



# Developing a Vision for Framework Programme 9

Position Paper by the ALLEA Working Group Framework  
Programme 9

Position paper by the  
**ALLEA Working Group Framework Programme 9**

Final version: July 2017

**Members**

John Bell - British Academy, Chair  
Axel Börsch-Supan - Union of German Academies of Sciences and Humanities  
Ali Çarkoğlu - Bilim Akademisi (The Science Academy, Turkey)  
Alberto Conte - Turin Academy of Sciences (Italy)  
Marta Estrada - Royal Academy of Sciences and Arts of Barcelona (Spain)  
Ottmar Ette - Union of German Academies of Sciences and Humanities  
Andrea Evers - De Jonge Akademie (The Young Academy, Netherlands)  
Tibor Frank - Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
Gábor Hamza - Hungarian Academy of Sciences  
Muhamedin Kullashi - Kosovo Academy of Arts and Sciences  
Imelda Maher - Royal Irish Academy  
Maria Marcuzzo - National Academy of the Lincei (Italy)  
Thomas Olechowski - Austrian Academy of Sciences  
Simona Pekarek Doehler - Swiss Academies of Arts and Sciences  
Gevorg Poghosyan - National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Armenia  
Kerstin Sahlin - Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences  
Birgitta Svensson - Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities  
Przemysław Urbańczyk - Polish Academy of Sciences  
Krista Varantola - Council of Finnish Academies  
Didier Viviers - The Royal Academies for Science and the Arts of Belgium

Working Group support: Philip Lewis (British Academy)

## Summary

ALLEA's Framework Programme 9 Working Group calls for the EU to set itself and meet the ambition of being the world leader in research and innovation in the development and realisation of the next Framework Programme. That Framework Programme's agitating concern should be to support research and innovation originality and creativity, and not to be led by administrative capacities. This will require a significant resource commitment especially for Horizon 2020's most successful initiatives such as the European Research Council and the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions. As importantly, however, the EU must add value, not replicate, national research systems, and put in place the foundations for a programme that incentivises interdisciplinarity, mobility, internationalism, excellence, impact focused on European societies not just economic or industrial benefit, and impact for the long-term.

## Key Recommendations

In particular, the Working Group recommends that the next Framework Programme:

- takes on board the [Lamy Report](#)'s suggestion for a broader definition of innovation that involves all forms of knowledge, and that the current one-size-fits-all linear approach to innovation through Technology Readiness Levels has proved unhelpful;
- recognises fully, as does the Lamy Report, the value and importance of the humanities and social sciences, and ensures these diverse disciplines have a central role;
- supports the ERC's Scientific Council's request for resources as originally intended at its establishment of 5% of Europe's national research agencies;
- re-thinks significantly mission-oriented research, including the purpose of such funding, the need for long-term impact and horizons for calls that encourage research on futures as well as their language and scope, the need for including fundamental and applied research, and the process of (and involvement of the European Commission in) formulating Work Programmes;
- provides more support for research infrastructures and critically opens up the current understanding of research infrastructures to include research human capital infrastructures at a European level that engage and bring together academics in the humanities and social sciences;
- encourages a range of size of grants from small to medium to large, with those of shorter duration having a quicker application process. A range of smaller grant sizes will help to support early career researchers, include a greater range of participants and provide a broader scope for building excellence for which thought needs to go beyond the harnessing of structural funds.

## Developing a Vision for Framework Programme 9

### Introduction

Framework Programme 9 will be the EU's next research and innovation programme after Horizon 2020 (Framework Programme 8) comes to an end in 2020. It is likely to run from 2021 to 2027 alongside the next Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF).<sup>1</sup>

Commissioner Moedas has already set out the guiding principles or core values that he sees for FP9 as impact, excellence, and openness. Commissioner Moedas has also sketched out the objectives around which he wishes to see FP9 revolve. These are Open Science, Open Innovation, and Open to the World. These are useful umbrella terms with which to frame FP9 but to this point they have been described too narrowly and unambitiously, in our view, in order to develop the next step in EU Framework Programmes.

