



**erasmus+**  
meer perspectief

**Verantwoording Erasmus+ KA107 Call 2018**

**Mei 2018**

## Introduction

The purpose of this information note is to explain the proposal for funding under the Erasmus+ KA107 action, mobility of students and staff with partner countries.

The action KA107 is funded from the heading 4 budget of the European Commission. The aim of the action is to extend the well-known Erasmus mobility of individuals between programme countries to other regions across the globe. This is the fourth call of the action.

The call for proposals EAC/A05/2017 was launched on 25/10/2017 with a deadline on 1 February 2018. For the Netherlands a total budget of € 4.884.764 million euro was available covering 12 different geographic regions. One specific regional window for cooperation with West Africa, funded by the West Africa Trust Fund (WTF) was offered for the first time in the present call. One novelty in call 2018 is the introduction of traineeships for students and the possibility to invite staff from enterprises to teach at programme and partner HEI's.

The National Agency (NA) received 25 applications which were submitted to an eligibility check according to the requirements of the Erasmus+ programme. The eligibility check consisted of a check of the following aspects:

1. the applicant is a Dutch Higher Education Institution (HEI) with an ECHE
2. the applicant used the e-form and submitted only one application for the action
3. the activities applied for are in line with the action

All 25 applications were considered eligible and submitted to a qualitative assessment organised by the NA according to the specific Guide for Experts on Quality Assessment (Annex I) and the Guide for National Agencies of the European Commission.

Distribution of applicants by type of HEI:

Type of institution	Nr. of applications
Universities of applied sciences	13
Research universities	11
HEI overseas territories	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>

Three HEI's are submitting for the first time an application under KA107: Universiteit Utrecht, Christelijke Hogeschool Ede and Fontys Hogeschool. The remaining 22 HEI's have applied in one of the previous calls. Out of these 22 HEI's, 18 have already received a contract in one of the previous calls.

## Evaluation commission: composition and tasks

In view of the grant award decision, the NA set up a specific Evaluation Committee to support the NA in preparing the grant award proposal.

The Evaluation Committee for the action KA107 is composed of three members:

Organisation	Name and position
Nuffic	<u>Mrs. Birgitte Vos</u> Senior programme administrator, Orange Knowledge Programme
Ministry of Education and Culture	<u>Mr. Max Bueno de Mesquita</u> Senior Policy Advisor EU/International Affairs
Ministry of Education and Culture	<u>Wouter Exterkate</u> Policy Officer Higher Education

The Evaluation Committee:

1. Validates the results of the formal eligibility check;
2. Assesses the list of sets of mobility flows by budget envelope. The sets of mobility flows are sorted in order of merit as a result of a qualitative assessment;
3. Based on the proposal prepared by the NA, the Evaluation Committee makes a proposal for applications to be accepted, rejected or put on a reserve list based on their quality;
4. Proposes a grant award per budget envelope according the merit of the proposals to the Director NA Erasmus+ who will take the final decision. Any exception to the ranking will be duly justified and documented.
5. The members of the Evaluation Committee sign the grant award proposal.
6. The NA Director will take the grant award decision based on the proposal of the Evaluation Committee.

## Qualitative assessment

The NA appointed five external experts to carry out the qualitative assessment of the KA107 proposals. The experts were appointed on the basis of the following criteria:

- previous experience with the evaluation of KA107 proposals
- experience with the evaluation of other Erasmus+ actions
- expertise in the field of internationalisation of higher education and cooperation with partner countries.

The assessment was organised as follows: each proposal was assessed by one expert. The second expert acted as reviewer to guarantee consistency of use of the award criteria and feedback comments towards applicants. The NA provided a specific training before the start of the evaluation exercise and prepared a complete information package to support the evaluation process. The assessment was an independent exercise and the experts involved signed a declaration to prevent the conflict of interest.

