings. The specific project monitoring practice which characterises the CORE Organic was experienced by Master Class participants through group work conceived as a role-play.

The Group Work – Interactive sessions

The interactive session was done using a role-play method simulating the monitoring meeting of a research project. It was based on fictional research projects and problems occurring during the course of such projects. The participants were divided into three groups and following the CORE Organic monitoring model, in each group there was a chair of the monitoring meeting, project coordinator presenting the project that is monitored and ministerial representatives funding the project activities. Each group first engaged in the experience of the monitoring principles in relation to their fictional roles. After that, they devoted time to discuss and write on post-its relevant points. Considering diverging monitoring practices in different ERA-NETs this was an opportunity to stimulate discussion related to the monitoring process considering both to the applicability of this model for other ERA-NETs and also the existing challenges for its implementation. What follows is the transcription of the groups' notes during the discussion made on post-its:

Group 1

The main concerns and recommendations:

- **PROJECT EXTENSIONS** – are considered nearly automatic but in the Cofund mechanism the project should finish during Cofund implementation phase and this needs to fit national rules, EU regulations and be well argued,
- **DEADLINES** – clear commitments among funding bodies, coordinator and ERA-NET Secretariat, solutions - mitigation measures and overseeing the issues;
- **REPORTING** – do not be too demanding, focus on schedule, milestones, deliverables and put emphasis on the transnational added value;
- **BEING CONSTRUCTIVE** – not only point out problems, encourage the coordinator and project teams;
- **FACE-TO-FACE VS. VIDEO CONFERENCE MEETINGS** – both at mid-term and final project phase, invite stakeholders, more meetings and less formal formats, kick off meetings to connect researchers, funding bodies and other stakeholders, workshop in dissemination assistance on communication, mid-term meeting and final meeting.



Group 2

The main concerns and recommendations:

- **NATIONAL PRACTICES** – how to integrate this type of monitoring in our own system with follow up group?; what is under the control of funding bodies and what is beyond their capacity?
- **IPR ISSUES** – patenting issues are new for many participants; need to know about monitoring of tasks; how can we enhance the industry participation; non-cooperation issue, is IPR well-defined in Consortium Agreement?,
- **FACE-TO-FACE MEETING** – interesting for identifying possible solution brought by a group founders; good for synergies among funders (or to put international pressure); an effort to ensure success of the project implementation,
- **DIRECT COMMUNICATION** – development of solutions can be easier if there is a direct communication between the funders as a group and the researchers; need for coordinator to gather info plus defend their project, could be positive; direct communication brings solution,
- **TRANSNATIONALITY** – transnational aspects are evident in the process; the project contracting is differently seen in transnational context; funding issues in GR sensitive issues – companies and researchers, national level,
- **TIMING** – meeting for mid-term more relevant than at the end; role play has indicated that the monitoring method is more relevant for mid-term reporting, and that should be considered a different model for the final reporting,
- **DISCUSS MAIN ISSUES** – main questions should be discussed in person while others via e-mail; questions beforehand are useful so that it also can be brought to the system of their ERA-NETs,
- **MAKE PREPARATION OBLIGATORY** – reports are not read by all funders if not binding,
- **SHARE** – exchange of templates (documents, among the partners); IPR issue from ERA-NETs relevant for other disciplines (SME's).



Group 3

The main concerns and recommendations:

- **MOTIVATION** – how to motivate funding bodies to participate?; how many ERA projects have been discontinued?;
- **VISIBILITY OF ISSUES** – since all funding bodies are on board, problems with single funding body become visible and could be solved; provides platform for founders to discuss difficulties due to administration of budgets (i.e. one partner blocks project progress, others will need to extend; difficult in Cofund),
- **DEFINE RULES FOR MONITORING IN ADVANCE** – how to show the outcome of the mid-term report discussion (coordination integrates discussion in the reports?; minutes with proposal from funders); prepare report templates the way not only reporting on progress but also difficulties are described; main question what is more important national rules – advances of national partners or all consortium).
- **TIME CONSUMING** – This method provides funders with a lot of information, however the process is very time consuming, some issues related to national regulations could also be addressed on the national level instead via coordinator and this meeting.



