



Foreword by Vladimír Šucha, Director-General of the Joint Research Centre (JRC)

I am very pleased to address the Widening Community in this Sixth issue of the NCP_Wide.Net e-Bulletin.

The research and innovation divide in Europe remains a pressing challenge, and targeted approaches can significantly contribute to redress the situation.

Since my arrival at the Joint Research Centre I have been actively promoting collaboration between funding programmes that decrease disparities across Europe. First, because the high significance of issues such as climate change, migration or emerging infectious diseases calls for the mobilisation of all available potential in addressing them. Second, because challenges affect countries, regions and cities in different ways.



In my view all territories can benefit from customised solutions by identifying their unique innovation opportunities.

Third, because, in leaving no place behind, socio-economic inequalities across people and places can be tackled, and opportunities for peace and prosperity can be consolidated.

Contributors: Anna Vosečková, Vassiliki Kalodimou, Kaspars Kalniņš

Editors: Wojciech Adamiak, Kristin Kraav, Anna Mossolova



Foreword by Vladimír Šucha, DG of the JRC

[Smart Specialisation Strategies for Research and Innovation \(RIS3\)](#) across the European Union and beyond allow all territories to find their place in addressing global challenges with local strengths.

While the origin of the Smart Specialisation Strategies approach can be found in the design of the Cohesion Funds, effective implementation of these strategies across EU territories requires joint efforts between EU, national, regional and local levels, and across funding sources. I am proud that the European Institutions in general and the JRC in close collaboration with DG Regio in particular, are taking a leading role in the EU engagement with the Member States and regions to achieve that.

JRC has been working extensively with slow growth and low income regions (or the so called "lagging regions") to help them develop specific capacities to implement their Smart Specialisation Strategies, while also developing a more cross-cutting approach to key issues regarding growth and governance in such regions.

Significant numbers of key stakeholders from across the EU's less developed regions and beyond have been brought together to generate and develop project ideas and identify relevant funding sources in the priority areas for their regions. This approach has also enhanced understanding of and increased commitment to the Smart Specialisation process. It has helped to further develop practical support and valuable lessons for regions across Europe, in particular how to better help the development and enhancement of territorial innovation ecosystems and the design and implementation of relevant innovation policies.

The joint European Parliament – European Commission "***Stairway to Excellence***" project has been a flagship initiative to support lagging regions. It started by exploring ways of bridging the Research Framework Programme and the Cohesion funds, and is now experimenting with new approaches for synergies between various funding programmes.



Foreword by Vladimír Šucha, DG of the JRC

For example, together with the European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT), synergies between Smart Specialisation Strategies and the Knowledge and Innovation Communities are explored, not only under the EIT Regional Innovation Scheme but also with their Co-Location Centres across Europe. Closer collaboration between national and regional authorities that manage structural funds with public-private partnerships under H2020, such as Joint Undertakings are also encouraged, as in Horizon Europe successful partnering between public and private actors at local, regional, national and European level will be ever more important.

Interregional partnerships on matching priorities in their Smart Specialisation strategies are also crucial for the prosperity of the regions. They currently operate in three key areas: energy, industrial modernisation and agri-food.

They offer regions targeted support in fostering interregional cooperation based on matching smart specialisation priorities related to these three thematic areas. They enable regions to develop or share infrastructure, as well as to combine different EU investment instruments, such as the [European Structural and Investment \(ESI\) Funds](#), [COSME](#), [Horizon2020](#) and the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI). This shared objective has aligned the platforms closely with the activities of the *Stairway to Excellence* project.

I am very pleased that the European Parliament decided to extend the scope of the *Stairway to Excellence* project which, since 2017, covers all Member States. In its current phase the project is focused on how to enhance the value of EU funding sources for research, regional development and innovation and with special attention to territories with less experience in attracting funding from a variety of sources.