According to the Erasmus+ programme guide [https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/programme-guide_en) and the guidelines for experts (annex I), the assessment referred to the following aspects:

1. The applications are assessed according the criteria of
  - Relevance of the strategy (30 points)
  - Quality of cooperation (30 points)
  - Quality of project design and implementation (20 points)
  - Impact & dissemination (20 points)
2. There is a threshold of 60 points to be eligible for funding and at least half of the points (15) must be obtained in the criterion "relevance of the strategy".
3. The selection of applications consists of a ranking list by budget envelope (in total 12 + 1 West Africa window). The budget envelopes are stipulated by the European Commission.
4. The budget envelopes DCI Asia, DCI Central Asia, DCI Latin America, DCI South Africa, DCI Middle East, EDF and EU Emergency Trust Fund (West Africa Window) covering different regions are submitted to priorities settled by the European Commission regarding incoming and outgoing mobility. Furthermore, and due to the small amount (below € 60.000), additional criteria have been added by the National Agency to the envelope DCI South Africa.

Annex II shows a detailed overview of the budget for The Netherlands for the present call and corresponding conditions for each of the funding instruments.

## Results of the qualitative assessment

Annex III contains the results of the qualitative assessment. According to the terminology used in this document, one application consists of cooperation projects/applications with one or more partner countries.

Received	Rejected applications due to quality	Applications considered for funding
25	1	24

## Analysis of regions and budget request

The following can be noticed:

1. The interest remains limited for the Western Balkan region (52% of the available budget) and for the region DCI Iran Iraq and Yemen no applications were submitted. This lack of interest came as a surprise, at least when it comes to cooperation initiatives with Iran.
2. There is for the first time a full request for the regions ENI South, ENI East and DCI Central Asia.
3. In line with previous years, the demand in the budget envelopes DCI Asia and EDF largely surpasses the available budget.

## Grant distribution methodology

The NA set the methodology for the grant distribution following the Erasmus+ Guidelines for NA's on the selection of KA1 mobility projects between Programme and Partner Countries in the field of HE. Particular attention was given to the specification (numbers 5 and 6 of the methodology).

*“Where possible and in addition to the overarching criteria of order of merit and geographical balance, the evaluation committee will seek to spread the available budget widely to avoid dominance of a small number of HEIs. It will strive to be as inclusive as possible, maximizing participation of stakeholders without undermining quality, geographic balance or the minimum critical size per mobility project to ensure feasibility”. Guide for National Agencies, annex III.3 Guidelines for NA's on selection of KA1 mobility projects between programme and partner countries in the field of HE*

The methodology for grant distribution follows the principles below:

1. The ranking as a result of the experts assessment.
2. Geographical balance in the multi country budget envelopes according to the targets set by the EC (see annex V) and, when possible award more than two countries in the same budget envelope.
3. Benefit the maximum number applications of enough quality within the same envelope
4. Award as many projects as possible and introduce budget cuts and/or reduction in the envelopes where the requested grant exceeds the available budget.
5. Determination of a minimum grant awarded by project application within one region with the goal that small applications have less or no reduction.
6. Determination of a maximum grant by partner country application expressed in percentage of the total request in a region in order to prevent that the budget will be awarded mainly to large applications.
7. Determination of the score reduction calculation factor, so that applications with higher assessment scores will receive a smaller reduction than applications with lower assessment scores. The calculation factor makes sure that the reduction is applied according to the order of merit expressed in the ranking. The starting point is factor 1,00 for a 100 point score and factor 0,6 for 60 points. The calculation tool uses a build in slider and the reduction factor will change automatically and gradually for each region. The reduction on the basis of the assessment scores is now always fair.
8. Without the *calculation factor* every application would have the same percentage of reduction (the reduction factor is for all projects 1,00).

The NA developed a KA107 Calculation Tool (for each region) in order to settle the minimum grant awarded per application, the maximum applicant grant per partner country application in percentage of the total request and the score reduction calculation factor.

These three aspects are applicable for each region and change according to the total amount requested and the available budget. The NA tried to level these three aspects and other criteria in the various regions as much as possible. For example, when applications had to be rejected due to lack of funds, the NA decided to use the same assessment score level across regions. In most cases this meant that projects with  $\leq 80$  are rejected.

Variables in the calculation of the budget are: Travel and Individual Support for staff mobility for teaching and training (incoming and outgoing) and student mobility for study and traineeships (incoming and outgoing) and support for the organisation of mobility (Organisational Support).

