



This document provides a brief overview of the Call Process used by EURAMET in EMPIR. It is based on the introduction in the first work plan approved by the EC¹ in 2014. The processes themselves were developed from those in the previous programme implemented by EURAMET² – The European Metrology Research Programme.

The European Union's participation in the European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR) is to support the provision of appropriate, integrated and fit-for-purpose metrology solutions and the creation of an integrated European Metrology Research system with critical mass and active engagement at regional, national, European and international level that would not be sufficiently achieved by the Member States alone. The scale and complexity of metrology requirements calls for investments that go beyond the core research budgets of the National Metrology Institutes (NMIs) and their Designated Institutes (DIs). The excellence required for research and the development of cutting-edge metrology solutions is spread across national borders and requires coordination by integrating national efforts into a consistent European approach, by bringing together compartmentalised national research programmes, by helping design common research and funding strategies across national borders, and by achieving the critical mass of actors and investments required.

EURAMET, as the designated implementation structure for EMPIR, issues calls in topic areas called Targeted Programmes (TPs). Some of these topics have been addressed in predecessor programmes such as the European Metrology Research Programme (EMRP), some are new to EMPIR. Launching TPs at three year intervals allows running projects which are funded from the predecessor call in the TP to consider a submission for a successor project. This allows projects with a longer-term perspective a chance of continuing.

There are two main types of projects; Joint Research Projects (JRPs) are Research and Innovation actions, whilst the Support for Impact Projects (SIPs) and Joint Network Projects (JNPs) are Coordination and Support actions.

The implementation processes for EMPIR - which are distinct from Horizon 2020 – develop the work to be performed in stages. The general call topic is decided upon much earlier than the specific details of the selected research topics. This process is outlined briefly below:

1. Most, but not all calls for Targeted Programmes (TP) under EMPIR are implemented in two stages: a stakeholder consultation followed by a call for proposals. As SIP actions are targeted at the exploitation of results from previous research projects, there is no separate public consultation phase prior to the call for proposals.
2. In developing the scope for a Call a number of EURAMET bodies and external organisations, including CEN/CENELEC and key stakeholders relevant to the call, are consulted to provide orientation for the EMPIR programme.
3. The first “Potential Research Topic” (PRT) respectively “Potential Network Topic” (PNT) stage invites interested stakeholders - and this comprises a huge variety of representatives from science, industry and other stakeholders - to propose relevant research areas under the TP. The PRT/PNT consultation is a bottom-up driven identification process for metrology research needs. PRT consultations are typically launched at the beginning of the year and are open for about 6 weeks. A PRT/PNT consultation is not to be compared to a first stage

¹ C(2014) 7958 final - COMMISSION DECISION of 31.10.2014 concerning the adoption of a Financing Decision 2014 and the approval of the associated Work Plan of the Art. 185 initiative ‘European Metrology Programme for Innovation and Research (EMPIR)’

² <http://www.emrponline.eu/downloads/EMRP%20call%20process.pdf>

of a two-stage call implementation under Horizon 2020 - the outcome of this first consultation is not binding in any way. It merely aims at identifying the topics that will be covered by the calls without any evaluation of the stakeholders that propose or of the detailed activities required to meet the identified needs.

4. An EMPIR Sub-Committee sifts the outcome of the PRT/PNT consultation and compiles a list of "Selected Research Topics" (SRT) and "Selected Network Topics" (SNT). This process involves the selection of parts of one or more PRTs/PNTs which are incorporated into each SRT/SNT and the refinement of the objectives.
5. The EMPIR Committee decides on the proposed list of SRTs/SNTs - as prepared by the EMPIR Sub-Committees – following debate and modification of the proposed objectives for each SRT/SNT.
6. Following the decision, calls are launched allowing the whole summer period for the proposers to write their Joint Research Projects (JRPs)/ Joint Network Projects (JNPs). Partnering events that support consortia building are organised at the beginning of the period; the deadline for submissions is usually set for early October. Proposals are submitted against the specific list of "Selected Research Topics"/"Selected Network Topics".
7. A call for proposals for Support for Impact Projects (SIPs) is launched in the summer and the submission deadline is usually set for late September. Proposals are submitted against the published Call Scope.
8. All JRP, JNP and SIP proposals are evaluated following the H2020 rules for participation.
9. The majority of proposals submitted are evaluated at a review conference, where a representative from each of the submitted proposals present the proposed work on posters, and evaluators can clarify any open issues in direct dialogue. At the end of the conference, reviewers agree on the evaluation results for the proposals, and establish a ranked list for all proposals submitted to one TP. The review conference process was a key feature of the EMRP, refined over many call cycles with the assistance of the independent observers appointed by the European Commission. The evaluators are appointed on similar terms and conditions to those used in H2020 ensuring their independence. They receive the proposals to review prior to the review conference, but they do not submit individual evaluation reports prior to the event. After they meet the representative of the proposers at a poster and seek clarification about any part of the proposal they need, they meet together to compare their individual assessments and formulate a set of formal questions to ask the representative. The questions are then put to the representative by the evaluators and answers recorded. The evaluators then meet again to complete a joint evaluation report, recording comments and marks against the evaluation criteria. The procedures ensure equal treatment of proposals by timetabling the interactions between the evaluators and proposers – ensuring equal opportunity for debate, and close monitoring of the process by the Programme Manager and Independent Observer.
10. For Support for Impact actions, evaluation without a discussion between evaluators and proposers in a traditional consensus group is current practice.
11. On the basis of the evaluation results, the EMPIR Committee decides on the funding list, i.e. the proposals selected for preparation of the grant agreement. The EMPIR Committee does not change the order of the ranked list, merely decides where the line is drawn that separates those to be funded from those not selected for funding.