Foreword by Vladimír Šucha, DG of the JRC

Best practices are being gathered from a number of pilots, ranging from a Learning Lab on supporting mechanisms for capacity building in Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe, through networking opportunities for various actors, to efficient use of research infrastructures.

While recent innovation performance in Europe in terms of overall growth in the volume of research and innovation activities has been promising, significant territorial differences in innovation performance still persist across the European landscape. The *Stairway to Excellence* project will therefore continue to foster complementarities with *widening* in addressing this territorial disparity by fully exploiting the potential of Europe's talent pool, ensuring that the benefits of an innovation-led economy are both maximised and widely distributed across the European Union.

JRC remains fully committed to accompanying Member States and regions in their journey to more efficient and effective implementation of their Smart Specialisation Strategies, and finding synergies between available funding sources. I firmly believe that tailored approaches combined with a reinforced R&I thematic support will be most beneficial for the future prosperity of all regions across Europe.





Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

This article, as did the previous one on TWINNING from autumn 2018, features the most frequent mistakes that appeared in the proposals submitted to the ERA Chairs 2019 call (open for applicants from 26 July 2018 to 15 November 2018). The term “most frequent mistakes” in fact means “comments from the independent experts evaluating the proposals” that appeared in the Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs) more frequently and had a negative impact on scoring. Our aim is to alert the applicants to the issues they should be aware of so as not to lose precious award points and to increase their chances of succeeding in the competition. We strongly recommend the proposers to go through this list carefully and check their text against these issues.

We have divided the most frequent evaluator comments into three blocks corresponding to the structure of the Coordination and Support Action (CSA) proposal template – Technical Annex (Part B), i.e. Excellence, Impact and Implementation.

Within these three blocks, the most frequently mentioned mistakes related to specific issues of the ERA Chairs projects are grouped to allow for easy navigation. The specific key features that the ERA Chairs projects belong to are as follows: mono-beneficiary action (one participant), recruitment of an outstanding personality as an ERA Chair holder, and structural changes at the institution aligned with ERA priorities. The activities performed and the outputs of the project should have a positive influence not only on the institution hosting the ERA Chair holder, but also on the region and possibly the widening country as a whole.

Criterion Excellence

Within this part, the evaluators are asked to consider the extent to which the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the call text as well as to the relevant Work Programme.

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

Then, the experts check the clarity and pertinence of the objectives, the credibility of the proposed methodology, and the soundness of the concept. Finally, they assess the quality of the proposed CSA measures.

SWOT analysis

- lacks sufficient depth and therefore the need for this grant cannot be assessed;
- there is no convincing picture of credibility and viability as the SWOT analysis is missing entirely;
- issues regarding facilities and support funding are not addressed sufficiently.

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

- the proposal is mainly based on scientific objectives / non-scientific objectives on structural changes are not sufficiently clear / objectives do not relate to the recruitment of the ERA Chair holder;
- the objectives are not convincingly linked to the attributes identified in the SWOT analysis;
- they are not realistic / not measurable/ lack detailed description / are too ambitious.

Key performance indicators (KPIs)

- KPIs for monitoring and evaluating actions are missing;
- the proposal does not demonstrate the achievability of the objectives as realistic indicators are not described sufficiently;
- the targets for each objective are generic and performance indicators are not clearly identified.

Structural changes

- defined too broadly / do not cover ERA priorities;
- do not target achieving excellence on a sustainable basis;
- support from the ERA Chair to help the organisation to compete for research funding is not clearly formulated.

Concept and methodology

- no convincing methodology to strengthen research capabilities ;
- the development of a new laboratory/division is not described well enough to be credible;
- the concept is not related to the central role of the ERA Chair and their team.

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

Long-term vision and sustainability

- the sustainability of the ERA Chair position beyond the duration of the project is not properly addressed;
- it is unclear how the new researchers attracted to the institution with the help of the ERA Chair would be retained after the project ends other than by securing more funding.