## Grant award proposal

Annex IV is an overview of the applications proposed for funding according to the budget envelope. It also contains an overview of the grant award proposal by HEI.

A summary of the grant award proposal by budget envelope is presented below.

### IPA

<b>R1 - Western Balkans</b>	
Budget Available	€ 991.412
Budget Spent	€ 393.578
Budget Left	€ 597.834
Applications Received	10
Applications Awarded	10
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 10 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 10 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding.

Min. Grant	N/A
Max. % request	N/A

### ENI East

<b>R2 - Eastern Partnership Countries</b>	
Budget Available	€ 754.194
Budget Spent	€ 754.394
Budget Left	€ 200
Applications Received	9
Applications Awarded	9
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 9 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 9 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding. Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 50.000
Max. % Request	20%

\*2 applications were under the minimum grant

### ENI South

<b>R3 - South Mediterranean Countries</b>	
Budget Available	€ 886.287
Budget Spent	€ 886.323
Budget Left	- € 36
Applications Received	18
Applications Awarded	17
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	1

- 18 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 1 application does not fulfil the minimum quality requirements.
- 17 applications fulfil the quality requirements and are proposed for funding.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 25.000
Max. % Request	10%

\* 4 applications were under the minimum grant and 1 application was above the maximum request %

### ENI Russia

<b>R4 - Russian Federation</b>	
Budget Available	€ 488.426
Budget Spent	€ 488.515
Budget Left	- € 89
Applications Received	8
Applications Awarded	8
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 8 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.



- 8 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding. Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 25.000
Max. % Request	20%

\*1 application was under the minimum grant

#### DCI Asia

<b>R6 – Asia</b>	
Budget Available	€ 598.314
Budget Spent	€ 597.954
Budget Left	€ 360
Applications Received	27
Applications Awarded	18
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	9
Applications Under threshold	0

- 27 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 27 applications fulfil the quality requirement and qualify for funding.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology. For China and India together award a maximum of 30% of the total DCI Asia Budget . This is according the geographic targets of the funding instrument DCI Asia (Annex V).

The applications with Bhutan and Laos are proposed for funding without reductions. This is in line with the geographic targets of the funding instrument DCI Asia (at least 25% budget for less developed countries. See annex V

For China, India and Indonesia all applications with a score of  $\leq 80$  were rejected respecting the DCI quota for India and China and the principle of geographical balance. Applications for other countries with a score of  $\leq 70$  were rejected.

- 18 applications are proposed for funding with reduction.
- 9 applications were rejected due lack of funds.

Min. Grant	€ 10.000
Max. % Request	10%

\*1 application was above the maximum request %

### DCI Central Asia

R7 - Central Asia	
Budget Available	€ 135.529
Budget Spent	€ 135.496
Budget Left	€ 33
Applications Received	4
Applications Awarded	4
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 4 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 4 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 15.000
Max. % Request	50%

### DCI Latin America

R8 - Latin America	
Budget Available	€ 194.023
Budget Spent	€ 193.389
Budget Left	€ 634
Applications Received	14
Applications Awarded	12
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	2
Applications Under threshold	0

- 14 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 14 applications fulfil the quality requirement and qualify for funding.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology. For Brazil and Mexico all applications with a score of  $\leq 80$  were rejected. Applications for other countries were not rejected. For Brazil and Mexico there is a maximum of 35% of the total DCI Latin America Budget to apply. This is according the geographic targets of the funding instrument DCI Latin America (Annex V). In order to follow this target, the allocation of DCI Latin America is split up in 30% of the total budget for Brazil and Mexico and 70% for the other countries.

The grant award proposal is as follows:

- 12 applications are proposed for funding with reduction.
- 2 applications were rejected due lack of funds.
- The application for Nicaragua is proposed for funding without any reduction. This is according the geographic targets of the funding instrument DCI Latin America (at least 25% budget for less developed countries. See annex V).