We would agree that the EU has an exceptional opportunity to place itself as the - not simply a - world leader in research and innovation. Critically this means that the EU needs to

coordinate but not replace national research initiatives to ensure that European collaboration is of greater impact than the sum of its parts. To grasp this opportunity the EU needs to make a substantial resource commitment. But, as importantly, it should focus on developing the areas where the EU has added value whilst proactively encouraging researchers across the EU and the world to see the EU's research and innovation system as the most attractive, competitive and highest quality anywhere in the world. That is the bar the EU should be setting itself, no less.

We see the guiding principles and objectives for FP9 in a similar overarching way to the Commissioner but would critically place new and additional emphasis in the following areas:

- Interdisciplinarity that helps to address and understand the issues society faces and in particular fully integrates the humanities and social sciences in a way that offers opportunities to provide a lead role where appropriate for the expertise of such disciplines;

<sup>1</sup> Although we are aware of discussions about shortening the MFF period to 5 years.

- Mobility across Europe and with the wider world especially for early career researchers where mobility is critical in developing the networks and links vital to future research careers;
- Internationalism with seamless and frictionless cooperation with all international partners throughout the programmes which will require considerable positive interaction with wider Europe and intercontinental research systems;
- Excellence as the fundamental criterion and which is understood as excellence in the way we understand the world, society and technology that supports our future;
- Impact focused on the value of research and innovation for and in European societies taken holistically and not focused purely on economic or industrial benefit. Such an approach takes account of the full range of approaches to research and of their contributions to society. Amongst other things, this would take full account of the value of the humanities and social sciences both in showing how things in society can be imagined differently and in ensuring that European society is at the forefront of social, cultural and ethical developments, as well as economic, industrial and technological advances in 2040; and,

- Focus on long-term impact and foresight rather than short-term impact.
- FP9 should be squarely aimed at making research and innovation in the EU as attractive as possible. FP9's agitating concern should be to create the conditions for research and innovation to flourish in the EU in the coming decades. The question FP9 needs to answer therefore is how can it ensure that the best researchers and innovators, and research and innovation takes place in Europe in the next twenty years and how the EU can add to national programmes and priorities.

## Horizon 2020's Legacy

Horizon 2020 has taken forward successfully new programmes established in Framework Programme 7 such as the European Research Council (ERC) as well as continued excellent schemes such as the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA). Horizon 2020 also tried some of its own innovations, such as developing a research and innovation programme, as well as the Societal Challenges Pillar.

### *European Research Council & Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions*

The ERC is the premier frontier research funder in Europe. It is the most valued element of Horizon 2020 amongst the research community, and this is recognised in the Lamy Report.<sup>2</sup> It has provided an outstanding vehicle for discovery and bottom-up research that has been the leading light in raising the value and prominence of the EU's research funding on the world stage. The ERC also enables blue sky thinking to be promoted, rather than a response to pre-defined (and potentially out-of-date) research agendas. It is our firm recommendation that the

<sup>2</sup> Report of the Independent High Level Group, [Investing in the European future we want](#) (July 2017): 'the ERC has become a global beacon of scientific excellence'(p. 13).

ERC needs much more funding to continue to attract and develop the very best researchers in the EU. This significant additional funding would also help to provide much greater balance to the lack of fundamental research that is funded through other parts of Horizon 2020. We find compelling the recommendation of the ERC's Scientific Council made in its statement of 15 May that the ERC's budget should reach the level originally intended of 5% of Europe's national research agencies, which would provide the ERC with a minimum budget of €4 billion per annum.

We would, however, make some recommendations for the ERC in FP9. We are convinced that the leadership of the Scientific Council and the reputation and standing of the ERC's assessment panels have been excellent. The role of the ERC President, including the incumbent Jean-Pierre Bourguignon, has been vital in establishing the ERC as a world-leading research body. Unfortunately, this has been at times undermined or at least made difficult by the current legal standing of the ERC and its reliance on an executive agency not under the sole control of the Scientific Council.

