



GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

**COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION
(SUPPORTING)**

Annexes specific to call:

FP7-PEOPLE-2011-NIGHT

This part of the guide contains the annexes for the specific call and funding scheme shown above. It should be read in conjunction with the common part of the guide, published as a separate document, which contains the general information for applying to FP7 under this funding scheme.

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 and Participant Portal call pages. 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	28 September 2010
Deadline for submission of proposals	12 January 2011, Brussels time 17:00.
Evaluation of proposals	Week 7 February 2011 (14-18)
Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators ("initial information letter")	Week 8 February 2011
Invitation letter to successful coordinators to launch grant agreement negotiations with Commission services	Week 11 March 2011
Letter to unsuccessful applicants	As from Week 11 March 2011
Signature of first grant agreements	As from June 2011

- **The indicative budget for this call is equal to €4 million¹.**
- **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
Participant Portal

<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm>
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/>
(select tab "FP7 calls")

Information day related to this call

**13 October 2010, REA premises, COVENT GARDEN 16
Place Rogier 1210 Brussels**

¹ Under the condition that the draft budget for 2011 is adopted without modification by the budgetary authority

European Researchers' night website

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

(Documents accompanying the call, frequently asked questions)

General sources of help:

The FP7 Enquiry service

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries>

National Contact Points

<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ncp.htm>

National Contact Points in third countries

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/third-countries_en.html

Contact person

Colette RENIER

Colette.renier@ec.europa.eu

+ 3222951769

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>

Ethics help desk

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/get-support_en.html

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

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 ensure that the process is fair, and in line with the principles contained in the Commission's rules².

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 fulfil 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 is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present). To satisfy this condition, part B of the proposal must be readable, accessible and printable.
- 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.

² Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures (posted on CORDIS).

- The event is planned on the fourth Friday of September, i.e. 23rd September 2011 (except for Israel if a successful proposal is submitted, the event is expected to be organised on the closest possible date).

Where a maximum number of pages have been indicated for a section of the proposal or for the proposal as a whole, the experts will be instructed to disregard any excess pages.

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;

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 allocate 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.

<i>Evaluation criteria</i>		
Research and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)	Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management	Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives • Quality and effectiveness of the support action mechanisms, and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 ...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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 be raised later during the discussions on the proposal.

The relevance 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 "Research quality", and the first sub-criterion under "Impact" respectively. When a proposal is partially relevant 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 - | <i>The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information</i> |
| 1 - | <i>Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.</i> |
| 2 - | <i>Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.</i> |
| 3 - | <i>Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.</i> |
| 4 - | <i>Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.</i> |
| 5 - | <i>Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.</i> |

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 and on the Participant Portal.

Conflicts of interest: 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.

Confidentiality: 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 Individual Evaluation Report (IER), 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.

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

Scope of the call: 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 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 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.

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.

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, 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, 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.

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 a REA representative or by an expert appointed by the REA. The REA will ensure fair and equal treatment of the proposals in the panel discussions. The chairperson will also act as rapporteur.

A ranked list will be drawn up for the indicative budget as shown in the call fiche, as well as a shortlist of proposals consisting of the highest scoring proposal passing all thresholds from each applicant country.

Priority order for proposals with the same score

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) Proposals having been awarded the highest scoring against the criterion "potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results"; when these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion "research and/or technological excellence".

(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;
- 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 shortlist of proposals consisting of the highest scoring proposal passing all thresholds from each applicant country;
- 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.

Following the final scoring and ranking by experts, the Commission will apply the following rules (which are set out in the work programme for this call):

- Initial funding based on the shortlist of proposals consisting of the highest scoring proposal passing all thresholds for each applicant country;
- Subsequent funding decisions based on the strict order of the panel ranked list.

