Research Executive Agency

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Marie Curie specific actions
Researchers' Night

COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION (SUPPORTING)

Call identifier FP7-PEOPLE-2010-NIGHT

Further copies of this Guide, together with all information related to this call for proposals, can be downloaded from the following web-site:
http://cordis.europa.eu/

About this Guide

This is version number 4 of the FP7 Guide for Applicants for calls using single-stage submission procedures.

The main part of this Guide (sections 1 to 5) is common to all such calls. Information specific to this call is found in the annexes.

This version contains a number of clarifications and amendments, the most important of which are:

- Inclusion of guidance on Participant Identification Code and the Unique Registration Facility
- Incorporation of new work programme provisions on dealing with proposals having an equal score (annex 2)
- Additional guidance on page limits (annex 4)
- Additional guidance on dissemination of research (annex 4)
- Revised evaluation scoring (annex 2) and provision on ethical issues (annex 4)
- A part of PEOPLE programme has been delegated to the Research Executive Agency (REA). The REA manages large parts of the project cycle on behalf of the Commission. Hence in many instances, this guide now refers to the REA instead of the Commission.

Please note: This Guide is based on the rules and conditions contained in the legal documents relating to FP7 (in particular the Seventh Framework Programme, Specific Programmes, Rules for Participation, and the Work programmes), all of which can be consulted via the CORDIS web-site. The Guide does not in itself have legal value, and thus does not supersede those documents.

Contents

1. Getting started

Funding decisions in the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) are made on the basis of **proposals** submitted following **calls** published now by the Research Executive Agency (REA). Proposals describe planned research activities, information on who will carry them out, and how much they will cost. They must be submitted using a special web-based service before a strictly-enforced **deadline**. The REA evaluates all eligible proposals in order to identify those whose quality is sufficiently high for possible funding. The basis for this **evaluation** is a peer-review carried out by independent experts.

The REA then **negotiates** with some or all of those whose proposals have successfully passed the evaluation stage, depending on the budget available. If negotiations are successfully concluded, **grant agreements** providing for an EU financial contribution are established with the participants.

The sequence of steps is summarised in this flow chart:

This **Guide for Applicants** contains the essential information to guide you through the mechanics of preparing and submitting a proposal. It is important that you have the correct document! Not only are there different Guides for different calls, there may also be different Guides for other funding schemes within the same call.

You must also refer to the **work programme** covering the theme[1] of FP7 related to this call. This provides a detailed description of the objectives and topics which are open for proposals, and will describe the wider context of research activities in this area. Work programmes are revised each year, so make sure you refer to the latest version before preparing your proposal.

> *Please check that this is the right guide for you by consulting the work programme, the* ***call fiche*** *(both posted on CORDIS), and the description of the funding scheme in the next section.*

This Guide and the work programme are essential reading. However, you may also wish to consult other reference and background documents, particular those relating to negotiation and the grant agreements, which are available on the CORDIS web site (see annex 1 to this guide) and on the Participant Portal: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal.

---

[1] In addition to the main domains of the "Cooperation" programme, the term "theme" is used in this guide to refer, as appropriate, to the parts of FP7 in "Capacities".

2. About the funding scheme: Coordination and Support action (Supporting)

2.1 General

A number of funding schemes are available to implement projects in FP7, but only certain ones may be available for the topics covered by this call. These are indicated in the call fiche.

This Guide covers the **Coordination and support action (Supporting)** funding scheme, and a description is given in this section.

Please note that special conditions may apply on a call-by-call basis. These will always be set out in the work programme, including the call fiche.

2.2 Coordination and support actions[2]

Research, technological development or demonstration activities cannot be supported within this scheme.

Purpose

This funding scheme allows for two different types of actions to be financed:

- "*Co-ordination (or networking) actions*" aimed at coordinating research activities and policies.
- "*Support actions*" aimed at contributing to the implementation of the Framework Programmes and the preparation of future Community research and technological development policy or the development of synergies with other policies, or to stimulate, encourage and facilitate the participation of SMEs, civil society organisations and their networks, small research teams and newly developed or remote research centres in the activities of the thematic areas of the Cooperation programme. Support actions normally focus on one specific activity and often one specific event.

Specific Programmes concerned

This Funding Scheme is to be used for the implementation of the actions under the Specific Programmes "Cooperation", "Capacities", "People" and, Ideas".

Participation

For Coordination (or networking) actions whose purpose is to coordinate research activities: There must be at least three 'legal entities' established in different EU Member States or Associated

---

[2] Coordination and Support Actions may also be awarded to participants named in the work programme. In these cases other indicative conditions may apply.

countries (the countries concerned are listed in section 3). The entities must be independent of each other.

For other coordination actions and support actions, the minimum condition shall be the participation of one legal entity.

A higher number of participants may be specified on a call-by-call basis (See the call fiche).

"Target audience": Research organisations; universities; industry including SME; research programme managers and owners (ERA-NET and Research Infrastructure actions), associations, foundations, public authorities (Night).

Size and resources

The size, scope and internal organisation of coordination actions and support actions can vary from research theme to research theme and from topic to topic.

Indicative average duration

Coordination actions are expected to have a duration of typically two to four years, while support actions are expected to have a shorter duration from some months to two to four years and, in the framework of "Night", should have **a maximum 7 months -duration**.

Activities

Coordination (or networking) actions may cover activities such as:

the organisation of events – including conferences, meetings, workshops or seminars, related studies, exchanges of personnel, exchange and dissemination of good practices, and, if necessary, the definition, organisation and management of joint or common initiatives, together with management of the action.

Support actions may cover activities, depending on their nature such as:

monitoring and assessment; conferences; seminars; workshops; working or expert groups or individual expert appointment letters; studies; fact finding; monitoring; strategy development; high level scientific awards and competitions; operational support; data access and dissemination, information and communication activities; management activities; specific services activities related to research infrastructures, such as for example transnational access; preparatory technical work, including feasibility studies for the development of new infrastructures; contribution to the construction of new infrastructures; cooperation with other European research schemes; or a combination of these.

Form of Reimbursement

Reimbursement will be based on eligible costs (based on maximum rates of reimbursement specified in the grant agreement for different types of activities within the project). In some cases the reimbursement of indirect costs is based on a flat rate.
The work programmes shall specify if other forms of reimbursement are to be used in the actions concerned. International Cooperation Partner Countries (see annex 1 to the Work programme) may opt for a lump sum.

If so provided in the call fiche, it is possible to claim subsistence and accommodation costs (related to travel as part of the implementation of a project) on the basis of flat rates. These rates, which do not cover travel costs, are in the form of a daily allowance for every country. The use of these rates is optional, but you may wish to use them when calculating your proposal budget. The rates themselves, and the detailed rules for their use, are given at this address: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html

3. How to apply

3.1 Turning your idea into an effective proposal

The coordinator

For a given proposal, the coordinator acts as the single point of contact between the participants and the REA. The co-ordinator is generally responsible for the overall planning of the proposal and for building up the consortium that will do the work.

Focusing your planned work

The work you set out in your proposal must correspond to one or more of the topics, and associated **funding scheme**(s), indicated in this call for proposals. **Proposals that fail to do so will be regarded as ineligible.**

> *Multidisciplinary proposals addressing several topics may be submitted, provided that the 'centre of gravity' lies in a topic or topics open in the call in question.*

Refer to annex 2 to this Guide, and the work programme, to check all the **eligibility criteria** and any other additional conditions that apply.

Refer also to the **evaluation criteria** against which your proposal will be assessed. These are given in annex 2. Keep these in mind as you develop your proposal.

National Contact Points

A network of National Contact Points (NCPs) has been established to provide advice and support to organisations which are preparing proposals. You are highly recommended to get in touch with your NCP at an early stage. (Contact details are given on the CORDIS call page - annex 1 to this Guide).

Please note that the REA - through the Commission - will give the NCPs statistics and information on the outcome of the call and the outcome of the evaluation for each proposal. This information is supplied to support the NCPs in their service role, and is given under strict conditions of confidentiality.

Other sources of help

Annex 1 to this guide gives references to these further sources of help for this call. In particular:

- The FP7 general **enquiry service** on any aspect of FP7. Questions can be sent to a single e-mail address and will be directed to the most appropriate department for reply.

- A dedicated help desk has been set up to deal with technical questions related to the **Electronic Proposal Submission Service** (EPSS). See section 3.2 below.

- A further help desk providing assistance on intellectual property matters.

- Any other guidance documents or background information relating specifically to this call.

- The date and contact address for any '**information day'** that the REA may be organising for this call.

• Other services, including partner search facilities, provided via the CORDIS web site.

Who can participate?

In principle, a legal entity may participate in a proposal no matter where it is established.

> *A legal entity can be a so-called "natural person" (e.g. Mme Dupont) or a "legal person" (e.g. National Institute for Research).*

However, there are certain minimum conditions that have to be met relating to participation from the EU and Associated countries. These conditions vary between funding scheme and may vary from call to call. See the call fiche for the conditions applicable to this call.

> *The EU Member States are:*
>
> *Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.*
>
> *The Associated Countries are:*
>
> *Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and Turkey*
>
> *Note that the association agreement between the EC and the Faroe Islands is expected to become provisionally applicable as of 1 January 2010. Other countries may become associated during the course of FP7. The latest news will be posted on the CORDIS web site.*

The following may receive EU funding in an FP7 project:

• Any legal entity established in a Member State or an Associated country (including the European Commission's Joint Research Centre), or created under Community law (e.g. a European Economic Interest Grouping),

• Any International European Interest Organisation (see glossary).

• Any legal entity established in an FP7 International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC). The list of ICPC can be found on the CORDIS web site, and is given in Annex 1 to the related work programme.

In the case of a participating international organisation, other than an international European interest organisation, or a legal entity established in a non-EU country other than an associated country or ICPC, a Community financial contribution may be granted provided that at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:

(a) Provision is made to that effect in the specific programmes or in the relevant work programme,

(b) It is essential for carrying out the indirect action,

(c) Such funding is provided for in a bilateral scientific and technological agreement or any other arrangement between the Community and the country in which the legal entity is established.

> *Before the signature of a grant agreement, the Commission has to verify the existence and legal status of all participants. This verification is made only once for each organisation at the time of its first participation in FP7. The details of all validated organisations are stored in a **Unique Registration Facility (URF)**. These organisations are allocated a unique code, the so-called **Participant Identification Code (PIC)**. In any*

> *further participation in other proposals, the organisations already validated use the PIC for their identification with the Commission.*

For the confirmation and maintenance of the data stored in the URF, the Commission asks each organisation to nominate one privileged contact person, the so-called Legal Entity Appointed Representative (LEAR). The LEAR is usually a person working in the central administration of the organisation and he/she must be appointed by the top management of the entity. The LEARs can view their organisations' legal and financial data online and ask for corrections and changes to the data of their legal entity via the Web interface of the Unique Registration Facility.