ERA Chair holder and their team

- the role of the ERA Chair is not sufficiently described / their focus area of research is unclear;
- the physical location of the ERA Chair and their team is unclear / their access to equipment and facilities is not elaborated on;
- the need for the ERA Chair position is not sufficiently demonstrated;
- the recruitment process is described in a very generic way and is therefore not credible.

Letter of the host institution

- no information on the commitment of the host institution regarding support for the ERA Chair holder (e.g. remuneration package, roles and responsibility);
- a letter of support from the institution including a description of the remuneration package for the ERA Chair holder is completely missing;

- the proposal lacks clarity around the remuneration package for the ERA Chair holder and on the resources planned for the scientific team.

Interactions with authorities and stakeholders

- the alignment of regional and national strategies for smart specialisation is discussed but interactions with the relevant authorities and stakeholders are not substantiated;
- external research and innovation collaborations and interactions with national and regional authorities and stakeholders are not sufficiently described / lack detail;
- although there are obvious connections to industry, an adequate plan to exploit this synergy is not provided;
- measures for interacting with industry are not fully elaborated.

Criterion Impact

In this part, the evaluators are asked to consider the extent to which the project output would contribute to each of the anticipated impacts stated in the Work Programme and the call text, respectively.

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

Next, the experts assess the quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate project results, including intellectual property rights (IPR), and to manage research data where relevant. Finally, they look at the quality of the proposed measures to communicate project activities to different target audiences.

Anticipated impact and KPIs

- the anticipated impacts listed in the Work programme are not addressed / not adequately described either quantitatively or qualitatively;
- the impact regarding the ERA priorities is insufficiently elaborated / lacks credibility as it is not described in detail;
- the impact on the adoption of the Charter and Code throughout the institution is not sufficiently addressed;
- baseline values have not been provided and the KPIs are not grouped per impact area.

ERA priorities

- the plan for implementing ERA priorities within the institution is missing / not enough attention is paid to the implementation of ERA priorities;

- the gender equality plan is not clearly proposed;
- the implementation of ERA priorities, such as the Charter and Code, is addressed in the proposal but lacks specific details and is therefore unconvincing.

Attractiveness and research excellence

- it is not convincingly explained how the outputs would increase the attractiveness of the institution, region and country for internationally excellent researchers;
- there is no convincing view of how the institution's capability to compete successfully for internationally competitive research funding should be improved;
- project output would somewhat contribute to the anticipated impacts in the Work Programme, but would primarily affect the host institution, and there is not enough detail on how the attractiveness of the region and country would be increased.

Dissemination and exploitation (DoE)

- there is no adequate plan for the exploitation of project results / exploitation planning is insufficiently elaborated;

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

- DoE measures are generic, a concrete plan is missing, and KPIs are not clearly defined
- there is no clear distinction between dissemination and communication activities.

IPR, data (high No. of comments)

- the IPR plan and data management policy are brief / lacking specific detail / insufficiently elaborated / there is no IPR management plan;
- Open Access principles are not sufficiently taken into account;
- data protection issues as well issues related to the management of IPR are hardly addressed;
- lack of a clear strategy for research data and knowledge management as well as IPR management.

Communicating the project activities

- communication to different target audiences is barely described / is limited / is completely missing;
- the communication plan is generic and not sufficiently detailed to be credible / not sufficiently elaborated and focused / inadequately described;
- the communication plan does not cover the phase after the completion of the project.

Criterion Implementation

Evaluators have to look at all the aspects allowing for the efficient and effective implementation of the proposed project.

Specifically, this means that they have to check the quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including the extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables. Closely linked to this is the aspect of the appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management. Last but not least, the experts look at appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that the involved personnel, including the recruited ERA Chair and their team, have a valid role and adequate resources to fulfil their roles.

