Līdzfinansē Eiropas Savienība

2027 Nacionālais attīstības plāns

Latvijas Zinātnes padome

Kas ir Twinning?

Twinning ir "Apvārsnis Eiropa" programmas dalības paplašināšanas un izcilības izplatīšanas (WIDERA) instruments, kura mērķis ir stiprināt pētniecības izcilību un institucionālo kapacitāti paplašināšanās valstīs, veicinot ilgtermiņa sadarbību ar starptautiski vadošām pētniecības organizācijām Eiropas Savienībā.

Galvenā informācija par konkursu

- Konkursa nosaukums: HORIZON-WIDERA-2026-02-WIDENING-01: Twinning
- Darbības veids: Coordination and Support Action (CSA)
- Finansējums vienam projektam: aptuveni 0,8-1,5 miljoni EUR
- Projekta ilgums: līdz 3 gadiem
- Konkursa atvēršana: **2026. gada 8. janvāris**
- Projekta iesniegšanas termiņš: **2026. gada 9. aprīlis**

Kas var piedalīties?

Koordinators: Pētniecības organizācija vai augstākās izglītības iestāde no paplašināšanās valsts (piemēram, Latvija).

Partneri: Vismaz divas starptautiski vadošas pētniecības organizācijas no divām dažādām ES dalībvalstīm vai asociētajām valstīm. Partneru lokā var būt arī komersanti. Joint Research Centre (JRC) var piedalīties kā asociētais partneris bez Eiropas Komisijas finansējuma.

Twinning projekti ir vērsti uz:

- pētniecības izcilības un kapacitātes stiprināšanu koordinējošajā organizācijā;
- pētniecības pārvaldības spēju uzlabošanu;
- ilgtspējīga sadarbības tīkla izveidi ar vadošām starptautiskām institūcijām.

Tipiskas aktivitātes ietver personāla apmaiņu, ekspertu vizītes, apmācības, seminārus, konferences, kopīgu vasaras skolu organizēšanu, kā arī izplatīšanas un informēšanas pasākumus. Projektā var iekļaut arī pētniecības un inovāciju komponenti, kas nepārsniedz 30 % no kopējā budžeta, un vismaz puse no šī finansējuma jānovirza koordinatoram.

Sagaidāmie rezultāti

- Uzlabota pētniecības izcilība un institucionālā kapacitāte paplašināšanās valstīs.
- Stiprināta stratēģiskā sadarbība ES līmenī.
- Paaugstināta koordinējošās organizācijas reputācija un pievilcība.
- Attīstīta pētniecības pārvaldības kapacitāte.
- Jaunu sadarbības virzienu izveide un pētnieku mobilitātes pieaugums.

Projekta pieteikuma priekšpārbaude (pre-screening)

Latvijas Zinātnes padome sadarbībā ar WIDERA.NET projekta partneriem piedāvā iespēju iesniegt projekta pieteikumu ekspertu priekšpārbaudei. Priekšpārbaude ir pieejama arī WIDERA konkursu, tostarp Twinning, pieteikumiem. To var iesniegt tikai projekta koordinators vai darba pakas vadītājs.

Priekšpārbaudes mērķis ir:

- identificēt pieteikuma vājās vietas pirms oficiālās iesniegšanas;
- uzlabot atbilstību vērtēšanas kritērijiem (Excellence, Impact, Implementation);
- palielināt projekta konkurētspēju.

Pieteikšanās priekšpārbaudei notiek platformā: https://wideraexperts.eu/

Atbalsts projektu pieteikumu Latvijas koordinatoriem

Ir pieejams atbalsts "Apvārnis Eiropa" projektu pieteikumu Latvijas koordinatoru konsultācijām arī Twinning konkursam. Atbalsta mērķis ir veicināt Latvijas zinātnisko institūciju dalību programmā "Apvārsnis Eiropa" kā projektu koordinatoriem, atlīdzinot ārvalstu ekspertu sniegto konsultāciju izmaksas projekta pieteikuma uzlabošanai apjomā līdz 5000 eiro.

Vairāk info: https://www.lzp.gov.lv/lv/jaunums/atbalsts-apvarsnis-eiropa-projektu-pieteikumu-latvijas-koordinatoru-konsultacijam-tagad-pieejams-ari-twinning-konkursam

Pieteikumu vērtēšanas kritēriji un vērtētāju komentāri (HORIZON-WIDERA-2023-ACCESS-02-01: Twinning 2023)

Excellence – aspects to be taken into account

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives

Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures including soundness of methodology.

Impact – aspects to be taken into account

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme.

Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

Quality and efficiency of the implementation – aspects to be taken into account

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.

Capacity and role of each participant, and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

Excellence

“The project is **exceptionally well-crafted, timely, and the array of activities outlined is not only feasible but also robust.** The proposal clearly outlines the primary project results aimed for, and the proposal's objectives are explicit, measurable, verifiable, and attainable.”
“**Well-defined objectives and concrete measures** will ensure that the coordinator substantially benefits from the partnership with outstanding European centres. These benefits will be ensured in many ways, like research, research management and administrative skills, and improved international visibility, mainly because the partners already have mutual collaborations.”