International cooperation

The European Commission attaches great importance to international cooperation in research, and FP7 has been designed to ensure that such activities can be integrated across the programme. In addition to the opportunities mentioned above, which are generally applicable, calls may include:

• Topics of mutual interest defined in the work programmes where international cooperation is particularly encouraged.

• Specific international cooperation actions (SICA), also on topics of mutual interest. Here special minimum conditions apply.

Please check the work programme, including the call fiche, to see if these possibilities apply to this call.

Ethical principles

Please remember that research activities in FP7 should respect fundamental ethical principles, including those reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. These principles include the need to ensure the freedom of research and the need to protect the physical and moral integrity of individuals and the welfare of animals. For this reason, the REA – together with the European Commission - carries out an ethical review of proposals when appropriate. The following fields of research shall not be financed under this Framework Programme:

  • research activity aiming at human cloning for reproductive purposes;
  • research activity intended to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable[3];
  • research activities intended to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer.

As regards human embryonic stem cell research, the REA and the Commission will maintain the practice of the Sixth Framework Programme, which excludes from Community financial support research activities destroying human embryos, including for the procurement of stem cells. The exclusion of funding of this step of research will not prevent Community funding of subsequent steps involving human embryonic stem cells.

Risk-Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF)

This innovative debt-based facility, designed by the European Commission and the European Investment Bank creates an additional capacity of up to EUR 10 billion for financing higher risk research, technological development, demonstration and innovation activities. The EIB will implement RSFF in close collaboration with all major EU national and regional banks within Member States and Associated Countries to FP7, which are providing support to the development of

---

[3] Research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads can be financed.

European companies. Financing through the RSFF can be sought either in addition to, or instead of FP7 grants.

For additional information on RSFF see:

http://www.eib.org/products/loans/special/rsff/index

http://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/funding/funding02_en.htm

Presenting your proposal

A proposal has two parts:

Part A will contain the administrative information about the proposal and the participants. The information requested includes a brief description of the work, contact details and characteristics of the participants, and information related to the funding requested (see annex 3 to this Guide). This information will be encoded in a structured database for further computer processing to produce, for example, statistics, and evaluation reports. This information will also support the experts and REA staff during the evaluation process.

The information in Part A is entered through a set of on-line forms.

Part B is a "template", or list of headings, rather than an administrative form (see annex 4 to this Guide). You should follow this structure when presenting the scientific and technical content of your proposal. The template is designed to highlight those aspects that will be assessed against the **evaluation criteria**. It covers, among other things, the nature of the proposed work, the participants and their roles in the proposed project, and the impacts that might be expected to arise from the proposed work. Only black and white copies are used for evaluation and you are strongly recommended, therefore, not to use colour in your document.

Part B of the proposal is uploaded by the applicant into the Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS) described below.

> *A maximum length may be specified for the different sections of Part B, or for Part B as a whole (see annex 4 to this Guide). You <u>must</u> keep your proposal within these limits. Experts will be instructed to disregard any excess pages.*
>
> *Even where no page limits are given, or where limits are only recommended, it is in your interest to keep your text concise since over-long proposals are rarely viewed in a positive light by the evaluating experts.*
>
> *A small number of calls operate a **continuous submission procedure**. These calls are open for an extended period, during which proposals will be evaluated in batches after fixed cut-off dates. The call fiche will show whether intermediate cut-off dates apply to his call.*

Proposal language

Proposals may be prepared in any official language of the European Union. If your proposal is not in English, a translation of the full proposal would be of assistance to the experts. An English translation of the abstract may be included in Part B of the proposal.

3.2 Proposal submission

About the EPSS

Proposals must be submitted electronically, using the **Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)**. Proposals arriving at the REA by any other means are regarded as 'not submitted', and will not be evaluated[4].

All the data that you upload is securely stored on a server to which only you and the other participants in the proposal have access until the deadline. This data is encrypted until the close of the call.

You can access the EPSS from the call page on CORDIS.

Full instructions are found in the "EPSS preparation and submission guide", available from the EPSS entry page (click on "EPSS user guide").

The most important points are explained below.

Use of the system by the proposal coordinator

As a coordinator you can:
- register as interested in submitting a proposal to a particular call
- set up (and modify) your consortium by adding/removing participants
- complete all of Part A of the proposal, pertaining to the proposal in general, and to your own administrative details
- download the document template for writing Part B of the proposal and, when it is completed, upload the finished Part B
- submit the complete proposal Part A and Part B.

Use of the system by the other participants

Other participants can:
- complete their own sections A2 (participant details)
- download the document template for writing Part B of the proposal, in order to assist the coordinator in preparing it (however, only the coordinator can upload the finished version)
- view the whole proposal.

Participant Identification Codes (PICs)

The Participant Identification Code is a unique 9 digit number that helps the European Commission identify a participant. It is used in all grant-related interactions between the participant and the Commission.

If your organisation has already participated in a 7th Framework Programme proposal, it is likely that the organisation has already received a PIC number. You can check it on the Participant Portal: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf.

> *If your organisation already has a PIC, it is likely that it has also appointed a Legal Entity Appointed Representatives (LEAR) (see section 31.). The names of LEARs are not available online, you have to enquire with the administration of your organisation.*

---

[4] In exceptional cases, when a proposal co-ordinator has absolutely no means of accessing the EPSS, and when it is impossible to arrange for another member of the consortium to do so, an applicant may request permission from the REA to submit on paper. A request should be sent via the FP7 enquiry service (see annex 1), indicating in the subject line "Paper submission request". (You can telephone the enquiry service if web access is not possible: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 from Europe; or 32 2 299 96 96 from anywhere in the world. A postal or e-mail address will then be given to you). Such a request, which must clearly explain the circumstances of the case, must be received by the REA no later than one month before the call deadline. The REA will reply within five working days of receipt. Only if a derogation is granted, a proposal on paper may be submitted by mail, courier or hand delivery. The delivery address will be given in the derogation letter.

All participants already possessing a PIC should use it to identify themselves in the Electronic Proposal Submission System. After entering the PIC, parts of the A forms will be filled in automatically.

If a PIC is not yet available for your organisation, you can still submit your proposal by entering the organisation details manually. However, it is strongly recommended that before submitting a proposal via the Electronic Proposal Submission System (EPSS), you self-register your organisation in the Unique Registration Facility and receive a temporary PIC, which can then be used in the EPSS. The use of PICs – even temporary ones – will lead to more efficient processing of your proposal.

In case you use the PIC of your organisation in the EPSS and the data on your organisation displayed in EPSS seem to contain mistakes, please ask your LEAR to change the data through the Unique Registration Facility (URF). This parallel process has no influence on the preparation and submission of your proposal. The proposal can be submitted even without the correction of such errors.

Self-registration in the Unique Registration Facility for receiving a temporary PIC is quick and simple, see http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf (use the button "Register").

Further details on the appointment of LEARs and the use of PICs can be found in the FAQs of the Participant Portal: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal   and   on   Cordis:
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/pp_en.html.

If your organisation has not yet appointed a LEAR, the necessary documents and instructions can be found here: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/pp-lear_en.html.

Submitting the proposal

Only the coordinator is authorised to submit the proposal.

Completing the Part A forms in the EPSS and uploading a Part B does **not** yet mean that your proposal is submitted. Once there is a consolidated version of the proposal, you must press the button "SUBMIT NOW".

(If you don't see the button "SUBMIT NOW", first select the "SUBMIT" tag at the top of the screen).

Please note that "SUBMIT NOW" starts the final steps for submission; it does not in itself cause the proposal to be submitted.

After reading the information page that then appears, it is possible to submit the proposal using the button marked "*Press this button to submit the proposal*".

The EPSS then performs an automatic validation of the proposal. A list of any problems ("validation error message") such as missing data, viruses, wrong file format or excessive file size will then appear on the screen. **Submission is blocked until these problems are corrected.** Once corrected, the coordinator must then repeat the above steps to achieve submission.

If successfully submitted, the coordinator receives a message that indicates that the proposal has been received. This automatic message is not the official acknowledgement of receipt (see Section 5).

The coordinator may continue to modify the proposal and submit revised versions overwriting the previous one right up until the deadline. The sequence above must be repeated each time.

If the submission sequence described above is not followed, the REA considers that no proposal has been submitted.

For the proposal Part B you must use exclusively PDF ("portable document format", compatible with Adobe version 3 or higher, with embedded fonts). Other file formats will not be accepted by the system. Irrespective of any page limits specified in annex 4 to this Guide, there is an overall limit of 10Mbyte to the size of proposal file Part B. There are also restrictions to the name you give to the Part B file. You should only use alphanumeric characters. Special characters and spaces must be avoided.

> *You are advised to clean your document before converting to PDF (e.g. accept any track changes). Check that your conversion software successfully converts all pages and the original document (e.g. there is no problem with page limits).*
>
> *Please note that the REA prints out proposals on plain A4 paper. The printable zone on the print engine is bounded by 1.5 cm right, left, top bottom. No scaling is applied to make the page "fit" the window. Printing is done at 300 dots per inch.*

About the deadline

Proposals must be submitted on or before the deadline specified in the Call fiche. It is your responsibility to ensure the timely submission of your proposal.

The EPSS will be closed for this call at the call deadline. After this moment, access to the EPSS for this call will be impossible.

Do not wait until the last moment before submitting your proposal!

Call deadlines are absolutely firm and are strictly enforced.

Please note that you may submit successive drafts of your proposal through the EPSS. Each successive submission overwrites the previous version. It is a good idea to **submit a draft well before the deadline**.

> *Leaving your first submission attempt to the last few minutes of the call will give you no time to overcome even the smallest technical difficulties, proposal verification problems or communications delays which may arise. Such events are never accepted as extenuating circumstances; your proposal will be regarded as not having been submitted.*
>
> ***Submission is deemed to occur at the moment when the proposal coordinator completes the submission sequence described above. <u>It is not the point at which you start the upload</u>.*** *If you wait until too near to the close of the call to start uploading your proposal, there is a serious risk that you will not be able to submit in time.*
>
> *If you have registered and submitted your proposal in error to another call which closes after this call, the REA will not be aware of it until it is discovered among the downloaded proposals for the later call. It will therefore be classified as ineligible because of late arrival.*
> *The submission of a proposal requires some knowledge of the EPSS system, a detailed knowledge of the contents of the proposal and the authority to make last-minute decisions on behalf of the consortium if problems arise. **You are advised not to delegate the job of submitting your proposal!***

In the unlikely event of a failure of the EPSS service due to breakdown of the Commission server during the last 24 hours of this call, the deadline will be extended by a further 24 hours. This will be notified by e-mail to all proposal coordinators who had registered for this call by the time of the original deadline, and also by a notice on the Call page on CORDIS and on the web site of the EPSS.

Such a failure is a rare and exceptional event; therefore do not assume that there will be an extension to this call. If you have difficulty in submitting your proposal, you should not assume that it is because of a problem with the Commission server, since this is rarely the case. Contact the EPSS help desk if in doubt (see the address given in annex 1 to this Guide).

Please note that the REA will not extend deadlines for system failures that are not its own responsibility. In all circumstances, you should aim to submit your proposal well before the deadline to have time to solve any problems.