We strongly recommend that the current halfway house is ended and

full autonomy is provided to the ERC so that it has its own executive agency only reporting to the Scientific Council and that the ERC President, reporting to the Scientific Council, is able to undertake negotiations and sign agreements on behalf of the ERC without the involvement (and potentially interference) of the European Commission. This would facilitate its international role in research cooperation. Since its establishment, the ERC Presidents and members of the Scientific Council have developed the ERC into what is described by Commissioner Moedas as the 'crown jewel' of the EU's Framework Programmes. That success should no longer be hampered by administrative and legal obstacles but should be supported through full autonomy.

Research mobility is invaluable for exchanging ideas and establishing networks of contacts that last over many years. The MSCA have played an important role for many years in encouraging mobility in a number of forms. We see particular added value in the Framework Programmes incentivising and supporting such mobility across the life-course of research careers, and particularly that it starts at the early career stage. We would encourage the MSCA to be continued in their current form and that the added value they bring

in providing bottom-up funding across the research and innovation domains be recognised by additional funding being provided for these actions. We would wish to see this scheme as a significant contributor to the development of research and innovation capacity across the entire EU.

#### *Innovation & Impact*

There are also areas in Horizon 2020 that we believe could do with significant improvement or rethinking. In particular, we wish to focus on innovation, impact, the humanities and social sciences, and the societal challenges.

It is important that 'innovation' is understood broadly. As the Lamy Report suggests (p.12):

*„Innovation is more than technology. EU innovation policy must be based on a definition of innovation that acknowledges and values all forms of new knowledge – technological, but also business model, financing, governance, regulatory and social – which help generate value for the economy and society and drive systemic transformation.“*

Innovation is best understood as the way in which the varied aspects of society are transformed, be they

cultural, governance, business or technological. If society is to flourish and develop, then we cannot look at these different aspects in isolation, but need to see their interactions and synergies. That is why transformational research has to draw on the variety of research methods and insights of different disciplines working together.

In relation to Horizon 2020, our concern has been that the Commission has understood research and innovation to take place to a large extent as part of an overly simplistic linear process through Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) where certain parts of Horizon 2020 are focused on achieving certain TRLs. This linear and 'one-size-fits-all' approach to research and innovation is inappropriate and unhelpful. This is illustrated well in the Commission's back ground 'Issue papers for the High Level Group on maximising the impact of EU research and innovation programmes'. Here the Commission, describes how Horizon 2020 has achieved a "shift to innovation" because now "more than 93% of the projects started have at least one company in the consortium".<sup>3</sup> That fact is not necessarily evidence of a shift to innovation. It is simply evidence

<sup>3</sup> European Commission, 'Issue papers for the High Level Group on maximising the impact of EU research and innovation programmes', p.14, [https://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/hlg\\_issue\\_papers.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none](https://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/pdf/hlg_issue_papers.pdf#view=fit&pagemode=none)

of a shift to more companies being partners in Horizon 2020 projects. It is troubling that the Commission would use such an inaccurate proxy for determining innovation.

Innovation must not be seen as the domain of business and industrial strategy, defined in economic terms alone. Innovation is not limited to business and economic opportunities but it is also fundamentally about how a variety of social actors imagine things differently in which the humanities and social sciences have a very strong contribution to make. For example, providing for the way in which cities are likely to develop and people are likely to live in them would help us to re-imagine what will be the needs for transport in ten years or twenty years' time and thus help us to think about the most useful technological solutions to the transport problems for which Europe should be preparing.

When describing, assessing and implementing innovation through FP9, the aim should be to support connectivity, collectivity, conviviality, creativity and evidence-based change. In this way innovation in FP9 can be opened up to include new imaginaries and the re-imagining/making/thinking of issues of society. Different disciplines contribute different ways of thinking about

problems. Natural sciences focus predominantly on observable phenomena. Social sciences, such as economics and geography, contribute insights through modelling, often with hypothetical data. Humanities use imagination to make salient the major issues. For example, philosophers use imagined examples (e.g. the prisoners' dilemma) and literature uses fiction (e.g. thinking about the surveillance society through works like George Orwell's *1984*). The humanities should be seen as contributing to the understanding of new futures or as a laboratory for thinking about the future. FP9 should draw on all these different ways of stimulating thinking to contribute to a holistic understanding of the issues which will confront Europe in the medium-term horizon. It should thus have a focus on sparking futures thinking in which the role of the humanities and the creative arts must play a significant part. This would helpfully break down the silo of thinking about the humanities as only being about the past and the natural sciences as the future.