Work plan

- the overall structure of the work plan is presented too briefly / the work plan does not sufficiently inform on the means by which the objectives and tasks will be fulfilled;
- the work plan is too complex and not described sufficiently;

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

- the role of the ERA Chair is not clearly described in the work plan;
- the inter-relations and inter-dependencies among the work packages are not duly described;
- the work plan is unbalanced as the majority of resources are assigned to WP Management and no justification is provided for this.

Work packages (WPs) and tasks (high No. of comments)

- WPs and tasks focus purely on research / are not logically defined / are too briefly outlined
- the objectives are not linked to the work package structure;
- WP leaders are not clearly appointed / the leadership of some WPs is not assigned;
- WPs do not sufficiently address: (i) recruitment of the ERA Chair holder and their team; (ii) a long-term plan for producing research excellence and potential for success at securing future grants; (iii) vital structural changes; (iv) enhanced ability for innovation through collaborations with industry / research at national and international levels;
- the allocation of tasks and resources to different WPs and individuals is inadequately defined / not sufficiently elaborated on.

Deliverables and milestones

- the number of milestones to monitor progress is minimal / the timing of some milestones is not realistic;
- deliverables and milestones are not described clearly enough to permit monitoring of progress;
- milestones are unevenly distributed to monitor progress.

Gantt chart

- does not provide sufficient detail to see a coherent timeline of WPs, tasks, deliverables and milestones;
- is included but does not give a clear overview of the work to be done, the links between the work packages, or indicative deliverables / milestones;
- is insufficiently developed and does not allow the progress to be monitored effectively.

Recruitment (high No. of comments)

- the procedures for the recruitment of the ERA Chair and their team members do not emphasise transparency and a merit-based approach;
- the time needed to recruit the ERA Chair holder and their research team is underestimated;

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

- the process of appointing the ERA Chair holder is insufficiently elaborated and lacks detail;
- there is limited external academic input in the procedures for appointing the ERA Chair holder;
- the budget associated with recruiting the ERA Chair holder is overestimated and not duly justified.

ERA Chair and their team (high No. of comments)

- the central role of the ERA Chair within an organisation is not presented and so it is difficult to judge complementarity / lack of detail in describing the integration of existing expertise with the expected ERA Chair, leaving the complementarity issue unfocused / unclear how the ERA Chair will interact with the wider organisation and within broader institutional management structures;
- inadequate description of necessary decision-making procedures confirming the autonomy of the ERA Chair / the role and autonomy of the ERA Chair are unclear / the roles, level of responsibility and obligations of the ERA Chair holder are not sufficiently presented;
- support funding is not appropriate for the ERA Chair's need to travel and attend conferences / the ERA Chair's travel expenses

are not well justified / the ERA Chair team is under-resourced.

Management structures and processes

- are not adequately described / are not convincing / are too complex / are not clear;
- the autonomy of the ERA Chair within the management structure is not clear / the vital ERA Chair holder position is not included as a major feature in the management structure;
- the project management team is mentioned but not clearly defined and not linked to the ERA Chair role;
- external partners are given roles in the management structure, and the reason for sharing decision-making with partners is unclear.

Risks and innovation management

- the risk analysis is not adequate and contingency plans are neither realistically considered nor relevant to the planned activities;
- the quality assurance procedure and risk contingency plan are minimal;
- innovation management is not properly addressed;
- risks and mitigation measures are not adequately addressed, since the risks are limited to recruitment issues, while technical and policy-related risks are not fully considered.

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

Resources and budget

- the allocation of tasks and resources is not appropriate / the number of PMs is minimal, which casts doubt at the viability of the activities to be implemented;
- other direct costs, such as travel costs, are not fully justified / the budget allocated for equipment is substantial but adequate justification is not provided;
- the budget lacks a detailed breakdown and the number of PMs committed is not sufficiently justified / distribution of PMs across work packages is imbalanced;
- some costs are not admissible (e.g. person months for individuals outside the host institution).