Correcting or revising your proposal

Errors discovered in proposals submitted to the EPSS can be rectified by simply submitting a corrected version. So long as the call has not yet closed, the new submission will overwrite the old one.

Once the deadline has passed, however, the REA can accept no further additions, corrections or re-submissions. The last eligible version of your proposal received before the deadline is the one which will be evaluated, and no later material can be submitted.

Ancillary material

Only a single PDF file comprising the complete Part B can be uploaded. Unless specified in the call, any hyperlinks to other documents, embedded material, and any other documents (company brochures, supporting documentation, reports, audio, video, multimedia etc.) sent electronically or by post, will be disregarded.

Withdrawing a proposal

You may withdraw a proposal before the deadline by submitting a revised version with an empty Part B section, with the following words entered in the abstract field of form A:

"The applicants wish to withdraw this proposal. It should not be evaluated by the REA".

If you wish to withdraw a proposal after the deadline, please contact the EPSS help desk.

Registration of legal entities in the Commission's Early Warning System (EWS) and Central Exclusion Database (CED)

To protect the EU's financial interests, the Commission uses an internal information tool, the Early Warning System (EWS) to flag identified risks related to beneficiaries of centrally managed contracts and grants. Through systematic registration of financial and other risks the EWS enables the Commission services to take the necessary precautionary measures to ensure a sound financial management[5].

EWS registrations are not publicly disclosed. However, registrations will be transferred to the Central Exclusion Database (CED) if they relate to entities that have been excluded from EU funding because they are insolvent or have been convicted of a serious professional misconduct or criminal offense detrimental to EU financial interests. The data in CED are available to **all public authorities implementing EU funds**, i.e. European institutions, national agencies or authorities in Member States, and, subject to conditions for personal data protection, to third countries and international organisations.

---

[5] The EWS covers situations such as significantly overdue recovery orders, judicial proceedings pending for serious administrative errors/fraud, findings of serious administrative errors/fraud, legal situations which exclude the beneficiary from funding.

The work programme informs you that the details of your organisation (or those of a person who has powers of representation, decision-making or control over it) may be registered in the EWS and the CED and be shared with public authorities as described in the relevant legal texts**[6]**.

More information on the EWS and CED, can be found here:

http://ec.europa.eu/budget/sound_fin_mgt/ews_en.htm

---

[6] The basis of registrations in EWS and CED is laid out in:
- the Commission Decision of 16.12.2008 on the Early Warning System (EWS) for the use of authorising officers of the Commission and the executive agencies (OJ, L 344, 20.12.2008, p. 125),
and
- the Commission Regulation of 17.12.2008 on the Central Exclusion Database – CED (OJ L 344, 20.12.2008, p. 12).

4. Check list

Of importance for the consortium in general, but in particular for the coordinator:

4.1 Preparing your proposal

- **Does your planned work fit with the call for proposals?** Check that your proposed work does indeed address the topics open in this call. (See the current version of the work programme).

- **Are you applying for the right funding scheme?** Check that your proposed work falls within the scope of this call, and that you have applied for one of the eligible funding schemes (see the work programme). If there is a choice, have you opted for the one that best suits your needs? Check the Part A and Part B formats shown in annexes 3 and 4 to this Guide[7]

- **Is your proposal eligible?** The eligibility criteria are given in the work programme. See also annex 2 to this Guide. In particular, make sure that you satisfy the minimum requirements for the makeup of your consortium. Have any additional eligibility criteria been set for this call? Check that you comply with any budgetary limits that may have been fixed on the requested EU contribution. Any proposal not meeting the eligibility requirements will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.

- **Is your proposal complete?** Proposals must comprise a Part A, containing the administrative information including participant and project cost details on standard forms; and a Part B containing the scientific and technical description of your proposal as described in this Guide. A proposal that does not contain both parts will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.

- **Does your proposed work raise ethical issues?** Clearly indicate any potential ethical, safety or regulatory aspects of the proposed research and the way they will be dealt with in your proposed project. An ethical check will take place during the evaluation and an ethical review will take place for proposals dealing with sensitive issues. Proposals may be rejected on ethical grounds if such issues are not dealt with satisfactorily.

- **Does your proposal follow the required structure?** Proposals should be precise and concise, and must follow exactly the proposal structure described in this document (annex 4 to this Guide), which is designed to correspond to the evaluation criteria which will be applied. This structure varies for different funding schemes. Omitting requested information will almost certainly lead to lower scores and possible rejection.

- **Have you maximised your chances?** There will be strong competition. Therefore, edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator; refer to the evaluation criteria given in annex 2 to this Guide. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.

- **Do you need further advice and support?** You are strongly advised to inform your National Contact Point of your intention to submit a proposal (see address in annex 1 to this Guide). Remember the Enquiry service listed in annex 1.

---

[7] If you have in error registered for the wrong call or funding scheme, discard that registration (usernames and passwords) and register again before the call deadline. If, after the close of the call, you discover that you have submitted your proposal to the wrong call, notify the EPSS Helpdesk.

4.2 Final checks before submission

- **Do you have the agreement** of all the members of the consortium to submit this proposal on their behalf?

- **Check once more the eligibility criteria mentioned in the call! This includes any budget limits.** Remember – the information given in part A is considered definitive.

- **Is your Part B in portable document format (PDF),** including no material in other formats?

- **Is the filename made up of the letters A to Z, and numbers 0 to 9?** You should avoid special characters and spaces.

- **Have you printed out your Part B**, to check that it really is the file you intend to submit, and that it is complete, printable and readable? <u>After the call deadline it will not be possible to replace your Part B file.</u>

- **Double check that you respect the font size (11 point) and the page limitations for the different chapters!**

- **Is your Part B file within the size limit of 10 Mbytes?**

- **Have you virus-checked your computer?** The EPSS will automatically block the submission of any file containing a virus.

- **Have you made yourself familiar with the EPSS in good time?**

- **Have you allowed time to submit a first version of your proposal well in advance of the deadline** (at least several days before), and then to continue to improve it with regular resubmissions?

- **Have you completed the submission process for your latest version?**

4.3 Following submission

- Information submitted to the EPSS remains encrypted until the deadline and can only be viewed by the applicant.

- It is recommended that you check that all your material has been successfully been uploaded **and** submitted.

- You can revise and resubmit your proposal up to call deadline.

5. What happens next

Shortly after the call deadline, the REA will send an **acknowledgement of receipt** to the email address of the proposal coordinator given in the submitted proposal. This is assumed to be the individual named on the A2 form for participant no. 1. Please note that the brief electronic message given by the EPSS system after each submission is not the official acknowledgement of receipt.

The sending of an acknowledgement of receipt does not imply that a proposal has been accepted as eligible for evaluation.

> *If you have not received an acknowledgement of receipt within 12 working days after the call deadline (or cut-off date, in the case of a continuously open call), you should contact the FP7 Enquiry Service (see annex 1 to this Guide). However, first please check that you are the person named in the proposal as contact person for partner no. 1, check the email address which you gave for yourself, and check the junk mail box of your email system for the first few days following the close of call for any mail originating from* FP7Aor@ess-fp7.org*.*

The REA will check that your **proposal** meets the **eligibility criteria** that apply to this call and funding scheme (see the work programme and annex 2 to this Guide).

All eligible proposals will be evaluated by independent experts. The evaluation criteria and procedure are described in annex 2 to this Guide.

If **hearings** are planned in this call (see annex 2 to this Guide), you will receive an invitation if your proposal is highly rated. In this case, you will be asked by the evaluation panel to provide further details on the proposal. The letter of invitation will specify the date and time and the particular arrangements. It may also list a number of specific questions concerning the proposal, which you should be prepared to respond to at the hearing. The letter will explain how to reply if you cannot attend in person.

Soon after the completion of the evaluation, the results will be finalised and all co-ordinators will receive a letter containing **initial information** on the results of the evaluation, including the Evaluation Summary Report giving the opinion of the experts on the proposal. Even if the experts viewed your proposal favourably, the REA cannot at this stage indicate if there is a possibility of EU funding.

> *If you have not received the "initial information letter" by the date referred to in annex I to this Guide, please contact the REA via the FP7 enquiry service.*

The letter will also give the relevant contact details and the steps to follow if you consider that there has been a shortcoming in the conduct of the evaluation process ("redress procedure").

The REA – through the Commission – also informs the relevant **Programme Committee**, consisting of delegates representing the governments of the Member States and Associated Countries.

Based on the results of the evaluation by experts, the REA – together with the Commission - draws up the Evaluation Results File, taking account of the available budget, the strategic objectives of the programme, the Community policies, as well as the overall balance of proposals to be funded. The REA transmits to the Commission the File, based on which the Commission, after informing the relevant Programme Committee, consisting of delegates representing the governments of the Member States and Associated countries, draws up the final list of proposals for possible funding.

Official letters are then sent to the applicants. If all has gone well, this letter will mark the beginning of a **negotiation** phase. Due to budget constraints, it is also possible that your proposal will be placed on a reserve list. In this case, negotiations will only begin if funds become available. In other cases, the letter will explain the reasons why the proposal cannot be funded on this occasion.

A description of the negotiation process will be provided in the **Negotiation Guidance Notes** available on CORDIS.

Negotiations occur between the applicants and the REA, and aim to conclude a grant agreement which provides for EU funding of the proposed work. They cover both the scientific/technological, and the administrative and financial aspects of the project. The staff conducting these negotiations on behalf of the REA will be working within a predetermined budget envelope. They will also refer to any recommendations which the experts may have made concerning modifications to the work presented in the proposal, as well as any recommendations arising from an ethical review of your proposal if one was carried out. Where relevant, security aspects shall also be considered.

The negotiations will also deal with gender equality actions, and, if applicable to the project, with gender aspects in the conduct of the planned work, as well as the relevant principles contained in the European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment.

Members of the proposal consortium may be invited to Brussels or Luxembourg to facilitate the negotiation.

For participants not yet having a Participant Identification Code (PIC), i.e. not yet being registered and validated in the Commission's Unique Registration Facility (URF) their existence as legal entities and their legal status will have to be validated before a grant agreement can be signed. For these participants, the procedure of registration and validation is triggered by a self-registration in the web interface of the URF available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf. This self-registration will lead to a request by the REA to the organisation to provide supporting documents and to nominate a Legal Entity Authorised Representative (LEAR). Further details can be found in section 3.2., on the Participant Portal http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf and on Cordis http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/pp_en.html

The LEAR is a person nominated in each legal entity participating in FP7. This person is the contact for the REA related to all questions on legal status. He/she has access to the online database of legal entities with a possibility to view the data stored on his/her entity and to initiate updates and corrections to these data. The LEAR receives a Participant Identification Code (PIC) from the URF (see below), and distributes this number within his/her organisation.