The third part was characterized by reporting back to the plenary some final points for discussion by the observer **Christine Bunthof** and the break-out group chairs:

Christine Bunthof – observer to all groups

- Success of meeting depends on number of factors, including the room and the sitting arrangement;
- From the cases in the role-plays it became clear how many things can cause delay of projects, or cause problems otherwise!
- Simulation of real-life situations – roles really came out – coordinators – funding bodies;
- Corrective actions, when in time, can save a project;
- Face-to-face discussion, and good preparations of in particular meeting chair and project lead PI are important for having a constructive meeting that results in options for mitigation of the problems.

Fabrice Gouriveau – chair of group 1

- Reporting using the simple formats
- Focus on deliverables
- Extensions
- Missing scientific experts
- Different level of experience of the process
- Face to face meetings vs. video conferences
- Need to commit people to take decisions
- Preparation – informal meeting before
- Encourage coordinator, national funding bodies
- Setting deadlines, tasks

Arnd Bassler – chair of group 2

- Useful tool for follow up of the projects
- Platform for delayed projects
- Visibility of funding bodies (present or not?)
- How can funding bodies be motivated? Time?

Ivana Trkulja - chair of group 3

- The session was interesting blend of role play fiction topics and real issues (i.e. patenting updates)
- Vivid interaction using the real tools and symbolic representation of the national funding bodies
- Presentation aspects of CORE Organic Cofund well accepted

7. Closing speech “FP9 process and instruments for coordination networks such as ERA-NETs”

Niels Gøtke (Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Denmark) presented ERA-NET instrument in relation to the new FP9 programme period following completion of the H2020 ([presentation](#)).

- ERA-NETs are very much about people managing different technical aspects;
- Future P2P, FP9 – to be discussed in the GPC (High Level Group on Joint Programming) as Mutual Learning Exercise (MLE), and as long term strategies for JPI (Chairs interacting);
- Annual Joint Programming Conference – 7-8 November 2017, Brussels – important event for this issue;
- Member States participate also with their position papers FP9;
- The main aspects of the Danish position paper: principle excellence; R&I was an already existing topic but now higher education is also integrated; high impact; new model of P2P (cross-cutting issues and less administrative); simplification.

Who is deciding?

- Confusion between ERA-NETs and other funding mechanisms (ERA-NET - 33% EU contribution vs Art. 185 Art. 50 % EU contribution – merge instruments in order to avoid competition),
- Discussion – no clear decision making bodies,
- Important that the P2Ps involved optimize the use of the instruments (administration vs. impact, costs).

The chair, **Ivana Trkulja**, summarised key points and recommendations of the working topics. She recalled that within the H2020 PLATFORM project this was the second Master Class on ERA-NET Cofund actions. Other topics covered in Master Classes and Workshops included: instruments for public-public collaboration, inclusiveness, and monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment. Through these workshops and master classes, and through the annual events, the PLATFORM project brings together the bioeconomy P2P community to share knowledge, learn, network, increase coherence, and have a common voice. She closed the event by thanking all speakers and participants for their contributions.