We do not see 'research' and 'innovation' as easily distinct categories or phases. The linear model conceives that research happens first and then is brought to market through commercialised innovation. Transformation actually

happens by theoretical and practical activities working together. We do not think that it is helpful to suggest there should be two distinct organisations, the ERC and the EIC, funding different aspects of what should be an integrated process.

#### *Humanities & Social Sciences*

Narrow understandings of innovation and impact have hampered Horizon 2020's ability to be an open research and innovation programme that speaks to all disciplines, participants, companies and countries, and most importantly have meant that innovative and impactful research has not always been supported where it could. This is particularly the case for the humanities and social sciences.

In its initial proposal for Horizon 2020 the Commission wished to mainstream the humanities and social sciences and suggested no societal challenge that spoke to directly or could be led by these diverse disciplines. After considerable pressure from the research community, the Commission has made some efforts to involve the humanities and social sciences in Horizon 2020 and there have been some very good projects funded.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> For example, CoHERE, Project ID: 693289: Critical Heritages, performing and representing identities, which brings together humanities scholars and museums to look at the range of ways in which identity is defined and expressed.

But we would argue that processes of defining research calls have fostered a short-term instrumental approach, which has not been helpful. It is our view therefore that what the Commission has attempted has not worked well up to now and that in order to achieve the Commission's ambition with regards to the humanities and social sciences a new approach is required.

The Commission's own Horizon 2020 SSH Monitoring Reports show that the Commission has not been successful in embedding these disciplines in Horizon 2020's societal challenges. The value of the humanities and social sciences needs to be understood in a far less technocratic and instrumental way so that there is considerably more opening for critical analysis and open-ended inquiry especially in the Societal Challenges Pillar. The Commission's heavily technocratic approach to the societal challenges has led to the calls containing off-putting language and inadequate understanding of the issues faced, which has inhibited the involvement and integration of researchers from the humanities and social sciences.

The humanities and social sciences are important analytical research areas in and of themselves. For example, their contributions are important to help understand human behaviour, as

well as the conditions and dynamics of social change, to enable changes in mindsets to consider challenges from different perspectives, to equip citizens with the capacity to deal with complex information and weigh evidence, and to foster democracy by helping people understand each other across languages, histories and cultures. The Lamy Report recognises this (p.16):

*„Where missions concern the big social questions of our time, for example having rewarding work in an era of robotics, living and working well together in culturally diverse cities or ensuring equal opportunities in and fair benefits from an innovative society, SSH researchers will initiate and lead them. Design-thinking should also be included to the greatest extent.“*

The fundamental problem within Horizon 2020 is that it has adopted internal processes which have not been conducive to interdisciplinarity and transformational research. The strategic leadership has not been in place to drive embedding through an organisational structure that is largely vertically put together with silos working on the first five societal challenges. Notably the sixth societal challenge does not even exist within the same part of DG Research as the first five. The Commission should

have established structures within DG Research to guide and implement embedding. These should have the power to enforce changes to draft Work Programmes to make them positively facilitate and encourage embedding. There needs to be a way of ensuring that the potential contribution of humanities and social sciences is considered in relation to each call and bid as FP9 is drafted.

### *Implementing processes*

In Horizon 2020, we have been concerned that that there seems to be no real process in place to consider the relative success rates of proposals that are interdisciplinary, or properly monitor the inclusion and involvement of the humanities and social sciences in proposals. This needs to be rectified as we move into FP9. In addition, we have been concerned that the evaluation stage of proposals does not sufficiently cover the breadth of the humanities and social sciences, which has disadvantaged them in this process. There cannot be a single SSH evaluator. Humanities and social sciences are, in fact, a set of diverse disciplines covering an exceptionally broad range. These are varied disciplines that require proper evaluation by people with relevant expertise. A recommendation that ALLEA's President, Professor Günter Stock, made to the previous

Commissioner and DG Research's Director General was to review the evaluations made by evaluators to test the effectiveness of the interdisciplinary nature of Horizon 2020. He thus suggested establishing as an experiment a shadow evaluation panel that would be constituted with a majority of SSH experts to see how such a panel might judge differently the merits of a batch of proposals in response to one or other call.