Applicants are reminded that the Commission's Research DGs have adopted a new and reinforced audit strategy aimed at detecting and correcting errors in cost claims submitted in projects on the basis of professional auditing standards. As a result the number of audits and participants audited will increase significantly and the Commission's services will assure appropriate mutual exchange of information within its relevant internal departments in order to fully coordinate any corrective actions to be taken in a consistent way. More information can be found here: http://cordis.europa.eu/audit-certification/home_en.html

Glossary

The following explanations are provided for clarity and easy-reference. They have no legal authority, and do not replace any official definitions set out in the Council decisions.

A

Acknowledgement of receipt:

Applicants are informed by email shortly after the deadline that a proposal has been successfully submitted (but not that it is necessarily eligible). Contact the *help desk* urgently if you do not receive such an acknowledgement.

Applicant

The term used generally in this guide for a person or entity applying to a call for proposals. The term 'participant' is used in the more limited sense of a member of a proposal or project consortium (see below).

Associated countries

Non-EU countries which are party to an international agreement with the Community, under the terms or on the basis of which it makes a financial contribution to all or part of the Seventh Framework Programme. In the context of proposal consortia, organisations from these countries are treated on the same footing as those in the EU. The list of associated countries is given in the body of this guide.

C

Call fiche

The part of the work programme giving the basic data for a call for proposals (e.g. topics covered, budget, deadline etc). It is posted as a separate document on the CORDIS web page devoted to a particular call.

Call for proposals (or "call")

An announcement, usually in the Official Journal, inviting proposals for research activities in a certain theme. Full information on the call can be found on the CORDIS web-site.

Consensus meeting

The stage in the proposal evaluation process when experts come together to establish a common view on a particular proposal.

Consortium

Most *funding schemes* require proposals from a number of participants (usually at least three) who agree to work together in a consortium.

Continuous submission

Some calls are open for an extended period, during which proposals may be submitted at any moment. In these cases, proposals are evaluated in batches after fixed *cut-off dates.*

Coordinator

The coordinator leads and represents the applicants. He or she acts as the point of contact with the REA.

CORDIS service

A web service providing access to all the documentation related to FP7, and access to the *electronic proposal submission service*.

Cut-off date

An intermediate date in the context of a call operating a *continuous submission procedure.* Proposals are evaluated in batches after each *cut-off date*.

D

Deadline

For a particular *call*, the moment after which proposals cannot be submitted to the REA, and when the *Electronic Proposal Submission Service* closes for that call. Deadlines are strictly enforced.

Deliverable

A deliverable represents a verifiable output of the project. Normally, each workpackage will produce one or more deliverables during its lifetime. Deliverables are often written reports but can also take another form, for example the completion of a prototype etc.

Direct costs

Direct costs are all eligible costs which can be attributed directly to the project and are identified by the participant as such, in accordance with its accounting principles and its usual internal rules.

E

Early Warning System (EWS)

An internal information tool of the Commission to flag identified financial risks related to beneficiaries.

Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)

A web-based service which must be used to submit proposals to the REA. Access is given through the *CORDIS* web-site, or via a specific site.

Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS) Helpdesk

A telephone / email service to assist applicants who have difficulty in submitting their proposal via the Electronic Proposal Submission System: tel: +32 2 233 3760 email support@epss-fp7.org

Eligibility Review Committee

An internal committee which examines in detail cases of proposals whose eligibility for inclusion in an evaluation is in question

Eligibility criteria

The minimum conditions which a proposal must fulfil if it is to be retained for evaluation. The eligibility criteria are generally the same for all proposals throughout FP7, and relate to submission before the *deadline, minimum participation, completeness and scope.* However, additional eligibility criteria may apply to certain calls, and applicants should check the work programme, and annex 2 to this Guide.

Ethical issues table

Research activities supported by the Framework Programme should respect fundamental ethical principles. The main issues which might arise in a project are summarised in tabular form in a checklist included in the proposal

Evaluation criteria

The criteria against which eligible proposals are assessed by independent experts. The evaluation criteria are generally the same for all proposals throughout FP7, and relate to S/T quality, impact and implementation. Relevance is also considered. However, additional evaluation criteria may apply to certain calls, and applicants should check the work programme, and annex 2 to this Guide.

Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)

The assessment of a particular proposal following the evaluation by independent experts is provided in an Evaluation Summary Report. It normally contains both comments and scores for each criterion.

F

FP7 enquiry service

A general information service on all aspects of FP7. Contact details are given in annex 1 to this Guide.

Funding scheme

The mechanisms for the Community funding of research projects. The funding schemes have different objectives, and are implemented through grant agreements.

G

Grant Agreement (GA)

The legal instrument that provides for Community funding of successful proposals.

H

Hearing

Applicants whose proposals have been evaluated are sometimes invited to provide explanations and clarifications to any specific questions raised by the experts. These questions are submitted to the applicants in advance.

I

Indirect costs

Indirect costs, (sometimes called overheads), are all those eligible costs which cannot be identified by the participant as being directly attributed to the project, but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project.

Individual evaluation

The stage in the evaluation process when experts assess the merits of a particular proposal before discussion with their peers.

Information Days

Open events organised by the Commission or the REA to explain the characteristics of specific calls, and often as well, a chance for potential applicants to meet and discuss proposal ideas and collaborations.

Initial information letter

A letter sent by the REA to applicants shortly after the evaluation by experts, giving a report from the experts on the proposal in question (the Evaluation Summary Report).

International Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC)

A list of low-income, lower-middle income and upper-middle-income countries, given in annex 1 to the work programme. Organisations from these countries can participate and receive funding in FP7, providing that certain minimum conditions are met.

International European Interest Organisation

International organisations, the majority of whose members are European Union Member States or Associated Countries, and whose principal objective is to promote scientific and technological co-operation in Europe.

J

Joint Research Centre (JRC)

The Commission's own research institutes.

L

LEAR (Legal Entity Authorised Representative)

The LEAR is a person nominated in each legal entity participating in FP7. This person is the contact for the REA related to all questions on legal status. He/she has access to the online database of legal entities with a possibility to view the data stored on his/her entity and to initiate updates and corrections to these data. The LEAR receives a Participant Identification Code (PIC) from the REA (see below), and distributes this number within his/her organisation.

Lump sum

Lump sums do not require the submission of financial justifications (statements), as they are "fixed". ICPC participants when participating in an FP7 grant agreement (GA) have got the option between being reimbursed on the basis of eligible costs or on the basis of lump-sums. This option can be made (and changed) up to the moment of the signature of the GA. Once made, it will apply during the whole duration of the GA without the possibility of changing it. ICPC participants may opt for a lump sum in a given project and for reimbursement of costs in another. Whatever the final option chosen, the maximum EC contribution for the project will remain.

M

Milestones

Control points where decisions are needed with regard to the next stage of the project.

N

National Contact Points (NCP)

Official representatives nominated by the national authorities to provide tailored information and advice on each theme of FP7, in the national language(s).

Negotiation

The process of establishing a grant agreement between the REA and an applicant whose proposal has been favourably evaluated, and when funds are available.

Non-profit

A legal entity is qualified as "*non-profit*" when considered as such by national or international law.

P

Part A

The part of a proposal dealing with administrative data. This part is completed using the web-based EPSS.

Part B

The part of a proposal explaining the work to be carried out, and the roles and aptitudes of the participants in the consortium. This part is uploaded to the EPSS as a pdf file.

Part B template

A document in PDF format supplied by the EPSS, consisting of a template of all chapter headings, forms and tables required to prepare a proposal Part B. The template format is given in Annex 4 to this Guide.

Participants

The members of a consortium in a proposal or project. These are legal entities, and have rights and obligations with regard to the Community.

Participant Indentification Code (PIC)
Organisations participating in FP7 will progressively be assigned Participant Identification Codes (PIC). The PIC is a unique 9-digit number for each organisation. Possession of a PIC will enable organisations to take advantage of the Unique Registration Facility (see below), and to identify themselves in all transactions related to FP7 proposals and grants. An online tool to search for existing PICs and the related organisations is available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf.

Programme committee

A group of official national representatives who assist the Commission in implementing the Framework Programme.

Proposal

A description of the planned research activities, information on who will carry them out, how much they will cost, and how much funding is requested

Public body

Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.

R

Redress procedure

The initial information letter will indicate an address if an applicant wishes to submit a request for redress, if he or she believes that there have been shortcomings in the handling of the proposal in question, and that

these shortcomings would jeopardise the outcome of the evaluation process. An internal evaluation review committee ("redress committee") will examine all such complaints. This committee does not itself evaluate the proposal. It is possible that the committee will recommend a re-evaluation of all or part of the proposal.

Research organisation

A legal entity established as a *non-profit* organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.

Reserve list

Due to budgetary constraints it may not be possible to support all proposals that have been evaluated positively. In such conditions, proposals on a reserve list may only be financed if funds become available following the negotiation of projects on the main list.

Risk-Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF)

A new mechanism to foster private sector investment in research, by increasing the capacity of the EIB and its financial partners to provide loans for European RTD projects.

RTD

Research and Technological Development.

S

SME

'SMEs' are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. SMEs are defined in Recommendation 2003/361/EC of 6 May 2003.

Specific International Cooperation Actions (SICA)

In some calls on topics of mutual interest, special conditions apply to promote research collaborations between European organisations and those based in the International Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC). This usually entails a minimum of two participants from EU or Associated countries, and two from ICPC.

T

Thresholds

For a proposal to be considered for funding, the evaluation scores for individual criteria must exceed certain thresholds. There is also an overall threshold for the sum of the scores.

Two-stage submission

Some calls require proposals to be submitted in two stages. In this case, applicants initially present their idea in a brief outline proposal. This is evaluated against evaluation criteria, or sub-criteria for this stage set out in the call. Applicants successful in the first stage will be invited to submit a full proposal at the second stage, which will be evaluated against criteria for this second stage set out in the call. The first stage criteria, as set out in the work programme, are usually a limited set of those applying at the second stage.

Two-step evaluation

An evaluation procedure in which a proposal is evaluated first on a limited number of evaluation criteria (usually, just one), and only those proposals which achieve the threshold on this are subject to a full evaluation on the remaining criteria.

U

Unique Registration Facility (URF)

A system that allows organisations to register their details and status once and for all, obviating the need to

provide the same information with each submission. The Web interface of the URF is found at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf On this website you will also find a search tool to check if your organisation is already registered or not.

W

Weightings

The scores for certain evaluation criteria may be multiplied by a weighting factor before the total score is calculated. Generally, weightings are set to one; but there may be exceptions and applicants should check the details in annex 2 to this Guide.

Work Package

A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed project with a verifiable end-point – normally a deliverable or a milestone in the overall project.

Work Programme

A formal document of the Commission for the implementation of a specific programme, that sets out the research objectives and topics to be addressed. It also contains information that is set out further in this Guide, including the schedule and details of the calls for proposals, indicative budgets, and the evaluation procedure.

Annex 1:

Timetable and specific information for this call

The **work programme** provides the essential information for submitting a proposal to this call. It describes the content of the topics to be addressed, and details on how it will be implemented. The work programme is available on the CORDIS call page. The part giving the basic data on implementation (deadline, budget, additional conditions etc) is also posted as a separate document ("call fiche"). You must consult these documents.