Annex 3:

Instructions for completing "Part A" of the proposal

Proposals in this call must be submitted electronically, using the Commission's 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 financial 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 should 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 should be added to the coordinator's budget. 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	<p>The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this call. It should be of <u>no more than 20 characters</u> (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please).</p> <p>The same acronym should appear on each page of Part B of your proposal.</p>
Proposal Title	<p>The title should be <u>no longer than 200 characters</u> and should be understandable to the non-specialist in your field.</p>
Duration in months	<p>Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months. (Note that for this specific call, duration will last at least <u>5 months and not more than 7 months</u>).</p>
Call (part) identifier	<p><u>FP7-PEOPLE-2011-NIGHT</u></p> <p>The call identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you are addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union, and on the call page.</p>
Topic code(s) most relevant to your proposal	<p>Please refer to the topic codes /objectives listed in the work programme call fiche.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
Free Keywords	<p>Please enter a number of keywords that you consider sufficient to characterise the scope of your proposal.</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 100 characters</u>.</p>
Abstract	<p>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.</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 2000 characters</u>.</p>
Similar proposals or signed contracts	<p>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.</p>

Section A2/ Participants	
Participant number	The number allocated by the consortium to the participant for this proposal. The coordinator 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 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	<p>For a 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;</p> <p>For a 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.</p> <p>For a natural person, it is for example Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT.</p>
Organisation Short Name	<p>Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents.</p> <p>This short name should not be more <u>than 20 characters</u> exclusive of special characters (./;...), for example CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one commonly used, for example IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac.</p>
Legal address	<p>For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office.</p> <p>For Individuals it is the Official Address.</p> <p>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.</p>
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	<p>NACE means "<u>N</u>omenclature des <u>A</u>ctivités économiques dans la <u>C</u>ommunauté <u>E</u>uropéenne".</p> <p>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</p>
Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)	<p>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</p> <p>To find out if your organisation corresponds to the definition of a SME you can use the on-line tool at http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm</p>

Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)	<p>Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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). <p><u>Control:</u> Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. <p>The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(b) The legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.</p>
Character of dependence	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<p>It is the main person in charge of the proposal for the participant. For participant number 1 (the coordinator), this will be the person the REA will contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, sending of evaluation results, invitation to negotiations).</p>
Title	<p>Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.</p>
Sex	<p>This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.</p>
Phone and fax numbers	<p>Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.</p>
Section A3/Budget	
Indirect Costs	<p>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.</p>

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 allowed 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 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.

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)

<p>Type of Activity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; organisation of events and related preparatory work; 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. • Management activities include the overall legal, financial and administrative management.
<p>Personnel costs</p>	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. <p>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.</p>
<p>Sub-contracting</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Where it is necessary for the participants to subcontract certain elements of the work to be carried out, the following conditions must be fulfilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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; <p>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 force prior to the beginning of the project that comply with the participant's usual management principles may also be accepted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If applicable, actual direct costs and real overhead costs of third parties that make available to the proposal resources otherwise unavailable within the consortium, can also be included under the category of subcontracting costs (provided that these costs are not related to proposal's core tasks).</p>
<p>Other direct costs</p>	<p>Means direct costs not covered by the above mentioned categories of costs (thus not consisting either personnel costs or subcontracting)</p>

Total Budget	<p>A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.</p> <p><u>Note:</u> The "total budget" is not the requested EC contribution.</p>
Requested EC contribution	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support activities = 100% • Other activities (including management) = 100%
Total Receipts	<p>Receipts of the project may arise from:</p> <p>a) Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <u>not</u> be considered a receipt of the project if their use is at the management discretion of the participant. <p>b) Income generated by the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <u>not</u> be considered a receipt for the participant when generated from the use of foreground resulting from the project. <p>Keep in mind that EU contribution doesn't consist of a receipt of the project.</p> <p><u>The Community financial contribution may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for the participants.</u> For this reason, the total requested EC funding plus receipts cannot exceed the total eligible costs.</p>

Annex 4:

Instructions for drafting "Part B" of the proposal

Coordination and support actions (Supporting)

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.

IMPORTANT: Page limits: remember to keep to the page limits 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 (e.g. Arial or Times New Roman).

As an indication, such a layout should lead to a maximum of between 5.000 and 6.000 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.

SUMMARY OF MANDATORY PAGE LIMITS
(conforming to font and margin sizes mentioned above).

Section	Maximum pages
1. Research and/or technical quality,	10 pages for whole section*,
1.1 Concept and objectives	1 page maximum
1.2 Progress beyond the state-of-the-art	1 page maximum
1.3 S/T methodology and associated work plan	1 page maximum for the description of the overall strategy (section 1.3) 1 page maximum per Work Package description (with the exception of the WP 2 "activities during the night" in case of multi location project)
2.1 Management structure and procedures	1 page maximum
2.2 Individual participants	Maximum half a page per participant
2.3 Consortium as a whole	Maximum half a page
2.4 Resources to be committed	Maximum 3 pages
3. Impact	Maximum 2 pages
5. Consideration of gender aspects	Maximum half a page

* This limit does not include the tables 1.3a- e.