We also believe that the briefing provided to evaluators is insufficient. For example, the Commission says that evaluators receive specific guidance on how to embed issues like SSH. The main evaluator page on the Participant Portal has a small section on SSH on page three which provides no real illumination on how to embed SSH, which can be evidenced by proposals being supported through Horizon 2020 with no SSH contribution despite being flagged as an SSH topic on the Portal as the Commission's own SSH Monitoring Reports highlight<sup>5</sup>. We also consider that if interdisciplinarity is central to a call and this includes embedding SSH then this must be included in the 'credibility of the proposed approach' section of the Evaluation Summary Report. This is because

<sup>5</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants\\_manual/pse/h2020-evaluation-faq\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/pse/h2020-evaluation-faq_en.pdf)

if interdisciplinarity is core to FP9 (and for that matter Horizon 2020) then the credibility of any proposed approach must be based upon it.

One way forward might be that there is a presumption in favour of inclusion of scholars from the humanities and social sciences in every application submitted, subject to the possibility of reasoned justification as to why this has not happened or did not need to happen in a particular case.

### *Societal Challenges*

This leads to our final point on Horizon 2020's societal challenges. These were a major new part of this Framework Programme and had a real opportunity to support exceptional mission-oriented research, however, as the above illustrates, we believe these have not proved fit for purpose as they are currently constituted. Calls have been drafted as solely focused on applied research to such an extreme degree that it is difficult at times to tell whether this is a research and innovation programme or a consultancy programme. The language and focus of the calls are often too narrow and almost always overly prescriptive after a number of re-writes and additions from various DGs within the Commission. The whole process of establishing the Work Programmes for the societal

challenges needs a fundamental re-think, which we discuss below. In our view, the content of the calls as they are written and how the calls are funded do not enable research bids which respond effectively to the real social, psychological, economic and other such tangible problems we face today and in the years ahead. The grand vision of societal challenges has been engulfed by the prescriptive minutiae of the present day perceived needs by the Commission. Currently, calls are overwritten, overtly prescriptive and too clearly the result of the process of each Directorate-General putting in its own stamp so that the accumulative end product is a wish list rather than an invitation to conduct innovative research.

This is obviously a strong critique of the societal challenges but even if such problems could be ironed out another fundamental issue is troublesome. These societal challenges will have been put in place in some instances almost ten years before the end of Horizon 2020. The world moves on and issues of concern change. The monolithic top-down structure of the societal challenges is fundamentally problematic in ensuring that Horizon 2020 has been able to respond flexibly to the real societal challenges in Europe and the wider world. This top-down, tightly Commission-controlled mode of doing research is the exact

opposite of the research being funded so successfully through the ERC. It is notable in the Commission's own executive summary of the recently published Staff Working Document on the interim evaluation of Horizon 2020 that when the Commission wishes to illustrate excellence, prestige and high performance it invariably uses information from the Excellence Pillar and most often the European Research Council. The Lamy Report's suggestion of 'missions' (pp. 15-16) expressed at a high level of generality is more likely to succeed in stimulating the kind of imaginative and transformational research which contributes added value to the research undertaken at national level.

## **Framework Programme 9**

### *Content, Structure and Themes*

The Excellent Science Pillar (Pillar 1) in Horizon 2020 has been the area of standout success in Horizon 2020, especially the ERC and MSCA. This needs to be developed and further supported with additional funding in FP9. It is potentially unhelpful that this pillar is described as excellent science as it suggests that the remainder of Horizon 2020 is not meeting the core value of excellence that Commissioner Moedas has set for FP9. We would recommend that excellence should be fundamental to FP9 and it should only support excellent science of which the ERC and the MSCA are of fundamental importance. We would in particular wish to see additional funding for the ERC and for it to receive full autonomy from the Commission, as described above. Furthermore, we believe that it would be helpful to have additional funding available through the MSCA for shorter duration travel.

