EUCIS-LLL Erasmus+ assessment – June 2014
First phase – ownership of the programme and applications

### GETTING TO KNOW ERASMUS+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>POSITIVE FEEDBACK</th>
<th>NEGATIVE FEEDBACK</th>
<th>SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New programme architecture</td>
<td>• 71% of respondents very much/more or less satisfied</td>
<td>• Concealment of former sectors’ brand names despite Parliament decision (EAC website, users’ guide)</td>
<td>• Restore brand names’ visibility and communication on them for coherence and continuity towards beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A majority thinks the structure in Actions/activities is clear</td>
<td>• Not always clear for beneficiaries where to apply, especially those with a scope of more than one sector</td>
<td>• Improve communication and guidance on activities’ target groups (“What’s in it for me” type)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New programme objectives</td>
<td>• 89% of respondents think programme objectives are very much/more or less adapted to their reality</td>
<td>• Some sectors feel spoiled (i.e. adult education reduced to basic skills challenge)</td>
<td>• Ensure all sectors can identify to programme objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Various and wide objectives covering many sectors and responding to current societal needs</td>
<td>• Some objectives are on the contrary too restrictive for some sectors (entrepreneurship)</td>
<td>• Ensure they remain broad/flexible enough for beneficiaries to work on truly innovative topics while respecting EU political priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation compared to LLP</td>
<td>• 60% of respondents believe Erasmus+ is very much/more or less innovative compared to LLP</td>
<td>Regret for disappearance of successful actions:</td>
<td>• Re-assess in partnership with beneficiaries the impact and success of LLP actions that disappeared; envisage reintroducing some features of the most regretted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• actions clearly focused on languages</td>
<td>• Better communicate on actions that give equivalent opportunities to LLP ones that have disappeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Roma multilateral projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grundtvig in-service trainings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Grundtvig networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• study visits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SURVEY ITEM</td>
<td>POSITIVE FEEDBACK</td>
<td>NEGATIVE FEEDBACK</td>
<td>SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme guide</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too dense, lacking clarity, not user-friendly for newcomers to the programme</td>
<td>Separating guide by actions or by activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General information on applications and collaboration with Agencies</td>
<td>62% found their Agency very or rather helpful (73% for Belgian Agencies); often available and ready to help</td>
<td>Spread among different sources</td>
<td>Better gather information on administrative and financial guidelines; better communicate on where it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial guidelines not clear in particular</td>
<td>Ensure coherence otherwise (i.e. among NAs) including in translations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Divergent interpretations according to languages</td>
<td>Be transparent on number of actions funded/budget available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of infodays and occasion to network/find partners</td>
<td>Set up standard rules for information among NAs (i.e. yearly infodays and contact seminars, national databases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Huge variations in quality, support and understanding among NAs; often consequent lack of trust also due to contradictory information</td>
<td>More capacity-building for young NAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of national priorities prevailing/different political approaches from one NA to another</td>
<td>Accompany decentralisation with transfer of expertise and additional human/financial resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralisation still seen as a mistake, especially by European NGOs (not Belgian NAs’ primary target group, fear of being discriminated, no extra resources received...)</td>
<td>Assess together with EU NGOs’ and Belgian NAs effects of decentralisation (need more capacity-building? Budget?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions practicalities</td>
<td>Most respondents satisfied with eligibility criteria</td>
<td>Frustration on the end of individual applications; hindering participation</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of spoliation towards large consortia (heavy forms, small management budget)</td>
<td>Adapt administrative/financial aspects of the application to large consortia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Too long eligibility periods for KA1 projects; too hard to plan mobilities such in advance</td>
<td>Adapt KA1 length to beneficiaries’ reality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustrations on intellectual outputs (KA2): confusing, hindering a global vision of the work plan; excluding many good products</td>
<td>Reconsider eligible project outputs and better communicate on intellectual ones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissemination and exploitation</td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td>• 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications procedures/forms</td>
<td>• Smart time laps between KA1 and KA2 deadlines to enable organisations to apply for both • Truly innovative PIC system</td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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
EUROPEAN NGOs AND ERASMUS+ (CIVIL SOCIETY COOPERATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SURVEY ITEM</th>
<th>POSITIVE FEEDBACK</th>
<th>NEGATIVE FEEDBACK</th>
<th>SUGGESTION FOR IMPROVEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New programme objectives</td>
<td>• Clear, broad enough and relevant to current context</td>
<td>• Spoiled sectors in objectives i.e. adult education</td>
<td>• Concert stakeholders for modalities of a three-years framework agreement to enable genuine impact/reaching objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application procedure/forms</td>
<td>• Periods of application/annual report submission/KA1 and KA2 deadlines overlapping</td>
<td>• Lack of transparency on selection timeline</td>
<td>• Reflect on proper application timeline and period/improve transparency on selection results and timeline (harmonise within DG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Still some redundant and overlapping questions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide a commented application form (like for decentralised actions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide more space for describing activities; enable images, charts, bold text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary issues</td>
<td>• Realistic amount for grants</td>
<td>• Amounts still low compared to other sectors</td>
<td>• 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction of lump sums welcome</td>
<td>• Still many concerns on staff costs calculation</td>
<td>• Make non-EU residents travel and subsistence costs eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of communication on in-kind contributions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Not covering costs for non EU-residents impedes democratic functioning of NGOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>included), not taking into account country standards of living</td>
<td>• Allow differenced calculation for management according to country level and project size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Smarter budget structuration (i.e. clear line for dissemination/quality; rethink intellectual outputs budget)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>