EUCIS-LLL Erasmus+ assessment – June 2014

First phase – ownership of the programme and applications

GETTING TO KNOW ERASMUS+

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
New programme architecture	• 71% of respondents very much/more or less satisfied • A majority thinks the structure in Actions/activities is clear	• Concealment of former sectors' brand names despite Parliament decision (EAC website, users' guide) • Not always clear for beneficiaries where to apply, especially those with a scope of more than one sector	• Restore brand names' visibility and communication on them for coherence and continuity towards beneficiaries • Improve communication and guidance on activities' target groups ("What's in it for me" type)
New programme objectives	• 89% of respondents think programme objectives are very much/more or less adapted to their reality • Various and wide objectives covering many sectors and responding to current societal needs	• Some sectors feel spoiled (i.e. adult education reduced to basic skills challenge) • Some objectives are on the contrary too restrictive for some sectors (entrepreneurship)	• Ensure all sectors can identify to programme objectives • Ensure they remain broad/flexible enough for beneficiaries to work on truly innovative topics while respecting EU political priorities
Innovation compared to LLP	• 60% of respondents believe Erasmus+ is very much/more or less innovative compared to LLP	Regret for disappearance of successful actions: • actions clearly focused on languages • Roma multilateral projects • Grundtvig in-service trainings • Grundtvig networks • study visits	• Re-assess in partnership with beneficiaries the impact and success of LLP actions that disappeared; envisage reintroducing some features of the most regretted • Better communicate on actions that give equivalent opportunities to LLP ones that have disappeared

APPLYING FOR ERASMUS+

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
Programme guide		• Too dense, lacking clarity, not user-friendly for newcomers to the programme	• Separating guide by actions or by activity • Avoid splitting information with annexes • Avoid EU jargon
General information on applications and collaboration with Agencies	• 62% found their Agency very or rather helpful (73% for Belgian Agencies); often available and ready to help	• Spread among different sources • Financial guidelines not clear in particular • Divergent interpretations according to languages • Lack of infodays and occasion to network/find partners • Huge variations in quality, support and understanding among NAs; often consequent lack of trust also due to contradictory information • Fear of national priorities prevailing/different political approaches from one NA to another • Decentralisation still seen as a mistake, especially by European NGOs (not Belgian NAs' primary target group, fear of being discriminated, no extra resources received…)	• Better gather information on administrative and financial guidelines; better communicate on where it is • Ensure coherence otherwise (i.e. among NAs) including in translations • Be transparent on number of actions funded/budget available • Set up standard rules for information among NAs (i.e. yearly infodays and contact seminars, national databases) • More capacity-building for young NAs • Accompany decentralisation with transfer of expertise and additional human/financial resources • Assess together with EU NGOs' and Belgian NAs effects of decentralisation (need more capacity-building? Budget?)
Actions practicalities	• Most respondents satisfied with eligibility criteria	• Frustration on the end of individual applications; hindering participation • Feeling of spoliation towards large consortia (heavy forms, small management budget) • Too long eligibility periods for KA1 projects; too hard to plan mobilities such in advance • Frustrations on intellectual outputs (KA2): confusing, hindering a global vision of the work plan; excluding many good products	• Reconsider application modalities to make sure all individuals interested can apply/communicate better towards legal representatives (school heads, CEOs…) on added value of staff mobility • Adapt administrative/financial aspects of the application to large consortia • Adapt KA1 length to beneficiaries' reality • Reconsider eligible project outputs and better communicate on intellectual ones

Dissemination and exploitation	• respondents trust the potential of (re)new(ed) platforms in place (Erasmus+ platform, EPALE, eTwinning) to contribute to greater visibility, synergies and improved partner search	• despite the fact that dissemination/exploitation is an important programme feature: no extra funding allocated in projects to that purpose • disappearance of Grundtvig/Comenius catalogues seen as a disaster for visibility and quality of trainings	• include all former projects in new databases/make them interactive and enable coordinators' contributions • Ensure systematic dissemination of projects by National Agencies • Ensure proper funding for dissemination • Reintroduce specific dissemination actions (former LLP KA4, funding for follow-up actions of successful projects) • Reintroduce actions catalogues
Applications procedures/forms	• Smart time laps between KA1 and KA2 deadlines to enable organisations to apply for both • Truly innovative PIC system	• Problem of deadlines during Easter holiday • Lack of transparency regarding dates for selection procedures • Only 60% of respondents found application forms easy to handle (rigid, heavy, time-consuming • eForms contents: still redundancies, lack of logic connections, questions not always clear • eForm budget not really user-friendly	• Ensure proper application periods falling out of work/school holiday • Clear timeline on selection results • Provide systematic and user-friendly guidelines on PIC system (French NA model); use it for other parts of the eForm; more flexibility on signatures (mandates from legal representatives) • Reflect on a better format for application forms that would avoid technical difficulties and ease collaborative partner work (track changes, file sharing…); enable images, charts, bold text • Avoid "thousands of clicks" for activities and intellectual outputs • Design more flexible application forms in order not to denature project ideas • Provide an only budget tool (French NA)
Budgetary issues	• Lump sums: easier calculations	• Unrealistic estimations especially for travel costs • Unclear reporting guidelines • Insufficient management budget (especially if dissemination and quality assurance	• Reassess travel costs; make travel costs eligible among partners within the same country • More transparent and user-friendly guidelines on what is eligible and how to

| | | included), not taking into account country standards of living | justify it
• Allow differenced calculation for management according to country level and project size
• Smarter budget structuration (i.e. clear line for dissemination/quality; rethink intellectual outputs budget) |
|---|---|---|---|

EUROPEAN NGOs AND ERASMUS+ (CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION)

SURVEY ITEM	POSITIVE FEEDBACK	NEGATIVE FEEDBACK	SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT
New programme objectives	• Clear, broad enough and relevant to current context	• Spoiled sectors in objectives i.e. adult education	• Concert stakeholders for modalities of a three-years framework agreement to enable genuine impact/reaching objectives
Application procedure/forms		• Periods of application/annual report submission/KA1 and KA2 deadlines overlapping
• Lack of transparency on selection timeline
• Still some redundant and overlapping questions	• Reflect on proper application timeline and period/improve transparency on selection results and timeline (harmonise within DG)
• Provide a commented application form (like for decentralised actions)
• Provide more space for describing activities; enable images, charts, bold text
Budgetary issues	• Realistic amount for grants
• Introduction of lump sums welcome	• Amounts still low compared to other sectors
• Still many concerns on staff costs calculation
• Lack of communication on in-kind contributions
• Not covering costs for non EU-residents impedes democratic functioning of NGOs	• Revision of the contributions in kind system; should be formally recognised i.e. by reducing co-financing to 0% or 10% (see other Europe for Citizens)
• Make non-EU residents travel and subsistence costs eligible