In addition, we would recommend that greater funding is provided to research infrastructures. The funding available currently is minimal for the potential infrastructures that might be supported and the opportunities for leveraging additional contributions from Member States

and other countries is considerable. We do, however, consider that the understanding of research infrastructure has been too tightly drawn to focus on physical capital rather than human capital. This has led somewhat to a bias against the humanities and social sciences which we would like to see altered through some of any additional funding provided. We would recommend that the Commission supports a range of research human capital infrastructures at a European level that engage and bring together academics in the humanities and social sciences.

As we have indicated, we believe the major area of concern is how the societal challenges pillar (Pillar 3) has been conceived and implemented to this point. If there is to be a mission-oriented programme based on excellence, as the Lamy Report suggests, it must be established in such a way as to retain flexibility to both respond to changing times and attract creative proposals. As that report suggests (p. 16), the function of calls in this area should not be to tell aspiring applicants exactly what to do but instead outline briefly the topic of concern and actively invite thought-provoking and imaginative bottom-up applications focused on engaging with these topics.



In addition, the topics should be focused on developing our understanding of the future so that Europe is well placed for the society, economy, culture and technology of 2040. Such topics or overarching umbrella issues for foresight research would be our recommendation for how to develop a mission-oriented programme. The indicative list of topics on p. 16 of the Lamy Report is still too narrow:

*„[...]some potential missions for the post-2020 EU R&I programme: achieving a plastic litter-free Europe by 2030; understanding and enhancing the brain by 2030; producing steel with zero carbon in Europe by 2030; making 3 out of 4 patients survive cancer by 2034; building and operating the first quantum computer in Europe.“*

The list focuses on a Europe of things, rather than on the nature of the community which Europe will be. For example, one important umbrella issue could be ‘Living Together’ under which it would be possible to explore matters such as digital communication and education, biodiversity and conservation, societal wellbeing, the co-production of research, migration, radicalisation, the Global South, innovation, democracy, climate change and borders.

Some further possible examples of such texts follow:

#### CATCHING UP WITH INNOVATION

*Technical innovations and scientific breakthroughs entail unforeseen social, cultural, political, and legal consequences that generate new challenges for societies. Think, for example, of the previous centuries’ industrial revolution, split of the atom, or the mapping of the human genome. Today’s moving into Industry 4.0 (and related technologies) will not only reshape how things are made; it can also be anticipated to bring about profound consequences for the constituency of workplaces and economic landscapes, and may ultimately affect the social make-up of our populations: shift in economic equilibria at the micro-, meso- and macro-level, re-structuring of the geographic (and international) spread of industries, alteration in local and global educational needs and infrastructures, and much more. With the development and implementation of new technologies in the age of Industry 4.0, we need close scrutiny, understanding and anticipation of the concomitant social, cultural, demographic, economic and legal changes.*

#### VALUING THE GLOBAL SOUTH

*The world does not yet possess a history of knowledge and science*

*that does justice to the cultural and scientific creativity of the Global South – as well as valuing its economic and political contribution, past, present and future. Despite recent advances in scholarship, academic and popular thinking remains broadly informed by outdated narratives of knowledge that pivot around events and developments in the North and which frequently invoke a mythical story of ‘the West.’ This story is not only misleading; it contributes to underdevelopment. For example, in Latin America, this well-worn narrative is manifested in the self-defeating notion that all things useful and modern were and are developed abroad in ‘the centre’. When such a misreading of history is installed in public opinion and the classroom it may sustain a vicious cycle of cultural recrimination and oblivion in ‘the periphery.’ The problem is not made any better by simply standing Eurocentrism on its head, as if it were merely a question of patriotic or anti-colonial rhetoric. Coming to a refreshed understanding of the place of Europe with the rest of the world, including its colonial past, has the potential to prepare the North for a better understanding of its place in the world, and also to help to provide narratives which integrate without condescension the diaspora communities that now form part of European society. So the research questions focus on the creativity*

*and influence of the Global South in the shaping of Europe and how this continues to influence the nature and future of Europe.*

Above, we discussed impact and how the definition and implementation of impact needs to be broadened. In addition, we would recommend that impact and the desire for open science should encapsulate support for the digitisation and the translation of research into widely read languages in order to widen the impact of the research funded by the EU. In addition, a broader understanding of Commissioner Moedas’ three O’s should include a stress in FP9 on the communication of research and public engagement (see Lamy p. 22). This could include expanding forms of communication of research into social media, exhibitions, museums, radio, TV and more public engagement.