Annex I: Participant List

Last name	First name	Organisation	Country
Afentaki	Paraskevi	General Secretariat for Research and Technology (GSRT)	GR
Allegrini	Marco	Ministry of Agricultural, Food and Forestry Policies (Mipaaf)	IT
Ansem, van	Wilke	Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (ZonMw)	NL
Bassler	Arnd	Federal Office of Agriculture and Food (BLE)	DE
Brandenburg	Roland	Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FFG)	AT
Breuer	Christian	Project Management Jülich (JÜLICH)	DE
Bunthof	Christine	Wageningen University and Research (WUR)	NL
Chojnacka	Justyna	Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness (MINECO)	ES
Darmendrail	Dominique	French National Research Agency (ANR)	FR
Fekete	Anett	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (FVM)	HU
Flindt Jørgensen	Lisbeth	Geological Survey of DK and Greenland (GUES)	DK
Frenzel	Monika	French National Research Agency (ANR)	FR
Fuchs	Annika	Federal Office of Agriculture and Food (BLE)	DE
Gossen	Anna	German Aerospace Center – Project Management Agency Department (PT-DLR)	DE
Gøtke	Niels	Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education (DAFSHE)	DK
Gouriveau	Fabrice	French National Institute for Agricultural Research (INRA)	FR
Ivø	Martin Vive	Aalborg University (AAU)	DK
Jablonowski	Veronika	Research Centre Jülich (PTJ)	DE
Julkowska	Daria	French National Research Agency (ANR)	FR
Kunya	Zsófia	Ministry of Agriculture	HU
Kuzniar	Brenda	Wageningen University and Research (WUR)	NL
Lemke	Carina	Agency for Renewable Resources (FNR)	DE
Lisbjerg	Dennis	Technical University of DK - National Institute of Aquatic Resources (DTU Aqua)	DK
Margraf	Stefanie	Project Management Jülich (JÜLICH)	DE
Mogensen	Per	Danish Agency for Science and Higher Education (DAFSHE)	DK
Mughal	Nadeem	Department for Business Energy & Industrial Strategy (BEIS)	UK
Redd	Tom	The Research Council of Norway (RCN)	NO
Schavemaker	Yvonne	Dutch Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO)	NL
Schulte	Petra	Project Management Jülich (JÜLICH)	DE
Schulz	Nikola	Project Management Jülich (JÜLICH)	DE
Sinigoj	Jasna	Geological Survey of Slovenia	SI
Trkulja	Ivana	The International Centre for Research in Organic Food Systems (ICROFS)	DK
Vashev	Boris	Agency for Renewable Resources (FNR)	DE
Young	Chris	UK NCP Energy	UK

Annex II: Master Class Programme

Wednesday 7 June 2017

- 12.00-13:00 **Registration and welcome lunch**
INTRODUCTIONS
- 13.00 **Welcome**
 Niels Gøtke, Expert Group "ERA-NET Cofund evaluation", Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Denmark and Martin Vive Ivø, AAU Campus leader, Denmark
Opening speech "Evaluation of ERA-NET Cofund Actions under Horizon 2020"
 Niels Gøtke, Expert group "ERA-NET Cofund evaluation", Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Denmark
Tour de table
PLATFORM Activities
 Christine Bunthof, PLATFORM, Wageningen University & Research, The Netherlands
Black Box Transparency – Insights in ERA-NET Cofund funding scheme
 Roland Brandenburg, ERA LEARN, FFG, Austria
WORKING TOPICS
- 14:00 **Working topic A: Support tools for matchmaking and handling of applications and evaluation**
Call management systems in use, match-making methods and data-protection
 Christian Breuer, CoBioTech, Jülich, Germany
Working topic B: Evaluation and ranking of applications
One-step v. two-step procedure, evaluation criteria and comparability of scores
 Daria Julkowska, E-RARE, ANR, France
Round table
Participants share their working methods and best practices; conclusions and recommendations for these topics
- 15:30 **Coffee break**
- 16:00 **Working topic C: Selection of recommended applications, funding decisions and project negotiation**
 Anna Gossen, ERA-NET Neuron, DLR, Germany
Round table
Participants share their working methods and best practices; conclusions and recommendations for this topic
- 17:30 End of day one
- 19.00 **Dinner and social evening**

Thursday 8 June 2017

- 09.00 **Working topic D: Dissemination and joint project monitoring**
 Ivana Trkulja, ERA-NET CORE Organic, ICROFS, Denmark
Round table
Participants share their working methods and best practices; conclusions and recommendations for this topic
- 10.30 **Coffee break**
- CLOSING PART**
- 11:00 **Closing speech "FP9 process and instruments for coordination networks such as ERA-NETs"** Niels Gøtke, Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Denmark
- 11.30 **Overview of results and recommendations**
- 12:00 End of the Master Class
- 12.00-13:00 **Lunch & Goodbye**
Together with participants of the Workshop Monitoring, Evaluation and Impact Assessment