Recommendations

To conclude, we would like to give the potential applicants to the last ERA Chairs call in H2020 a set of recommendations that would help them include all the necessary elements and increase their chances in the grant competition. Firstly, they must be aware that a thorough SWOT analysis is the basis of a good proposal, they should be self-critical, and elaborate especially carefully on the weaknesses and threats.

These should then be fully incorporated into the Action Plan and individual work packages objectives down to the level of tasks. The number of work packages should not be too high (optimally 5-7), bearing in mind that three of them are in fact obligatory: WP on management, WP on communication and dissemination, and WP dedicated to the activities of the ERA Chair holder and their team. The management structure should be simple and the roles and responsibilities of the people involved should be clearly described, not forgetting the role of the ERA Chair holder. It is of utmost importance to take into account the EU General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), as it affects all the activities and events organised. Compared to the previous calls, there are a few new elements: better use of the installed research capacity (in particular EU co-funded research infra-structures and facilities – making full use of them will be an asset), description of previous/current ERA Chair grants (if any),

Most frequent mistakes in ERA Chairs proposals and what to be aware of

clearly demonstrating the added value and impact of the proposal compared to already funded project(s), and prolonging the duration of the project to six years.

The text of the proposal should be clear and brief, structured in short paragraphs, using simple sentences, avoiding buzzwords and abbreviations as much as possible. The interconnection with national and regional RIS3 strategies as well as the use of European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) should not be omitted. References to relevant important EU documents and strategies are of course an asset. Regarding the widening institution, please be aware that the evaluators will check the English version of your website to learn more about you, specifically about your participation in European and international projects. There are several recent documents that could help improve the proposals, e.g. the EC [Social Media Guide](#) published in April 2018, the IPR Helpdesk [brochure](#) on Communication, Dissemination and Exploitation from March 2018, and a [blog article](#)

by Angela Hengsberger explaining all aspects of Innovation Management. A good source of inspiration for Intellectual Property Management is the 2015 [fact sheet](#) of the IPR Helpdesk entitled “IP Management in H2020: proposal stage”. There are other important sources that can help the applicants improve their proposals, e.g. [the Guidance Note](#) on Ethics and Data Protection published by the European Commission in November 2018 or [the toolkit](#) of activities targeting the interaction with relevant stakeholders prepared by the SPARKS project in June 2018. Last but not least, an important source of knowledge is also the [CORDIS database of projects](#) – look at the section of projects results relevant to ERA Chairs to find their reports, deliverables and publications.

*Author: Anna Vosečková
WIDESPREAD NCP
Czechia*

The RECETOX Centre Hat Trick in the 2018 SEWP Calls

During the first half of 2019, the results of the 2018 SEWP calls (TEAMING Phase2, TWINNING and ERA Chairs) were gradually announced. Czechia belonged to the group of countries that were quite successful in all three calls. RECETOX Centre from Masaryk University in Brno (MU Brno) managed to achieve the most amazing result – they gained a grant in all three calls in 2018. This has never happened before. CONGRATULATIONS! The projects mentioned below have already been published on [CORDIS](#). Anybody can check out the details of these projects (including the abstracts).

TEAMING Phase 2

Project CETOCOEN Excellence coordinated by RECETOX MU Brno has four partners: ICRC FNUSA Brno – CZ; University College London – UK; Research Infrastructure BBMRI-ERIC – AT; and ETH Zürich – CH

TWINNING

Project URBAN_X coordinated by RECETOX MU Brno has two partners: University College London – UK; and ISGlobal – ES

ERA Chairs

Project R-Exposome Chair is coordinated by RECETOX MU Brno

RECETOX (Research Centre for Toxic Compounds in the Environment) is an independent department under the Faculty of Science, Masaryk University, with its own programmes for research and development and education. It is also involved in expert activities within the field of environmental contamination. The centre focuses on persistent organic pollutants (POPs), polar organic compounds, toxic metals, and their species and natural toxins – cyanotoxins. The original RECETOX (Research Centre for Environmental Chemistry and Education) was established in the 1990s thanks to the European Union PHARE funds.