“The proposal's alignment with the work programme is exemplary. **The objectives stand out for their clarity, relevance, achievability, measurability, and verifiability, painting a picture of ambition coupled with feasibility.** They are highly pertinent to the work programme.”

“The proposal **very well outlines a range of activities to enhance research excellence and strengthen research management and administration skills in the coordinating institution**, including PhD student exchange.”

“The specific **objectives are clearly presented, measurable, achievable and verifiable**, with a well-defined path to achievement.”
“The proposal **has a number of shortcomings**: The claimed ambition of the proposed work is **not fully credible** and does not provide sufficient information. There are some objectives which are **not measurable and credible**.”
“The **proposal does not demonstrate sufficient creativity in research through the development of new approaches**. This is a shortcoming.“
“The objectives, activities and the involvement of these leading institutions in strengthening of research management and administration skills of the coordinating institution **are not described at sufficient level of detail**. Specific actions for enhanced researcher mobility are not addressed satisfactorily as well.”
“**Challenges** associated with increasing research capacity **have not been sufficiently identified**; approaches to overcome challenges have not been considered. This is a minor shortcoming.”

“Although the project proposes extended cooperation and activities based on the expertise and knowledge exchange with partners, **it is not clear what will be the explicit area where the widening country member can benefit** and strengthen R&I capacity of the homeland.”

“The proposal d**oes not make clear how these objectives are pertinent to the Call Work Programme**. A weakness is **the lack of a focus** on strengthening the research management capacities and administrative skills of the participant from the Widening country.”
“The proposal generally states how the Widening institution will benefit from the leading partners, but **it lacks details on what will be the impact of certain common events**. The proposal generally describes the involvement of leading institutions in joint research activities and in organizing mobility. However, **the inward and outward mobilities with leading institutions are unbalanced**. This is a shortcoming.”

“While the proposal includes well defined set of activities with concrete deliverables at the end, **the project methodology for R&I component is not persuasive**. In addition, when making reference to citizen science the project does not specify which categories of stakeholders could be helpful in generating new insights.”
“Firstly, **the proposal lacks clearly defined measurement indicators**, making it impossible to assess how the objectives will be achieved concretely. This lack of concreteness or details is a major weakness. Additionally, **the absence of concrete, measurable targets under the vision reduces the proposal's credibility**.”
“**The proposal's objectives** are within the scope of the call, but they **are not sufficiently developed or clearly specified**. The research component remains very vaguely defined. This lack of clarity is evident in several aspects of the proposal.”

Impact

“The research proposal includes **a transparent and credible dissemination, exploitation, and communication plan** with **defined measures, target audience groups, and Key Performance Indicators**, such as the publication of six articles in Q1/Q2 journals and conference presentations throughout the proposed work.”
“The **well-constructed dissemination and communication plan** excellently addresses the project's scale and reaches different stakeholders, including industrial partners of the consortium institutions, in order to maximise the impact. The relevant conferences to be attended are clearly selected. **Clear and convincing KPIs are provided**.”

“The pathways for achieving expected outcomes in the work programme **are very clear and credible**, with the project's multidisciplinary approach enhancing its significance.”
“The proposal describes in **an excellent manner and in quantitative terms** how the outcomes of the planned activities will contribute to the expected impacts specified of the work program. Targeted groups are identified in a very exhaustive way for each impact category. The proposal **is very clear in demonstrating the improvement of the excellence capacity and resources of the widening country**, specifying the areas of impact and the expected results. It also includes a sound description of the positive impact of the proposal on the leading institutions.”

“The pathways to achieve the project outcomes and impacts identified in the Work Programme are duly considered and linked to defined actions during the project lifetime, **making it credible and justifying the significant impacts expected in the medium term**.”
“The proposal claims contributions to many impacts listed in the call, but **some of them are not fully convincing and credible**, such as the mobility expectations or the expected improvement outreach at the international scale for all actors involved. Some of the **indicators proposed are not well reflected in the cost table and Key Performance Indicators are not convincingly described**. Potential barriers are well identified, however some mitigation measures are not sufficiently justified.”
“Exploitation of project results is well planned and in general convincing. Nevertheless, **exploitable outcomes arising from the research activities that could benefit industry and policymakers are not discussed in enough detail in the proposal**.”
“The impact of the proposal on strengthening the research management capacities and administrative skills of the staff at the coordinating institution **is not convincingly presented**.”

"Potential barriers and limiting factors **are not identified sufficiently**. Mitigating measures against potential barriers **are insufficiently addressed**. This is a shortcoming."