- **Indicative timetable for this call**

Publication of call	*13 October 2009*
Deadline for submission of proposals	*13 January 2010, Brussels time 17:00:00*
Evaluation of proposals	*Week 7/15-19 February 2010*
Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators ("initial information letter")	*Week 8-February2010*
Invitation letter to successful coordinators to launch grant agreement negotiations with Commission services	*Week 11/March 2010*
Letter to unsuccessful applicants	As from week 11/March 2010
Signature of first grant agreements	As from June 2010

      the indicative budget for this call is equal to €3,5 million

    Further information and help

The CORDIS call page contains links to other sources that you may find useful in preparing and submitting your proposal. Direct links are also given where applicable.

Call information
CORDIS call page and work programme   http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm
Evaluation forms
Information Days related to this call   *18 November 2010;*
More info: http://ec.europa.eu/research/researchersineurope/events/researchersnight09/index_en.htm

General sources of help:
The FP7 Enquiry service   http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries

National Contact Points

        http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/third-countries en.html

National Contact Points in third countries

Contact person *(optional)***:**

A list of contact details of Commission and REA staff can be found on a separate document on the call page.

Specialised and technical assistance:

CORDIS help desk   http://cordis.europa.eu/guidance/helpdesk/home_en.html

EPSS Help desk   support@epss-fp7.org

IPR help desk   http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org

Researchers' night website:

http://ec.europa.eu/research/researchersineurope/events/researchersnight09/index_en.htm

You may also wish to consult the following documents that can be found at

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html

FP7 Legal basis documents generally applicable

- Decision on the Framework Programme
- Rules for Participation
- Specific Programmes
- Work Programmes

Legal documents for implementation

- Rules for submission, evaluation, selection, award
- Standard model grant agreement
- Rules on verification of existence, legal status, operational and financial capacity

Guidance documents

- Guidance Notes on Audit Certification Guide for beneficiaries Guide to Financial Issues
- Guide to IPR
- Checklist for the Consortium Agreement
- Negotiation Guidance Notes and Templates for Description of Work

Other supporting information

- Brochure "The FP7 in Brief"
- European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment
- International cooperation
- Risk Sharing Financing Facility and the European Investment Bank

Ethics Review
- Ethics check list
- Supporting documents

Annex 2:

Evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied for this call

1. General

The evaluation of proposals is carried out by the REA with the assistance of independent experts.

REA staff ensures that the process is fair, and in line with the principles contained in the Commission's rules[8].

Experts perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They sign an appointment letter, including a declaration of confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest before beginning their work. Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

In addition, an independent expert will be appointed by the REA to observe the evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The role of the observer is to give independent advice to the REA on the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions, on the way in which the experts apply the evaluation criteria, and on ways in which the procedures could be improved. The observer will not express views on the proposals under examination or the experts' opinions on the proposals.

2. Before the evaluation

On receipt by the REA, proposals are registered and acknowledged and their contents entered into a database to support the evaluation process. Eligibility criteria for each proposal are also checked by REA staff before the evaluation begins. Proposals which do not fulfill these criteria will not be included in the evaluation.

For this call a proposal will only be considered eligible if it meets all of the following conditions:

- It is received by the REA before the deadline given in the call fiche

- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call fiche

- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)

- The content of the proposal relates to the topic(s) and funding scheme(s), including any special conditions set out in the relevant parts of the work programme

The REA establishes a list of experts capable of evaluating the proposals that have been received. The list is drawn up to ensure:

- A high level of expertise;
- An appropriate range of competencies;

---

[8] Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures (posted on CORDIS).

Evaluation criteria applicable to Coordination and support actions (Supporting)		
S/T QUALITY **"Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)"**	**IMPLEMENTATION** **"Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management"**	**IMPACT** **"Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results"**
• Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives • Quality and effectiveness of the support action mechanisms, and associated work plan	• Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) [only if relevant] • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment …)	• Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity • Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and disseminating knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders, and the public at large.

Provided that the above conditions can be satisfied, other factors are also taken into consideration:

- An appropriate balance between academic and industrial expertise and users;
- A reasonable gender balance;
- A reasonable distribution of geographical origins;
- Regular rotation of experts

In constituting the lists of experts, the REA also takes account of their abilities to appreciate the industrial and/or societal dimension of the proposed work. Experts must also have the appropriate language skills required for the proposals to be evaluated.

REA staff allocates proposals to individual experts, taking account of the fields of expertise of the experts, and avoiding conflicts of interest.

3. Evaluation of proposals

At the beginning of the evaluation, experts will be briefed by REA staff, covering the evaluation procedure, the experts' responsibilities, the issues involved in the particular area/objective, and other relevant material (including the integration of the international cooperation dimension).

Each proposal will first be assessed independently by at least three experts.
The proposal will be evaluated against pre-determined evaluation criteria.

Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the three criteria, and not for the sub-criteria. The sub-criteria are issues which the expert should consider in the assessment of that criterion. They also act as reminders of issues to raise later during the discussions of the proposal.

The <u>relevance</u> of a proposal will be considered in relation to the topic(s) of the work programme open in a given call, and to the objectives of a call. These aspects will be integrated in the application of the criterion "S/T quality", and the first sub-criterion under "Impact" respectively. When a proposal is <u>partially relevant</u> because it only marginally addresses the topic(s) of the call, or if only part of the proposal addresses the topic(s), this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected on eligibility grounds.

Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Half marks can be given.

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:

0 -	*The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*
1 -	*Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*
2 -	*Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.*
3 -	*Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.*
4 -	*Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.*
5 -	*Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*

No weightings will be applied.

Thresholds will be applied to the scores. The threshold for individual criteria will be 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, will be 10.

Examples of the evaluation forms and reports that will be used by the experts in this call will be made available on CORDIS.

<u>Conflicts of interest:</u> Under the terms of the appointment letter, experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform a REA staff member if one becomes apparent during the course of the evaluation. The REA will take whatever action is necessary to remove any conflict.

<u>Confidentiality:</u> The appointment letter also requires experts to maintain strict confidentiality with respect to the whole evaluation process. They must follow any instruction given by the REA to ensure this. Under no circumstance may an expert attempt to contact an applicant on his own account, either during the evaluation or afterwards**.**

4. Individual evaluation

This part of the evaluation will be carried out in Brussels

At this first step the experts are acting individually; they do not discuss the proposal with each other, nor with any third party. The experts record their individual opinions in an <u>Individual Evaluation Report (IER),</u> giving scores and also comments against the evaluation criteria.

When scoring proposals, experts must *only* apply the above evaluation criteria.

Experts will assess and mark the proposal exactly as it is described and presented. They do not make any assumptions or interpretations about the project in addition to what is in the proposal.

Concise but explicit justifications will be given for each score. Recommendations for improvements to be discussed as part of a possible negotiation phase will be given, if needed.

The experts will also indicate whether, in their view, the proposal deals with sensitive <u>ethical issues</u>.

Signature of the IER also entails a declaration that the expert has no conflict of interest in evaluating the particular proposal.

<u>Scope of the call:</u> It is possible that a proposal is found to be completely out of scope of the call during the course of the individual evaluation, and therefore not relevant. If an expert suspects that this may be the case, a REA staff member will be informed immediately, and the views of the other experts will be sought.

If the consensus view is that the main part of the proposal is not relevant to the topics of the call, the proposal will be withdrawn from the evaluation, and the proposal will be deemed ineligible.

5. Consensus meeting

Once all the experts to whom a proposal has been assigned have completed their IER, the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment, representing their common views.

This entails a consensus meeting to discuss the scores awarded and to prepare comments.

The consensus discussion is moderated by a representative of the REA. The role of the moderator is to seek to arrive at a consensus between the individual views of experts without any prejudice for or against particular proposals or the organisations involved, and to ensure a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the required evaluation criteria.

The moderator for the group may designate an expert to be responsible for drafting the consensus report ("rapporteur"). The experts attempt to agree on a consensus score for each of the criteria that have been evaluated and suitable comments to justify the scores. Comments should be suitable for feedback to the proposal coordinator. Scores and comments are set out in a consensus report. They also come to a common view on the questions of scope, ethics

If during the consensus discussion it is found to be impossible to bring all the experts to a common point of view on any particular aspect of the proposal, the REA may ask up to three additional experts to examine the proposal.

<u>Ethical issues:</u> If one or more experts have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, the relevant box on the consensus report (CR) will be ticked and an Ethical Issues Report (EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues. Exceptionally for this issue, no consensus is required.

Outcome of consensus

The outcome of the consensus step is the consensus report. This will be signed/approved (either on paper, or electronically) by all experts, or as a minimum, by the "rapporteur" and the moderator. The moderator is responsible for ensuring that the consensus report reflects the consensus reached, expressed in scores and comments. In the case that it is impossible to reach a consensus, the report sets out the majority view of the experts but also records any dissenting views.

The REA will take the necessary steps to assure the quality of the consensus reports, with particular attention given to clarity, consistency, and appropriate level of detail. If important changes are necessary, the reports will be referred back to the experts concerned.

The signing of the consensus report completes the consensus step.

Evaluation of a resubmitted proposal

In the case of proposals that have been submitted previously to the Commission or the REA, the moderator gives the experts the previous evaluation summary report (see below) at the consensus stage. If necessary, the experts will be required to provide a clear justification for their scores and comments should these differ markedly from those awarded to the earlier proposal.

6. Panel review

This is the final step involving the independent experts. It allows them to formulate their recommendations to the REA having had an overview of the results of the consensus step.

The main task of the panel is to examine and compare the consensus reports in a given area, to check on the consistency of the marks applied during the consensus discussions and, where necessary, propose a new set of scores.

The panel comprises experts involved at the consensus step. One panel will cover the whole call call.

The tasks of the panel will also include:
- reviewing cases where a minority view was recorded in the consensus report
- recommending a priority order for proposals with the same consensus score;
- making recommendations on possible clustering or combination of proposals.

The panel is chaired by the REA or by an expert appointed by the REA. The REA will ensure fair and equal treatment of the proposals in the panel discussions. A panel rapporteur will be appointed to draft the panel's advice.

Priority order for proposals with the same score

As part of the evaluation by independent experts, a panel review will recommend one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above. A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget shown in the call fiche.

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. Whether or not such a prioritisation is carried out will depend on the available budget or other conditions set out in the call fiche.

The following approach will be applied successively for every group of ex aequo proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

(i) Equally scored proposals will be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion potential impact. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion scientific and/or technological excellence. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion management.

(ii) If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on other appropriate characteristics, to be decided by the panel.

The outcome of the panel meeting is a report recording, principally:

- An evaluation summary report (ESR) for each proposal, including, where relevant, a report of any ethical issues raised and any security considerations;
- A list of proposals passing all thresholds, along with a final score for each proposal passing the thresholds and the panel recommendations for priority order.
- A list of evaluated proposals having failed one or more thresholds;
- A list of any proposals having been found ineligible during the evaluation by experts;
- A summary of any deliberations of the panel;

The panel report is signed by at least three panel experts, and the chairperson.