We have been gravely concerned by the drop in internationalisation in Horizon 2020. We strongly concur with Commissioner Moedas’ objective for FP9 as being open to the world and support his vision for the development of a Global Research Area. To develop such a Global Research Area the Commission will need to undergo a significant change in its willingness and capability to work closely and productively with researchers from across the world. We recommend

that the Commission begins now in discussing with counterparts how an Open to the World strategy in the mould of a Global Research Area can be developed in time for the start of FP9.

#### *Budget, Implementation and Evaluation*

We have argued strongly above that FP9 should have a greater focus on originality and creativity. If this is to be achieved then FP9 must have a different structure of research projects than those in Pillar 3 of Horizon 2020. The Commission currently insists on the establishment of large consortia. In our understanding, this is largely due to the executive agencies of the Commission responsible for the assessment of proposals insisting they can only manage a certain number and type of applications. It is our view that if the EU wishes to be world-leading in research and innovation then the structure of its programmes cannot be determined by its administrative capacities. We strongly recommend that in order to encourage and incentivise originality and creativity FP9 must provide a range of size of grants from small to medium to large, with those of shorter duration having a quicker application process.

Large consortia are very difficult to put together, especially for early

career researchers, and are not a proof that innovation or impact will be achieved. A range of smaller grant sizes must be included in FP9. This will help fund more impactful research as well as helping raise the success rates currently seen in Horizon 2020. This range of funding available is likely to also support a wider range of participants across the EU being supported as there is more scope to build excellence and understanding of applying for and securing EU funding.

In this vein, we would welcome FP9 including a strong spirit of building excellence throughout its scope whilst taking into account that the EU should not be considered the funder of first resort but of added value. There are a number of ways this might be possible. We believe providing significant further funding for mobility programmes will be vital in developing exchange between researchers in the EU and the connections and experience necessary to build excellent research proposals. In addition, we believe that a two-stage application process, which had a simple first stage and then provided support between the first and second stage would be most helpful in building excellence. We also recommend that funding outside of FP9 is provided to help establish local capacity where it is required in building up expertise in

research management offices to help build and shape applications with researchers. This is of importance in countries which have been less successful in Horizon 2020. Thought needs to go beyond the harnessing of EU structural funds as an alternative funder of research and innovation activities (cf. Lamy p. 17)

In conclusion, the process of formulating themes and of evaluation requires change for FP9. The Commission should be aiming to enable an open framework for creativity to flourish, which focuses on setting simple and encouraging ground rules and foundations for researchers then to apply and work creatively within.

## ALLEA Framework Programme 9 Working Group

The ALLEA Framework Programme 9 Working Group aims to develop suggestions for the EU's future research and innovation programmes which will be initiated after the conclusion of Horizon 2020, the EU's current programme on research and innovation.

The Group was set up as a successor to the ALLEA Working Group on Social Sciences and Humanities (WG SSH). The FP9 Working Group seeks to continue to ensure that any successor research programme to Horizon 2020 is developed with the interests of the *Wissenschafts*-community in mind and in particular to ensure that the social sciences and humanities are fully represented. Its programme of action includes:

- Engaging with the European Institutions, particularly the European Commission and the European Parliament, on the development of Horizon 2020's mid-term review and interim evaluation, as well as discussions for post-Horizon 2020 successor programme(s);
- Encouraging deliberation and foresight within the ALLEA Member Academies on the fields and activities in which EU funding will be a priority within the period 2020 to 2030, and to develop suggestions following such deliberation which can be delivered to the EU Institutions in a timely fashion to contribute to the shaping of new programmes of EU research funding;
- Producing regular updates for ALLEA Member Academies on progress in achieving the objectives of the Group and also to identify instances in which Member Academies may wish to work in their national contexts;
- Taking into account at all times the position of the humanities and the social sciences in any post-Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme(s).