The RECETOX Centre Hat Trick in the 2018 SEWP Calls



Research centre
for toxic compounds
in the environment

In 2010, the actual centre was established with support from the European Research and Development Fund. The centre is also part of the Czech Roadmap of Large Infrastructures for Research, Development and Innovation endorsed by the Czech government since 2012, and since it has also been 2016 part of the ESFRI Roadmap. As such, it provides open access to the international scientific community.

Moreover, RECETOX hosts the National Centre for Toxic Compounds and the Stockholm Convention Regional Centre for Capacity-building and the Transfer of Technology that jointly support the rapid transfer of research outputs into practical applications nationally and internationally.

Author:
Anna Vosečková,
WIDESPREAD NCP
Czechia



Widening Actions & Regional Impact: Side Event of the EWRC 2019

How do widening projects contribute to regional growth?

The NCP_WIDE.NET project is delighted to organise a side event for this year's edition of [the European Week of Regions and Cities](#) that will address this question.

The European Week of Regions and Cities is an annual four-day event for regions and cities to showcase their capacity to generate growth and jobs. Each year, experts meet to share the best practices in economic development and social inclusion, cross-border cooperation, regional innovation and public-private partnerships. This year, the EWRC will take place in Brussels on October 7-10.

NCP_WIDE.NET chose the European Week of Regions and Cities as the main event to highlight the nature of widening actions and connect them to a greater cause, such as regional growth, which is close to the thematic pillars of this year's EWRC.

The side event "Widening Actions and Regional Impact" relates to the first thematic pillar of the EWRC – "The future of the EU and the roles of regions and cities".

Spreading Excellence & Widening Participation (WIDENING) actions are designed to address the uneven performance between member states in R&I, allowing for the capacity-building of beneficiary institutions and fostering collaborative networks between low R&I and high-performing member states. Widening schemes, namely Twinning, Teaming and ERA Chairs, are hosted in research related institutions, universities or research centers, which are in turn considered important drivers for regional growth.

This event will showcase widening projects, their synergistic effect with other schemes and explain impact achieved, namely for their host institution and the scientific community, but more specifically, the hosting region and society.



Widening Actions & Regional Impact: Side Event of the EWRC 2019

Furthermore, the plenary discussion will tackle the challenges faced by widening projects in achieving their envisaged impact. Complementary presentations will be featured to give the participants a basic understanding of the factors that drive regional growth, such as the Regional Innovation Scoreboard and the connection that universities have with regional growth.

To register to this and other side events to the European Week of Regions and Cities 2019, please click [here](#).



European Week | Brussels

A sneak peek at the programme

One of the projects to be presented at the side event is “**Cross-Border Educational Innovation thru Technology-Enhanced Research**”. This Estonia-based project leads the way in bringing education into the 21st century by providing new ways to support evidence-based education and conducting educational research.

A digital turn in both formal and informal education in Estonia and Europe in general leads to a shift in the learning paradigm towards more self-directed, creative and collaborative learning. The new technology is, however, usually brought into schools without adequate evaluation as to how teaching and learning would benefit from it. The CEITER project set out to facilitate structural changes in Estonia. “We sought to improve the take-up of evidence-based teaching and learning innovations in schools, including the use of digital technologies in teaching and learning,” outlines Professor Tobias Ley, head of the project.



Widening Actions & Regional Impact: Side Event of the EWRC 2019

Among other things, the CEITER has built a new method to conduct research in education called [EDULABs](#). It is a systematic research, training and development method that is integrated into teacher education to spread evidence-based innovation in schools. The project has tested and demonstrated the feasibility of the method by applying it to several **EDULAB** cases.