A further special ethical review of above-threshold proposals may be organised by the REA together with the Commission.

Annex 3:

Instructions for completing "Part A" of the proposal

Proposals in this call must be submitted electronically, using the Electronic Proposal Submission System (EPSS). The procedure is given in section 3 of this guide.

In Part A you will be asked for certain administrative details that will be used in the evaluation and further processing of your proposal. Part A forms an integral part of your proposal. Details of the work you intend to carry out will be described in Part B (annex 4).

Section A1 gives a snapshot of your proposal, section A2 concerns you and your organisation, while section A3 deals with money matters.

Please note:

- The coordinator fills in sections A1 and A3.

- The participants already identified at the time of proposal submission (including the coordinator) each fill in their respective section A2.

- Subcontractors shall not fill in section A2 and should not be listed separately in section A3.

- The estimated budget planned for any future participants (not yet identified at the time of the proposal) is not shown separately in form A3 but <u>should be added to the coordinator's budget</u>. Their role, profile and tasks are described in Part B of the proposal.

Check that your budget figures are correctly entered in Part A. Make sure that:

- *Numbers are always rounded to the nearest whole number*

- *All costs are given in Euros. Do not express your costs in thousands of Euros ("KEUROS") etc.This can affect decisions on the eligibility of your proposal*

- *You have inserted zeros ("0") if there are no costs, or if no funding is requested. Do not leave blanks*

- *Costs do not include value added tax.*

Note:
The following notes are for information only. They should assist you in completing Part A of your proposal. On-line guidance will also be available. The precise questions and options presented on EPSS may differ slightly from these below.

Coordination and support actions (Supporting)

Section A1: Summary	

Proposal Acronym	The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this action. It should be of <u>no more than 20 characters</u> (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please). The same acronym should appear on each page of Part B of your proposal.
Proposal Title	The title should be <u>no longer than 200 characters</u> and should be understandable to the non-specialist in your field.
Duration in months	Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months.
Call (part) identifier	Please indicate: FP7-Adhoc-2007-13
Topic code(s) most relevant to your proposal	Please refer to the topic codes /objectives listed in the work programme call fiche. All activities and topics of FP7 have been assigned unique codes, which are used in the processing of data on proposals and subsequent contracts. The codes are organised hierarchically. The choice of the first topic code will be limited in the drop-down menu to one of the topics open in this call. Select the code corresponding to the topic most relevant to your proposal. The choice for the second code is also limited to topics open in the call in question. Enter a second code if your proposal also addresses another of these. Select 'none' if this is not the case. Select a third code if your proposal is also relevant to another theme. This time, the available codes will simply correspond to broad themes. Select 'none' if this is not the case.
Free Keywords	Please enter a number of keywords that you consider sufficient to characterise the scope of your proposal. There is <u>a limit of 100 characters</u>.
Abstract	The abstract should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the Work Programme. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to the programme management committees and other interested parties. It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information. Please use plain typed text, avoiding formulae and other special characters. **If the proposal is written in a language other than English, please include an English version of the proposal abstract in Part B.** There is <u>a limit of 2000 characters</u>.
Similar proposals or signed contracts	A 'similar' proposal or contract is one that differs from the current one in minor ways, and in which some of the present consortium members are involved.

Section A2/ Participants	
Participant number	The number allocated by the consortium to the participant for this proposal. The **co-ordinator** of a proposal is always **number one**.
Participant Identification Code	The Participant Identification Code (PIC) enables organisations to take advantage of the Unique Registration Facility. Organisations who have received a PIC from the Commission are encouraged to use it when submitting proposals. By entering a PIC, parts of section A2 will be filled in automatically. An online tool to search for existing PICs and the related organisations is available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf. Organisations not yet having a PIC are strongly encouraged to self-register (at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf) before submitting the proposal and insert in section A2 the temporary PIC received at the end of the self-registration.
Legal name	**For Public Law Body,** it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Entity, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body;

For Private Law Body, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register.

For a natural person, it is for e.g. Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT. |
| **Organisation Short Name** | Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents.

This short name should not be more <u>than 20 characters</u> exclusive of special characters (./;…), for e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, for e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac. |
| **Legal address** | For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office.

For Individuals it is the Official Address.

If your address is specified by an indicator of location other than a street name and number, please insert this instead under the "street name" field and "N/A" under the "number" field. |
Non-profit organisation	Non-profit organisation is a legal entity qualified as such when it is recognised by national or, international law.
Public body	Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.
Research organisation	Research organisation means a legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.
NACE code	**NACE** means "<u>N</u>omenclature des <u>A</u>ctivités économiques dans la <u>C</u>ommunauté <u>E</u>uropéenne".

Please select **one** activity from the list that **best** describes your professional and economic ventures. If you are involved in more than one economic activity, please select the **one** activity that is **most** relevant in the context of your contribution to the proposed project. For more information on the methodology, structure and full content of NACE (rev. 1.1) classification please consult EUROSTAT at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&StrNom=NACE_1_1&StrLanguageCode=EN&StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC |
| **Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)** | SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003. The full definition and a guidance booklet can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/sme_definition/index_en.htm

To find out if your organisation corresponds to the definition of an SME you can use the on-line tool at http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm |

Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)	Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them:
	
	  − A legal entity is under the same direct or indirect control as another legal entity (**SG**);
	or
	  − A legal entity directly or indirectly controls another legal entity (**CLS)**;
	or
	  − A legal entity is directly or indirectly controlled by another legal entity **(CLB)**.
	
	Control:
	Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:
	
	  − A, directly or indirectly, holds more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of B,
	or
	  − A, directly or indirectly, holds in fact or in law the decision-making powers in B.
	
	The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:
	
	  (a) the same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50 % of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates;
	
	  (b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.

Character of dependence	According to the explanation above mentioned, please insert the appropriate abbreviation according to the list below to characterise the relation between your organisation and the other participant(s) you are related with:
	
	  • **SG**: Same group: if your organisation and the other participant are controlled by the same third party;
	  • **CLS**: Controls: if your organisation controls the other participant;
	  • **CLB**: Controlled by: if your organisation is controlled by the other participant.

Contact point	It is the main scientist or team leader in charge of the proposal for the participant. For participant number 1 (the coordinator), this will be the person the Commission will contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, invitation to hearings, sending of evaluation results, convocation to negotiations).
Title	Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.
Sex	This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.
Phone and fax numbers	Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.
Section A3/Budget	
Indirect Costs	Indirect costs are all those eligible costs which cannot be identified by the participant as being directly attributed to the project but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project. They may not include any eligible direct costs.

Method of calculating indirect costs	**Summary description (as displayed on EPSS)** • Participants who have an analytical accounting system that can identify and group their indirect costs in accordance with the eligibility criteria (e.g. exclude non-eligible costs) must report their **actual indirect costs** (or choose the 20% flat rate option referred to below). • For the purpose of calculating the actual indirect costs, a participant is allowed to use a **simplified method** of calculation of its full indirect eligible costs. • Optionally, participants may opt for a **flat rate** for indirect costs of **20%** of the direct costs (minus subcontracting and third party costs not incurred on the premises of the participant. • A specific **flat rate of 60%** of the direct costs is foreseen for **non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs** which are unable to identify with certainty their real indirect costs for the project. For **Coordination and Support actions**, whichever method is used, the reimbursement of indirect eligible costs may not exceed 7% of the direct eligible costs, excluding the direct eligible costs for subcontracting and the costs of reimbursement of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the participant. **Further guidance** In FP7 all departments, faculties or institutes which are part of the same legal entity must use the same system of cost calculation (unless a special clause foreseeing a derogation for a particular department/institute is included in the grant agreement). Under FP7, there are no cost reporting models. 1. Participants which have an analytical accounting system that can identify and group their indirect costs (pool of costs) in accordance with the eligibility criteria (e.g. exclude non-eligible costs) must report their **actual indirect costs (**or choose the 20% flat rate option under 2. below). This method is the same as the "full cost" model used in previous Framework Programmes. For the purpose of calculating the actual indirect costs, a participant is allowed to use a **simplified method** of calculation of its full indirect eligible costs. The simplified method is a way of declaring indirect costs which applies to organisations which do not aggregate their indirect costs at a detailed level (centre, department), but can aggregate their indirect costs **at the level of the legal entity**. The simplified method can be used if the organisation does not have an accounting system with a detailed cost allocation. The method has to be in accordance with their usual accounting and management principles and practices; it does not involve necessarily the introduction of a new method just for FP7 purposes. Participants are allowed to use it, provided this simplified approach is based on actual costs derived from the financial accounts of the last closed accounting year. There is no "standard model"; each legal entity will use its own system. The minimum requirements for it to be considered a simplified method for FP7 purposes are the following: - the system must allow the participant to identify and remove its direct ineligible costs (VAT, etc.); - it must at least allow for the allocation of the overheads at the level of the legal entity to the individual projects by using a fair "driver" (e.g. total productive hours); - the system applied and the costs declared according to it should follow the normal accounting principles and practices of the participant. Therefore, if the system used by a participant is more "refined" than the "minimum" requirements mentioned here, it is that system which should be used when declaring costs. *Example: if a participant's accounting system distinguishes between different overheads rates according to the type of activity (research, teaching...), then the overheads declared in an FP7 grant agreement should follow this practice and refer only to the concerned activities (research, demonstration...)* The simplified method does not require previous registration or certification by the Commission. 2. Optionally, participants may opt to declare their actual direct costs plus a **flat rate** for indirect costs of 20% of the direct costs (minus subcontracting and third party costs not incurred on the premises of the participant). This flat rate is open to any participant whatever the accounting system it uses. Accordingly, when this option is chosen, there is no need for certification of the indirect costs, only of the direct ones. 3. Also, a **specific flat rate** is foreseen for certain types of organisations. The use of this flat rate is subject to three cumulative conditions : (i) Status of the organisation The flat rate is reserved to: - non-profit public bodies - secondary and higher education establishments - research organisations

- SMEs

(ii) Accounting system of the organisation

The flat rate is foreseen for the organisations which are unable to identify with certainty their real indirect costs for the project. How will it be proved that an organisation is unable to identify with certainty their real indirect costs for the project? The participant (for example, an SME) does not have to change its accounting system or its usual accounting principles. If its accounting system can identify overall overheads but does not allocate them to project costs, then the participant can use this flat rate if the other conditions are fulfilled.

Example:
A University, which in FP6 has used the "additional cost" basis because its accounting system did not allow for the share of their direct and indirect costs to the project to be distinguished may under FP7:
- either opt for the 60% flat rate
- introduce a cost accounting system "simplified method" by which a basic allocation per project of the overhead costs of the legal entity will be established, or
- introduce a full analytical accounting system.

Following this, an organisation which used the "full cost" model under the Sixth Framework Programme is presumed to be in a situation to be able to identify the real indirect costs and allocate them to the projects. Accordingly, this organisation would not in principle be able to opt for the 60% flat rate for FP7.