Cover Page

Proposal full title:

Proposal acronym:

Type of funding scheme: Coordination and support actions (Supporting)

Work programme topics addressed:

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

Table of Contents

Proposal

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

1.1 Concept and objectives

- Describe the overall concept of your project and the main ideas on which it relies;
- Describe the objectives pursued, keeping in mind that the main one consists of "enhancing public recognition of researchers and their work";
- Indicate your quantitative target (figures regarding the number of people likely to be made aware of the Researchers' night and its objectives through the awareness campaign as well as rough figures about the expected attendees).

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

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages³ (WPs), following the implementation phases described further, including consortium management. (Please note that your overall approach to management will be described later, in section 2).

Please present your plans as follows:

- i) Description of the overall strategy of the work plan (*maximum length: 1 page*).
- ii) Overall scheduling of the various Work Packages;
- iii) 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 (please use table 1.2d);
 - § Summary effort table (please use table 1.2e)
- v) Description of significant risks, and associated contingency plans:
 - Bad weather conditions in particular should open air activities be planned;
 - Insufficient mobilisation of researchers;
 - Insufficient response from target audience...

Note: The Work packages have to comply with the list mentioned below (awareness campaign, activities during the night, impact assessment, management); the descriptions provided should allow for justifying the staff effort and financial resources planned and allow progress monitoring of the project.

³ A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed project with a verifiable end-point, e.g. a deliverable.

Maximum length for the whole of Section 1: 10 pages (This limit does not include tables 1.2a- e); note that the detailed description of each Work Package should not exceed one page, except for the WP2 in case of multi location projects.

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				1	
2	Activities during the night	SUPP					
3	Impact assessment	SUPP					
4	Management	MGT				1	
		TOTAL					

¹ Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

² Please indicate one activity per work package: SUPP = Support activities; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

³ Number of the participant leading the work in this work package.

⁴ The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

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

Table 1.2 b: Deliverables List

1	Report on awareness campaign + samples of promotional material	1	R + P	PU	Last Month ¹
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

¹ 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:	Month 1
Work package title	<i>Awareness campaign</i>		
Activity Type¹	SUPP		
Participant number			
Participant short name			
Person-months per participant:			

Objectives

- Make as many people as possible aware of the Researchers' night and its objectives;
- Attract as large as possible a number of participants to the events organised.

- **Description of work Communication tools** to be used:

- Off line (written media, TV, radio, direct marketing, mailings...direct contacts, seminars, meetings, participation in public events..);
- On line (Internet, websites, social networks, blogs...);

- **Messages** to be conveyed (possibly varied according to the target audience);

- Overall **scheduling** (start of the campaign, main phases);

- **Promotional material** (written material such as leaflets, programmes, flyers, advertising such as posters, billboards, gadgets including those to be displayed in the European corner)

TIPS FOR SUCCESS:

- **Plan the awareness campaign sufficiently early in order to reach the target audience (school pupils, students...);**
- **Possibly vary the messages, tone and visual content according to the specific target (young people, adults, elderly...);**
- **Should there be more than one funded project in your country, keep in mind that you would have to set up a common national awareness campaign (possibly in addition to local/regional ones) ;**

KEEP IN MIND

You have to plan the distribution of EU labelled promotional material through the European corner.

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

Report on awareness campaign + samples of promotional material

¹ Please indicate one activity per work package: SUPP = Support activities); MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

Last month of the project

Work package number	2	Start date or starting event:	Month
Work package title	Activities during the night		
Activity Type¹	SUPP		
Participant number			
Participant short name			
Person-months per participant:			

Objectives

- To offer all the categories of the public at large as broad as possible a range of activities:
 - Allowing a direct contact between researchers and participants;
 - Combining in a balanced way entertainment and "education" on research;
 - Likely to enhance public recognition of researchers and their work

Description of work

- Locations (cities, venues);
- Programme of activities (if relevant organised by location and classified according to the type of activity planned: hands on experiments, workshops, demos, science shows, researchers' dating, competitions, quizzes, exhibitions...);
- Target audience (the general target consisting of the public at large, but certain activities possibly addressing some specific categories of it);
- Overall consistency elements (between locations or between activities, such as for example : common theme, common approach, links between venues /locations if relevant...)