These cases include the robomath EDULAB, which integrates robotics into maths education. The outdoor learning EDULAB uses technology in natural sciences education. The digimath EDULAB utilises digital learning materials in secondary education to support teaching methods, and the smart schoolhouse EDULAB helps to boost students' interest in technology and solving real-life problems.

“The project led to higher levels of adopting digital technologies in Estonian schools and to an increased number of student-centred learning scenarios and methods,” reports Ley. Another result is higher levels of competence among teachers, who felt a sense of ownership towards the new methods used in the classroom. The outcomes of this ERA Chair project are expected to have a significant impact on educational policy nationally and in Europe. [*The description of the project was accessed at the [CORDIS](#) database*]

Tobias Ley's presentation on CEITER as well as all other presentations of the side event will be made available after 10 October 2019 at [the NCP_WIDE.Net website](#).

Author:
Vassiliki Kalodimou
WIDESPREAD NCP / Event Organiser
Greece



Forthcoming Calls and Events

European Week
of Regions and Cities.
October 8th CSIC,
Brussels, Belgium

September

October

November

December

January

February

March

April

November 14th

Expected results of the call

ERACHair

Twinning

European Week of Regions and Cities 2019

When: October 7-210, 2019 **Where:** Brussels, Belgium

The European Week of Regions and Cities is an annual four-day event during which cities and regions showcase their capacity to create growth and jobs, implement European Union cohesion policy, and prove the importance of the local and regional level for good European governance. The European Week of Regions and Cities and its workshops, debates and networking activities are addressed to: members of the European Committee of the Regions members of the European Parliament and national, regional and local politicians; government officials and experts in the field of managing and evaluating cohesion policy programmes; representatives of private companies, financial institutions and European and national associations; and researchers, PhD or masters students and practitioners in the field of European regional and urban policy.

“READ ME” – Recommended Publications

Public consultation on the R&I partnerships in Horizon Europe

How can the EU best support impactful, inclusive research and innovation partnerships with industry, Member States and other stakeholders? Now you can share your views on the 12 proposed institutionalised partnerships under Horizon Europe, the next EU research and innovation programme (2021-2027). The consultation is a key step in assessing the overall need for and focus of specific research and innovation partnerships.

[More information](#)

Future Technology for prosperity

What is the next ‘big’ technology which we should have ‘on our radar’, one as important as artificial intelligence or quantum technology? Something that will be a game changer for industry and society at large? This report is the outcome of a workshop that took place in Oslo in July 2019, bringing together leading figures from European research and technology organisations and funders to explore emerging technologies that would be most promising for prosperity. It identifies five technological frameworks (outside ICT) with a particularly strong potential.

[More information](#)

ERA Chair projects are recruiting

Visit the EURAXESS Jobs and Funding Portal to see which ERA Chair projects are currently recruiting!

[More information](#)

“READ ME” – Recommended Publications

Key indicators of R&I performance of EU countries

The key indicators cover four innovation dimensions, i.e. Inputs-Investments, Framework Conditions, Innovation Outputs and Impact. They are based on data from well accredited sources, mainly Eurostat. All are accompanied by interactive visualisations.

[More information](#)

Competition for ERC Public Engagement with Research Award launched

The European Research Council’s (ERC) Public Engagement with Research Award 2020 is designed to recognize and celebrate ERC grantees, including those working in Widening countries, who have demonstrated excellence in public engagement and outreach. The prize will include a trophy, complimentary registration to the EuroScience Open Forum 2020 and reimbursement of reasonable travel and hotel expenses for attending the award ceremony.

[More information](#)

ESFRI Roadmap 2021

The 6th edition of the ESFRI Roadmap is now in preparation. Expectations, methodology and the evaluation procedure were discussed in a dedicated ESFRI Roadmap 2021 Info Day on 25 September in Brussels. The Info Day marked the official invitation to the research community to propose new Research Infrastructures that will be included on the new ESFRI Roadmap. The deadline to submit proposals is May 5th, 2020.

[More information](#)