An organisation which can identify the real indirect costs but does not have a system to allocate these indirect costs can opt for this 60% flat rate. The choice of this flat rate lies within the responsibility of the participant. If a subsequent audit shows that the above-mentioned cumulative conditions are not fulfilled, all projects where this participant is involved might be reviewed.

(iii) Type of funding scheme

The flat rate is reserved to funding schemes which include research and technological development and demonstration activities: Network of Excellence and Collaborative projects (including research for the benefit of specific groups – in particular SMEs). The basis for the calculation of the flat rate excludes the costs for subcontracting and the costs of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the participant because in these two cases, the indirect costs are not incurred by the participant but by the subcontractor or the third party. When a participant opts for the transition flat rate of 60 % for its first participation under FP7 it can opt afterwards for the actual indirect costs system for subsequent participations. This change does not affect previous grant agreement. After this change, this organisation cannot opt again for a flat rate system (either 60% or 20% flat rate).

	Indirect Costs - Decision Tree
	Do either of these conditions apply? (1) your organisation possesses an analytical accounting system, or (2) you will declare overhead rates using a simplified method
	YES **No**
	Real indirect costs or costs calculated using a simplified method
	or
	20% of total direct eligible costs (1)
	or
	60% of total direct eligible costs (1), for : - **Non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs** - **When participating in funding schemes which include research and technological development**
	Coordination and support actions : **In any case Maximum 7% of the direct eligible costs (1)**
	(1) excluding direct eligible costs for subcontracting and the costs of reimbursement of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the beneficiary
International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC)	International Cooperation Partner Country means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income, lower-middle income or upper-middle-income country and which is identified as such in Annex I to the work programmes.
Lump sum funding method	Legal entities established in an ICPC may opt for lump sums. In that case the contribution is based on the amounts shown below, multiplied by the total number of person-years for the project requested by the ICPC legal entity. • Low-income ICPC: 8,000 Euro/researcher/year • Lower middle income ICPC: 9,800 Euro/researcher/year • Upper middle income ICPC 20,700 Euro/researcher/year The maximum EC contribution is calculated by applying the normal upper funding limits shown under "requested EC contribution". This amount is all inclusive, covering support towards both the direct and the indirect costs. More information on ICPC lump sums can be found in the section II.18 of the "Guide to financial issues" http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html

Type of Activity	•**Support activities** may cover activities, depending on their nature such as: monitoring and assessment; conferences; seminars; studies; high level scientific awards and competitions; operational support; data access and dissemination, information and communication activities; specific services activities related to research infrastructures, such as for example transnational access; preparatory technical work, including feasibility studies for the development of new infrastructures; contribution to the construction of new infrastructures; cooperation with other European research schemes; or a combination of these. •**Other activities** means any specific activities not covered by the above mentioned types of activity such as training, coordination, networking and dissemination (including publications). These activities should be specified in the proposal Part B. **Management activities** are part of the other activities. They include the maintenance of the consortium agreement, if it is obligatory, the overall legal, ethical, financial and administrative management including for each of the participants obtaining the certificates on the financial statements or on the methodology, the implementation of competitive calls by the consortium for the participation of new participants and, any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities.
Personnel costs	Personnel costs are only the costs of the actual hours worked by the persons directly carrying out work under the project and shall reflect the total remuneration: salaries plus social security charges (holiday pay, pension contribution, health insurance, etc.) and other statutory costs included in the remuneration. Such persons must: – be directly hired by the participant in accordance with its national legislation, – be working under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter, and – be remunerated in accordance with the normal practices of the participant. Participants may opt to declare average personnel costs if certified in accordance with a methodology approved by the Commission and consistent with the management principles and usual accounting practices of the participant. Average personnel costs charged by a participant having provided a certification on the methodology are deemed not to significantly differ from actual personnel costs.
Sub-contracting	A subcontractor is a third party which has entered into an agreement on business conditions with one or more participants, in order to carry out part of the work of the project without the direct supervision of the participant and without a relationship of subordination. Where it is necessary for the participants to subcontract certain elements of the work to be carried out, the following conditions must be fulfilled: - subcontracts may only cover the execution of a limited part of the project; - recourse to the award of subcontracts must be duly justified in Part B of the proposal having regard to the nature of the project and what is necessary for its implementation; - recourse to the award of subcontract by a participant may not affect the rights and obligations of the participants regarding background and foreground; - - Part B of the proposal must indicate the task to be subcontracted and an estimation of the costs; Any subcontract, the costs of which are to be claimed as an eligible cost, must be awarded according to the principles of best value for money (best price-quality ratio), transparency and equal treatment. Framework contracts between a participant and a subcontractor, entered into prior to the beginning of the project that are according to the participant's usual management principles may also be accepted. Participants may use external support services for assistance with minor tasks that do not represent per se project tasks as identified in Part B of the proposal. Include under the category of subcontracting costs also, if applicable the actual direct costs of third parties that make available resources which are not used on the premises of the beneficiary and the real overhead costs of third parties that make available resources.
Other direct costs	Means direct costs not covered by the above mentioned categories of costs.

Total Budget	*Note :* The "total budget" **is not** the requested EC contribution. A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.
Requested EC contribution	The requested EC contribution shall be determined by applying the upper funding limits indicated below, per activity and per participant to the costs accepted by the Commission, or to the flat rates or lump sums. **Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs** • **Support activities = 100%** • **Other activities (including management) = 100%** (*) For participants that are non profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs.
Total Receipts	*Note :* "Receipts" **are not** the requested EC contribution. Receipts of the project may arise from: a)Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties: i.shall be considered a receipt of the project if they have been contributed by the third party specifically to be used on the project. ii.shall not be considered a receipt of the project if their use is at the management discretion of the participant. b)Income generated by the project: i.shall be considered receipts for the participant when generated by actions undertaken in carrying out the project and from the sale of assets purchased under the grant agreement up to the value of the cost initially charged to the project by the participant; ii.shall not be considered a receipt for the participant when generated from the use of foreground resulting from the project. The Community financial contribution may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for the participants. For this reason, the total requested EC funding plus receipts cannot exceed the total eligible costs.

Annex 4:

Instructions for drafting "Part B" of the proposal

<u>Coordination and support actions (Supporting)</u>

A description of this funding scheme is given in section 2 of this Guide for Applicants. Please examine this carefully before preparing your proposal.

This annex provides a template to help you structure your proposal. It will help you present important aspects of your planned work in a way that will enable the experts to make an effective assessment against the evaluation criteria (see annex 2). Sections 1, 2 and 3 each correspond to an evaluation criterion. The sub-sections (1.1, 1.2 etc.) correspond to the sub-criteria.

Remember, please keep to maximum page lengths where these are specified.

The minimum font size allowed is 11 points. The page size is A4, and all margins (top, bottom, left, right) should be at least 15 mm (not including any footers or headers).

Please remember that it is up to you to verify that you conform to page limits. There is no automatic check in the system!

Ensure that the font type chosen leads to clearly readable text (eg. Arial or Times New Roman).

As an indication, such a layout should lead to a maximum of between 5000 and 6000 possible characters per page (including spaces).

The REA will instruct the experts to disregard any excess pages. Even where no page limits are given, or where limits are only recommended, it is in your interest to keep your text concise since over-long proposals are rarely viewed in a positive light by experts.

<u>Cover Page</u>

Proposal full title:
Proposal acronym:
Type of funding scheme: Coordination and support actions (Coordinating)

Work programme topics addressed:

     (if more than one, indicate their order of importance to the project)

Name of the coordinating person:

List of participants:

Participant no. * Participant organisation name   Country

1 (Coordinator)
2
3
    * *Please use the same participant numbering as that used in section A2 of the administrative forms*

<u>**Table of Contents**</u>

<u>**Proposal**</u>

1: Scientific and/or technical quality, relevant to the topics addressed by the call

1.1   Concept and objectives

Explain the concept of your project. What are the main ideas that led you to propose this work?

Describe in detail the objectives, i.e. mainly enhancing public recognition of researchers. You also should fix a quantifiable target (number of participants and number of people reached through the awareness campaign).

1.2   Quality and effectiveness of the support mechanisms, and associated work plan

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages[9] (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of the implementation of the project, and include consortium management and assessment of progress and results. (Please note that your overall approach to management will be described later, in section 2 and please note that you are expected to strictly follow the plan provided).

Please present your plans as follows:

i)   Describe the overall strategy of the work plan *(maximum length: 1 page)*. Should you have already benefited from a EU support for previous Researchers' night projects, describe the lessons learnt from previous experiences and the improvements that will be brought on such basis.

ii)   Provide a detailed work description broken down into work packages:
   ■ Work package list (please use table 1.2a);
   ■ Deliverables list (please use table 1.2b);
   ■ Description of each work package, and summary (please use table 1.2d);
   ■ Summary effort table (please use table 1.2e)

iii)   Describe any significant risks, and associated contingency plans. Main risks associated to the organisation of a Researchers'night are: bad weather conditions for outdoor events, insufficient mobilisation of the researchers/institutions to be involved, insufficient mobilisation of the target audience, scarce financial resources available…

<u>Note:</u>

The number of work packages and deliverables must be as indicated in the Annex. The

---

[9] A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed project with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable or a milestone in the overall project

planninbe sufficiently detailed to justify the proposed effort and allow progress monitoring by the
g   REA. Due to the short duration of the action, no plan regarding milestones is requested.
should

Maximum length for the whole of Section 1: 10 pages.).

Table 1.2 a: Work package list

Work package No[1]	Work package title	Type of activity[2]	Lead participant No[3]	Lead participant short name	Person-months[4]	Start month[5]	End month
1	Awareness campaign	Supp					
2	Activities during the night	Supp					
3	Impact assessment	Supp					
4	Management	Mgt				1	
				TOTAL			

---

[1] Workpackage number: WP1 – WPn.

[2] Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per workpackage: SUPP= Support activities; MGT= Management of the consortium; OTHER= Other specific activities, if applicable.

[3] Number of the participant leading the work in this workpackage.

[4] The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

[5] Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

Table 1.2 b: Deliverables List

Del. no.[10]	Deliverable name	WP no.	Nature[11]	Dissemination level[12]	Delivery date[13]
1	Report on awareness campaign + samples of promotional material	1	R + P	PU	Last Month[14]
2	Report on the activities during the night (participation, short description of activities, success rate…) possibly accompanied by pictures, videos…	2	R + O	PU	Last month
3	Report on impact assessment activities, including sample of questionnaires, inquiries, interviews	3	R + P	PU	Last month
4	Report on management	4	R	PU	End of project + 60 days

---

[10]   Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates. Please use the numbering convention <WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>. For example, deliverable 4.2 would be the second deliverable from work package 4.

[11]   Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:
R = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

[12]   Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:
PU = Public
PP = Restricted to other programme participants (including the REA Services). **RE** = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the REA Services). **CO** = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the REA Services).