Min. Grant	€ 7.500
Max. % Request	20%

\*1 application was above the maximum request %

### DCI Middle East

<b>R9 – Iraq, Iran and Yemen</b>	
Budget Available	€ 89.825
Budget Spent	€ 0
Budget transfer (10%) to DCI South Africa	€ 89.825
Applications Received	0
Applications Awarded	0
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- No applications in this region.

### DCI South Africa

<b>R10 - South Africa</b>	
Budget Available	€ 56.025
Budget Spent	€ 56.081
Budget Left	€ 56
Applications Received	6
Applications Awarded	5
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	1
Applications Under threshold	0

- 6 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 6 applications fulfil the quality requirement.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology. Applications with a score of  $\leq 80$  were rejected

- 5 applications are proposed for funding with reduction.
- 1 application is rejected due lack of funds.

Min. Grant	€ 7.500
Max. % Request	15%

\*1 application was above the maximum request %

#### EDF

<b>R11 - ACP</b>	
Budget Available	€ 196.156
Budget Spent	€ 196.308
Budget Left	- € 152
Applications Received	21
Applications Awarded	16
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	5
Applications Under threshold	0

- 21 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 21 applications fulfil the quality requirement and qualify for funding.

Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology. Applications with a score of  $\leq 80$  were rejected.

- 16 applications were proposed for funding with reduction.
- 5 applications were rejected due to lack of funds.

Min. Grant	€ 10.000
Max. % Request	10%

**WTF**

<b>West African Trust Fund</b>	
Budget Available	€ 60.000
Budget Spent	€ 59.906
Budget Left	€ 94
Applications Received	3
Applications Awarded	3
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 3 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 3 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding. Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 15.000
Max. % Request	50%

**PI Americas**

<b>PI Americas</b>	
Budget Available	€ 211.015
Budget Spent	€ 210.745
Budget Left	€ 270
Applications Received	8
Applications Awarded	8
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 8 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 8 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding. Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€ 10.000
Max. % Request	25%

\*1 application was above the maximum request %

**PI Asia**

<b>PI Asia</b>	
Budget Available	€ 223.358
Budget Spent	€ 223.730
Budget Left	- € 372
Applications Received	10
Applications Awarded	10
Applications Rejected due lack of funds	0
Applications Under threshold	0

- 10 applications for cooperation with the region were submitted.
- 10 applications fulfil the quality requirement and are proposed for funding. Once the total requested amount exceeds the available budget and in order to benefit a larger number of projects, a reduction of the requested grant was applied according to the described methodology.

Min. Grant	€	10.000
Max. % Request		20%

## Final remarks

1. From the 25 applications, 23 are proposed to be awarded funds from KA107.
2. The proposed beneficiaries are: 11 universities of applied sciences, 11 research universities and the University of Aruba.
3. Five institutions receive KA107 funds for the first time. These are:
  - Windesheim Hogeschool
  - NHTV Hogeschool
  - Universiteit Utrecht
  - Universiteit Wageningen
  - Design Academy Eindhoven
4. 53 partner countries will participate in the action under call 2018. This is an increase of 18 partner countries in relation to call 2017.
5. The NA choose to keep the grant award within the budget limits and did not add a percentage beyond the budget (*over committing*). This is because there is still very little experience with the action and only one call completely finished which does not provide a solid understanding of the potential of the HEIs to implement the budget fully.
6. Given the low budget request in the IPA budget envelope and in the region DCI Iran Iraq and Yemen, the Dutch NA can expect a reduction of the budget for these regions in call 2019. This is in line with the new methodology the EC uses to prevent unspent budget in the EU countries.
7. The new award methodology based on minimum grant award and a maximum percentage according to the application by budget envelope in order to be as inclusive as possible has allowed an overall increase of the budget distribution in terms of the number of projects by budget envelope, the number of partner countries involved (larger geographical distribution) and increase in the number of beneficiaries (18 in 2017 and 23 in 2018). The table below shows the main achievements.

	partner country application	HEI's application	nr. of countries application	partner country awarded	HEI's awarded	nr. of countries awarded
<b>2016</b>	72	23	33	44	18	25
<b>2017</b>	103	23	45	67	18	35
<b>2018</b>	137	25	54	120	23	53