

## JRC R&D ISPRA

---

**From:** JRC R&D ISPRA  
**Sent:** venerdì 19 febbraio 2016 15.43  
**To:** SUCHA Vladimir (JRC)  
**Cc:** GAMMEL Jean-Philippe (JRC)  
**Subject:** R&D first questions regarding the draft JRC strategy

Dear Mr Šucha,

Many of the principal points of the draft JRC Strategy are in line with the R&D electoral programme for the Ispra-Seville LSC elections in 2015.

This programme met the approval of a significant fraction of the staff at the JRC's largest site.

However, the devil is in the detail, and we do have some questions about some parts of the document about which we would request further explanations and reassurances in the spirit of constructive criticism.

Please find a non-exhaustive list below, but we are still examining the document and may have other comments to add on Monday:

- Repetitive work to be stopped – what about the opinion of partner DGs? How will this be decided? How will you ensure the laboratory facilities and staff involved will be correctly used afterwards?
- External access to laboratories – surely it would be better to allow full participation in H2020, as this could also allow external access of JRC facilities, but also JRC access to other facilities and expertise.
- 5 year project durations – is it necessary to be so strict a priori, especially if the Commission's working plan has a duration of 7 years (5 years for Euratom and therefore understandable in that field)?
- How is the scientific committee to be formed to make sure it is independent and represents the views of the scientific staff?
- Balanced ratio of permanent and flexible positions. Clearly scientific work needs to a flexible workforce, but too much precariousness is also destabilising and risks losing continuity and hard-won expertise.
- Any reduction of administrative staff to benefit scientific work, can only happen if the corresponding administrative burden is reduced, and must only happen organically. Do you plan to map the administrative procedures and check which one can be revised/abolished?
- Scientific staff must really work at the coal face as much as possible (in the scientific Institutes, rather than too many being located in Brussels), and not simply administer science or act as simply conduits
- Use our Commissioner – what does this mean? In what way has the Commissioner demonstrated interested in the JRC? What are his plans for the JRC?
- Education and training – can we really make any useful impact at the JRC? While a certain number of PhD students and postdoctoral researchers are extremely valuable to our work, we cannot ever be an educational establishment.
- Staff and Budget allocation. Co-design of projects with other DGs seems an useful idea to ensure usefulness, but how do we protect the JRC against too frequent changes in priorities? How will the

staff distribution be implemented? The staff are allocated to the Institutes that decide in which project/work-packages they participate? The budget will be allocate as usual to the unit or differently?

The R&D delegation on Monday will be composed of Mr Bernd Gawlik, Mr Juergen Vogt, Ms Eva Merglova, Mr Gianfranco Selvagio and Mr Davide Auteri.

We look forward to discussing the strategy document with you, and are confident that our considered opinions will be taken on board.

---

**Secretariat R&D Ispra**

BDG.63 - TP 630

Tel. +39 0332 78.9645

[jrc-rd-ispra@ec.europa.eu](mailto:jrc-rd-ispra@ec.europa.eu)

[www.rdispra.eu](http://www.rdispra.eu)