TIPS for success

- **Provide a global overview of the activities planned without necessarily describing all the details of the organisation;**
- **Arrange for a balanced combination of "EDUTAINMENT" during the whole event, avoiding concentrating all the "fun activities" in one single place or during one single moment.**

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

Report on the activities during activities, success rate...)	the night (participation, possibly accompanied	short description by pictures, videos...	of
--	--	--	----

¹ Please indicate one activity per work package: SUPP = Support activities); MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable.

Last month of the project

Work package number	3	Start date or starting event:	Month
Work package title	Impact assessment		
Activity Type ¹	SUPP		
Participant number			
Participant short name			
Person-months per participant:			

Objectives

- Assess the impact of the event, special attention being paid to possible evolution of the public perception of researchers and their work;
- Identify the type of activities which proved the most effective for reaching the fixed objectives;
- Identify possible evolution of public perception of researchers over a period of several years (if relevant: if previous similar events have already been organised in the same area by the same partners)

Description of work

- Description of the current situation regarding public perception of researchers (existing studies, surveys, inquiries...) and/or of the measures taken to analyse such situation;
- Description of the tools planned for implementing the impact assessment:
 - Questionnaires (on site and/or on line);
 - Polls;
 - Face to face inquiries;
 - Blogs...
- Quantitative indicators (number of responses expected as being a reliable sample, indicators of the public satisfaction regarding the programme of activities, the organisation...)
- Qualitative indicators

TIPS for success

- **Carefully plan the impact assessment exercise from the project's start, in relation with the awareness campaign;**
- **Make use of previous impact assessments when these exist;**

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

Report on impact assessment activities, including sample of questionnaires, inquiries, interviews

Last month of the project

¹ Please indicate one 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 Type¹	MGT		
Participant number			
Participant short name			
Person-months per participant:			

Objectives

- o Ensure a sound management of the project in all its components

Description of work

- o Description of the main management structures (project coordinator, project team, Work Package leaders, Contact persons, Steering Committee, Advisory Committee, decision making process, internal communication flows (electronic mail/phone for daily communication, meetings or video/phone conferences...))

TIPS for success

- o **Keep in mind the project is of short duration: avoid too sophisticated and rigid a management structure;**
- o **For multi partner and multi location projects: ensure an overall coordination but leave a certain level of autonomy to the various sites.**

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

Final management report

Last month of the project + 60 days

¹ Please indicate one 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	WP4	Total person months
Part.1 short name					
...					
...					
...					
Total					

2. Implementation

2.1 Management structure and procedures

Description of:

- Coordinator's tasks
 - Overall administrative, legal, financial and accounting management of the project;
 - Interfacing with EU relevant services (negotiation, reporting)
 - Possibly other tasks as partner to the project
- Various management organs , such as (if relevant):
 - Project management team
 - Steering Committee
 - Work Package leaders;
 - Contact persons within the partners' structure
 - Advisory Committee...
- Decision making process
 - Usually based on consensus amongst the partners;
 - If relevant, voting modalities.
- Internal communication flows:
 - Phone/electronic mailing for daily communication;
 - Meetings, video/phone conferences...

Maximum length for Section 2.1: 1 page

2.2 Individual participants

For each participant:

- Brief description of their activities and sphere of expertise;
- Brief description of their relevance to the tasks assigned to them;
- Brief description of the staff involved

Maximum length per participant : half a page

2.3 Consortium as a whole (only if relevant)

Only for multi partner projects:

Brief description of the complementarities and synergies amongst the various partners taking part in the consortium.

i) Sub-contracting:

If relevant, description:

- Of the main tasks intended to be subcontracted;
- Of their estimated costs

ii) Other countries: N.A.

2.4 Resources to be committed

Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised, including any resources that will complement the EC 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 – 3 pages

3. Impact

3.1 Expected impacts listed in the work programme

- Description of the expected impact of your project (essentially consisting of enhancing public recognition of researchers) ;
- If relevant, description of the project takes into account other similar or complementary activities at international/national/regional level;

3.2 Spreading excellence, exploiting results, disseminating knowledge

- If relevant, description of the measures planned for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results;
- for such cases, description of how these measures will increase the impact of the project (towards policy-makers, interest groups, media and the public at large).

Maximum length: 2 pages