"However, there is **limited attention to alignment with EU priorities for Twinning** countries to address global challenges through R&I."
"The scale and significance of the project in terms of expected outcomes and impacts **are rather limited**. The justification for each of the expected impacts is not clearly explained and supported by ambitious quantitative indicators. For example, the proposal would reach only a very limited number of students from each participating institution; **the rationale for this choice is unclear**. The proposal **does not adequately identify and address potential barriers** associated with the project impact, or outline corresponding mitigating measures."
"The proposal outlines several networking activities with the advanced partners, but it **does not convincingly demonstrate how the leading institutions and the key stakeholders from the Widening country will benefit from such activities**."
"The scale and significance of the contributions are potentially large but not fully specified."
"The importance of the project for the set objectives is well comprehended, and the proposal effectively showcases the big picture of the impact, which extends beyond the further development of the institutions and actors involved to an added value for society. However, **the proposal lacks measurable impact indicators or more specific definitions of the outcomes, which is a notable weakness**."
"**Inconsistencies and a lack of precision in describing target groups are evident in the proposal**. The categories of target groups and stakeholders overlap in several places. Given the importance of disadvantaged and vulnerable populations as target groups, the proposal does not provide sufficient clarity."

Implementation

"Both the **Work Plan as a whole and the individual work packages are convincing and effective**. The quality of the information provided about the implementation of the project is excellent."

"The **work plan is effective, with appropriate timing for each work package**. The activities within each work package are well-detailed and align with the project's objectives. **The milestones and deliverables are credible and coherent with the WPs**."

"**The work plan is of high quality and effectiveness**, presented in an engaging visualization, organized into six interrelated work packages, with a well-structured, logical, and efficient workflow."

"The work plan is robust, well-structured, and contains suitable quantitative targets. The task description is complete and for almost all the activities the partner roles are well detailed, which is very good. The duration of each work package is proportionate to their complexity, and the allocation of resources is appropriate to the proposed work. The distribution of the work packages over the proposal is summarized in a simple but effective Gantt chart which includes suitable milestones and deliverables to monitor the proposal efficiently."

"**The implementation plan**, in particular the structure of Work Packages (WPs), **is excellently constructed and clearly articulated**. The work plan is comprehensive and robust, containing all the necessary elements for the successful implementation of a high-quality Coordination and Support Action (CSA)."

"The **role of participants and the details of some tasks in the WP are not sufficiently specified**. Some costs are not included in the lump sum. Also, assembly cost are not detailed. Furthermore, **risks are not sufficiently identified and addressed in the proposal**."
"The proposal **lacks details on necessary infrastructure upgrades, trainings, and cost estimate justifications**. Some WPs lack deliverables for feedback and further action."
"The description of the work plan **contains numerous errors and inaccuracies that undermine its quality and the effectiveness of deliverables and milestones**. The research work package is of a good quality."
"Critical risks are discussed but **not all of them are very clearly described**. Additionally, some mitigation strategies are expressed in generic terms. This is a shortcoming."
"The **work plan is unclear and lacks coherence between proposed activities** and related deliverables and milestones."
"The **description of the project's coordination is somewhat confusing**, being divided into eight clusters, each representing distinct work packages. A dedicated work package (WP3) is included for the research, however, research-related activities are not limited to this particular WP. Substantial parts of work packages (WP1 and WP2) include research activities, which makes it difficult to evaluate whether the costs allocated to research are eligible."
"**Relevant risks** for implementation including their likelihood of occurrence and severity and the proposed mitigation measures **are not sufficiently credible**. For example, technical risks are not sufficiently identified nor mitigated. This is a shortcoming."
"**Non-involvement of policy actors is rightly considered a risk**, yet the respective mitigation strategy is very general and offers relatively little guidance."
"**The proposal does not clearly elaborate on the costs** involved in the research component, indicating compliance with the 30/50 condition regarding the total HE grant and allocation to the coordinator and other partner organizations"
"The proposal **falls short of explaining the role of external stakeholders**. It lacks detail on how they will be involved and contribute to the implementation of the proposal."

Finansēto un visaugstāk novērtēto 2023. gada HORIZON-WIDERA-2023-ACCESS-02-01 Twining konkursa projektu piemēri:

1. Development of Magnetic Resonance in Latvia (MR LATVIA)
Koordinators: Latvijas Organiskās Sintēzes Institūts, Latvija
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101160091

2. Enhancing Capacities for Quality and Impactful Research on Transformations, Labour and Migration in Southeast-Europe (RETLAMI-SEE)
Koordinators: Faculty of Political Sciences, University of Banja Luka, Bosnija un Hercegovina
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101158885

3. MPS_NOVA Hub: Advanced Microphysiological Systems and Pluripotent Stem Cell Technologies to Unveil Chronic Disease Mechanisms and Host-Microbe Interactions (MPS_NOVA)
Koordinators: Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugāle
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101159729

4. Twinning Towards Scientific and Technological Excellence in Plant Protein Innovation for Food Domain (PROTWIN)
Koordinators: Türkiye Bilimsel ve Teknolojik Araştırma Kurumu, Turcija
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101158968

5. Long-endurance cooperative Robotic tEchnologies for Localisation of targets during Emergency Incidents - Twinning for eXcellence (LORELEI-X)
Koordinators: Cyprus Marine and Maritime Institute, Kipra
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101159489

6. SCENTINEL - Building Integrative Single Cell Omics Capacities (SCENTINEL
Koordinators: Foundation for Research & Technology - Hellas, Grieķija
https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101159925