## ALL European Academies (ALLEA)

ALLEA, the European Federation of Academies of Sciences and Humanities, was founded in 1994 and currently brings together 59 Academies in more than 40 countries from the Council of Europe region. Member Academies operate as learned societies, think tanks and research performing organisations. They are self-governing communities of leaders of scholarly enquiry across all fields of the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. ALLEA therefore provides access to an unparalleled human resource of intellectual excellence, experience and expertise.

Independent from political, commercial and ideological interests, ALLEA's policy work seeks to contribute to improving the framework conditions under which science and scholarship can excel. Jointly with its Member Academies, ALLEA is in a position to address the full range of structural and policy issues facing Europe in science, research and innovation. In doing so, it is guided by a common understanding of Europe bound together by historical, social and political factors as well as for scientific and economic reasons.

## Member Academies

**Albania:** Akademia E Shkencave E Shqipërisë; **Armenia:** գիտությունների ակադեմիան ակադեմիա; **Austria:** Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften; **Belarus:** Нацыянальная акадэмія навук Беларусі; **Belgium:** Academie Royale des Sciences des Lettres et des Beaux-Arts de Belgique; Koninklijke Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten; Koninklijke Academie voor Nederlandse Taal- en Letterkunde; Academie Royale de langue et de literature francaises de Belgique; **Bosnia and Herzegovina:** Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine; **Bulgaria:** Българска академия на науките; **Croatia:** Hrvatska Akademija Znanosti i Umjetnosti; **Czech Republic:** Akademie věd České republiky; Učená společnost České republiky; **Denmark:** Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab; **Estonia:** Eesti Teaduste Akadeemia; **Finland:** Tiedeakatemiain neuvottelukunta; **France:** Académie des Sciences - Institut de France; Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; **Georgia:** საქართველოს მეცნიერებათა ეროვნული აკადემია; **Germany:** Leopoldina - Nationale Akademie der Wissenschaften; Union der deutschen Akademien der Wissenschaften; Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz, Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Hamburg, Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Nordrhein-Westfälische Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Künste, Sächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig (Associate Members); **Greece:** Ακαδημία Αθηνών; **Hungary:** Magyar Tudományos Akadémia; **Ireland:** The Royal Irish Academy - Acadamh Ríoga na hÉireann; **Israel:** האקדמיה הלאומית הישראלית למדעים; **Italy:** Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei; Istituto Veneto di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti; Accademia delle Scienze di Torino; **Kosovo:** Akademia e Shkencave dhe e Arteve e Kosovës; **Latvia:** Latvijas Zinātņu akadēmija; **Lithuania:** Lietuvos mokslų akademija; **Macedonia:** Македонска Академија на Науките и Уметностите; **Moldova:** Academia de Științe a Moldovei; **Montenegro:** Crnogorska akademija nauka i umjetnosti; **Netherlands:** Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen; **Norway:** Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi; Det Kongelige Norske Videnskabers Selskab **Poland:** Polska Akademia Umiejętności; Polska Akademia Nauk; **Portugal:** Academia das Ciências de Lisboa; **Romania:** Academia Română; **Russia:** Российская академия наук (Associate Member); **Serbia:** Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti; **Slovakia:** Slovenská Akadémia Vied; **Slovenia:** Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti; **Spain:** Real Academia de Ciencias Morales y Políticas; Real Academia de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales (Associate Member); Reial Acadèmia de Ciències i Arts de Barcelona; Institut d'Estudis Catalans; **Sweden:** Kungl. Vetenskapsakademien; Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien; **Switzerland:** Akademien der Wissenschaften Schweiz; **Turkey:** Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi; Bilim Akademisi (Associate Member); **Ukraine:** Національна академія наук України; **United Kingdom:** The British Academy; The Learned Society of Wales; The Royal Society; The Royal Society of Edinburgh

**ALLEA Secretariat**

c/o Berlin Brandenburg Academy of  
Sciences and Humanities

Jaegerstr. 22/23

10117 Berlin

Germany

Phone: +49 (0)30-3259873-72

Fax: +49 (0)30-3259873-73

Email: [secretariat@allea.org](mailto:secretariat@allea.org)

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

[@ALLEA\\_academies](#)