[13]   Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

[14]   Due to the short duration of the projects, all deliverables will be provided at the end of the project

Table 1.2 d: **Work package description**

Work package number 1	**Start date or starting event:**
Work package title	Awareness campaign
Activity Type[15]	SUPP
Participant number	
Participant short name	
Person-months per participant:	

Objectives
- o To attract as large an audience as possible to the Researchers' night event
- o To make as large as possible a public aware of the Researchers' night and its objectives

---

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks), and role of participants
- o The communication tools intended to be used (written press, radio, TV, Internet, blogs…)
- o The main messages to be delivered
- o The scheduling (general) of the campaign
- o The potential audience reached by the campaign (estimates)
- o The kind of promotional material that will be displayed through the European corner , enhancing the European dimension of the event

Please note:
- o The awareness campaign has to be undertaken early enough as to allow an effective implementation (school holidays, Summer period..)
- o Should there be other funded projects in the same country, they would have to organise a common national awareness campaign (not preventing from local /regional campaigns) (common website, common visual identity)

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

D1
- o Report on the awareness campaign (number of press articles, radio/TV programmes, Internet hints… and summary)
- o Samples of promotional material (posters, leaflets, gadgets…)

Month of delivery: last month of the project.

Work package number	2	**Start date or starting event:**					
Work package title	Activities during the night						
Activity Type[16]	SUPP						
Participant number							
Participant short name							
Person-months per participant:							

---

[15] Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:

SUPP = Support activities); MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

Objectives

o To offer all categories of the public at large a broad range of activities combining links with researchers and science and fun , as to

o Contribute to enhancing the public recognition of researchers through the setting up of a direct contact between them and public at large.

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks), and role of participants

Please describe:

- o The venues chosen

- o The programme of activities (broken down by location should your project be multi-locations)

- o The facilities planned as to allow the participants to take part in as many activities as possible (scheduling, links…)

- o Should you have more than one location, the measures adopted as to ensure a certain consistency amongst the various locations (in particular when close locations allowing the public to visit several of them)

Please note

- o The description of the activities should allow a clear understanding of the programme, although not going too much into details (as an example do not describe the rules of the games organised, just describe the "spirit")

- o The programme has to possibly fit all age categories and offer a balanced mix of fun and researchers-linked activities (avoid concentrating all "fun " activities during a certain time period or in a determined location)

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

D2

- o Report on the Night itself (brief description of the activities, participation, success, impact…) possibly accompanied by pictures, videos, DVDs…

Month of delivery: last month of the project.

Work package number	3	Start date or starting event:					
Work package title	Impact assessment						
Activity Type[17]	SUPP						
Participant number							
Participant short name							
Person-months per participant:							

Objectives

Assess the impact of the event, in particular regarding the public perception of researchers and their work.

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks), and role of participants

Please describe:

- o   The measures taken as to assess the current situation before the event

- o   The means planned for assessing the impact (questionnaires, interviews, inquiries, polls…)

- o   The sample of participants that will be selected and selection process

Please note:

- o   You should be able to describe the current situation regarding the public perception of researchers (existing surveys, or actions undertaken in such a purpose specifically for the project)

- o   Should there have been previous Researchers' nights, their results in terms of impact assessment have to be referred to and taken into account

- o   You should describe both quantitative and qualitative indicators to be used for assessing the impact of your action.

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

D3

- o   Impact assessment report (summary concrete results of the data collection, summary of the main conclusions reached regarding the impact assessment)

Month of delivery: last month of the project.

---

[17]   Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:

SUPP = Support activities); MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

Work package number	4	Start date or starting event:			Month 1	
Work package title	Management					
Activity Type[18]	MGT					
Participant number						
Participant short name						
Person-months per participant:						

Objectives

To ensure a sound management of the project in all its components

---

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks), and role of participants

Please describe:

o   The overall management structure

o   The distribution of the main tasks and responsibilities

Please note:

o   The project is expected to have a short duration, which implies not too complicated a management structure;

o   A certain flexibility margin can be considered necessary in implementing the programmes, and a certain level of autonomy of the various local responsible can be considered relevant (for multi locations projects)

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

D4

Final management report

Month of delivery:

within 45 days after the project last's month

---

[18]   Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:

SUPP = Support activities); MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

Table 1.2 e: Summary of staff effort

A summary of the staff effort is useful for the evaluators. Please indicate in the table the number of person months over the whole duration of the planned work, for each work package, for each participant. Identify the work-package leader for each WP by showing the relevant person-month figure in bold.

Participant no./short name	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP 4	Total person months
Part.1 short name					
…					
…					
…					
Total					
ANNEX 4			47		

2.   Implementation

2.1   Management structure and procedures

Describe the organisational structure and decision-making mechanisms of the project. Show how they are matched to the complexity and scale of the project.

(Maximum length for Section 2.1: one page)

2.2   Individual participants

For each participant in the proposed project, provide a brief description of the legal entity, the main tasks they have been attributed, and the previous experience relevant to those tasks. Provide also a short profile of the staff members who will be undertaking the work.

*(Maximum length for Section 2.2: one half page per participant.
The maximum length applying to a legal entity composed of several members each of which is a separate legal entity, is one half page per member, provided that the members have quite distinct roles within the proposal.)*

2.3   Consortium as a whole (only if relevant)

Describe how the participants collectively constitute a consortium capable of achieving the project objectives, and how they are suited and are committed to the tasks assigned to them. Show the complementarity between participants. Explain how the composition of the consortium is well-balanced in relation to the objectives of the project.

i) Sub-contracting: If any part of the work is to be sub-contracted by the participant responsible for it, describe the work involved and explain why a sub-contract approach has been chosen for it.

2.4   Resources to be committed

Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised, including any resources that will complement the EU contribution. Show how the resources will be integrated in a coherent way, and show how the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

In addition to the costs indicated in Part A3 of the proposal, and the staff effort shown in section 1.3 above, please indicate any other major costs (e.g. equipment).

Please ensure that the figures stated in part B are consistent with those in Part A.

(Maximum length for Section 2.4 – two pages)

3.   Impact

3.1   Expected impacts listed in the work programme

Describe how your project will contribute towards the expected impacts listed in the work programme in relation to the topic or topics in question (i.e. public recognition of researchers). Explain why this contribution requires a European (rather than a national or local) approach. Indicate how account is taken of other national or international research activities. Mention any assumptions and external factors that may determine whether the impacts will be achieved.

3.2   Dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

Describe the measures you propose for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and how these will increase the impact of the project. In designing these measures, you should take into account a variety of communication means and target groups as appropriate (e.g. policy-makers, interest groups, media and the public at large).

For more information on communication guidance, see http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/science-communication/index_en.htm or CORDIS.

(Maximum length for the whole of Section 3 – ten pages)

4.   Ethical Issues

Describe any ethical issues that may arise in their proposal. In particular, you should explain the benefit and burden of their experiments and the effects it may have on the research subject.

The following special issues should be taken into account:

Informed consent: When describing issues relating to informed consent, it will be necessary to illustrate an appropriate level of ethical sensitivity, and consider issues of insurance, incidental findings and the consequences of leaving the study.

Data protection issues: Avoid the unnecessary collection and use of personal data. Identify the source of the data, describing whether it is collected as part of the research or is previously collected data being used. Consider issues of informed consent for any data being used. Describe how personal identify of the data is protected.

Use of animals: Where animals are used in research the application of the 3Rs (Replace, Reduce, Refine) must be convincingly addressed. Numbers of animals should be specified. Describe what happens to the animals after the research experiments.

[If applicable] Human embryonic stem cells: Research proposals that will involve human embryonic stem cells (hESC) will have to address all the following specific points:

- the applicants should demonstrate that the project serves important research aims to advance scientific knowledge in basic research or to increase medical knowledge for the development of diagnostic, preventive or therapeutic methods to be applied to humans;

- the necessity to use hESC in order to achieve the scientific objectives set forth in the proposal. In particular, applicants must document that appropriate validated alternatives (in particular, stem cells from other sources or origins) are not suitable and/or available to achieve the expected goals of the proposal. This latter provision does not apply to research comparing hESC with other human stem cells;

- the applicants should take into account the legislation, regulations, ethical rules and/or codes of conduct in place in the country(ies) where the research using hESC is to take

place, including the procedures for obtaining informed consent;

- the applicants should ensure that for all hESC lines to be used in the project were derived from embryo's

  - o of which the donor(s)' express, written and informed consent was provided freely, in accordance with national legislation prior to the procurement of the cells;

  - o that result from medically-assisted *in vitro* fertilisation designed to induce pregnancy, and were no longer to be used for that purpose;

  - o of which the measures to protect personal data and privacy of donor(s), including genetic data, are in place during the procurement and for any use thereafter. Researchers must accordingly present all data in such a way as to ensure donor anonymity;

  - o of which the conditions of donation are adequate, and namely that no pressure was put on the donor(s) at any stage, that no financial inducement was offered to donation for research at any stage and that the infertility treatment and research activities were kept appropriately separate

Identify the countries where research will be undertaken and which ethical committees and regulatory organisations will need to be approached during the life of the project.

Include the Ethical issues table below. If you indicate YES to any issue, please identify the pages in the proposal where this ethical issue is described. Answering 'YES' to some of these boxes does not automatically lead to an ethical review. It enables the independent experts to decide if an ethical review is required. If you are sure that none of the issues apply to your proposal, simply tick the YES box in the last row.

(No maximum length for Section 4: Depends on the number of such issues involved)

Notes:
Only in exceptional cases will additional information be sought for clarification, which means that any ethical review will be performed <u>solely on the basis of the information available in the proposal</u>. Projects raising specific ethical issues such as research intervention on human beings[19]; research on human embryos and human embryonic stem cells and non-human primates are automatically submitted for ethical review.

To ensure compliance with ethical principles, the Commission Services will undertake ethics audit(s) of selected projects at its discretion.
A dedicated website that aims to provide clear, helpful information on ethical issues is now available at: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ethics_en.html

---

[19] Such as research and clinical trials, and research involving invasive techniques on persons (e.g. taking of tissue samples, examinations of the brain).

ETHICAL ISSUES TABLE

(Note: Research involving activities marked with an asterisk $*$ in the left column in the table below will be referred automatically to Ethical Review)

Research on Human Embryo/ Foetus		YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryos?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Foetal Tissues/ Cells?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?		
*	Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?		
*	Does the proposed research on Human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Research on Humans		YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve children?		
*	Does the proposed research involve patients?		
*	Does the proposed research involve persons not able to give consent?		
*	Does the proposed research involve adult healthy volunteers?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human genetic material?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human biological samples?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human data collection?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Privacy		YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?		
	Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Research on Animals		YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve research on animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic farm animals?		
*	Are those animals non-human primates?		
	Are those animals cloned farm animals?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Research Involving Developing Countries		YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve the use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant, etc)?		
	Is the proposed research of benefit to local communities (e.g. capacity building, access to healthcare, education, etc)?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Dual Use	YES	Page
Research having direct military use		56
Research having the potential for terrorist abuse		
I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		