



GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

NETWORKS OF EXCELLENCE

Annexes, specific to call:

Call identifier FP7-SEC-2011-1

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 | 20 July 2010 |
| Deadline for submission of proposals | 02 December 2010, 17:00 CET |
| Evaluation of proposals | January / February 2011 |
| Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators ("initial information letter") | March / April 2011 |
| Security scrutiny ¹ | May 2011 |
| Invitation letter to successful coordinators to launch grant agreement negotiations with the Commission or the REA | From June 2011 |
| Letter to unsuccessful applicants | From June 2011 |
| Signature of first grant agreements | From 2 nd half 2011 |

Indicative budget for the FP7-SEC-2011-1 call: 221.43 M€

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>

Participant Portal

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/>

¹ See Annex 5

(select tab "FP7 calls")

Information Days related to this call

An Information Day is foreseen on September 9, 2010 in Brussels. Please refer to the website

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/rea/index.cfm?pg=events>

Other background docs:

<http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/policies/security/>

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/security/home_en.html

REA Security Research helpdesk DG ENTR Security Research helpdesk

REA-SECURITY-PROJECTS@ec.europa.eu
ENTR-SECURITY-RESEARCH@ec.europa.eu

Fifth European Security Research Conference <http://www.src10.be/>

General sources of help:

The Commission's FP7 Enquiry service <http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries>

National Contact Points <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ncp.html>
<http://www.seren-project.eu>

National Contact Points in third countries http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/third-countries_en.html

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
- International cooperation
- Risk Sharing Financing Facility and the European Investment Bank

Ethics Review

- Ethics check list
- Supporting documents

Handling of Classified Information

- Commission decision n°2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001)
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001D0844:20060805:EN:PDF>

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 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 the 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 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). 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

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

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

- 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 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 five 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.

| Evaluation criteria applicable to Networks of Excellence proposals | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| S/T QUALITY | IMPLEMENTATION | IMPACT |
| “Scientific 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 • Contribution to long-term integration of high quality S/T research • Quality and effectiveness of the joint programme of activities 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 ability to tackle fragmentation of the research field, and commitment towards a deep and durable institutional integration) • Adequacy of resources for successfully carrying out the joint programme of activities | <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. |

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 "S/T 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 - *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 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 the 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 may be carried out in Brussels or on the premises of the experts concerned ("remotely").

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.

The experts will also indicate whether, in their view, the proposal raises research ethics issues, or if it requires further scrutiny with regard to security³ considerations.

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

³ See Annex 5
ANNEX 2

this may be the case, the 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 or of the Commission. 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 and security.

If applicable, the consensus group will also suggest questions to be asked during the hearing. (See below).

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 of the Commission moderator may ask up to three additional experts to examine the proposal.

Ethics issues: If one or more experts have noted that there are ethics issues touched on by the proposal, the relevant box on the consensus report (CR) should be ticked and an Ethics Issues Report (EIR) should be completed stating the nature and type of ethics issues involved. 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 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 and potentially new experts. Several panels may be organised to cover the different activities, topics or funding schemes of this call.

The tasks of the panel may 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,
- making recommendations on the security issues of proposals.

The panel is chaired 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

The panel will recommend two ranked lists of proposals, following the scoring systems indicated above. One ranked list will be drawn up for all the Integration Projects (CP-IP) and the other one for all the other topics as indicated in the implementation section of the work programme.

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 that address topics not otherwise covered by more highly-rated proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.

(ii) These proposals will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion *scientific and/or technological excellence*. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion *impact*. If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on other appropriate characteristics, to be decided by the panel, related to the contribution of the proposal to the European Research Area and/or general objectives mentioned in the work programme (e.g. presence of SMEs, international co-operation, public engagement).

(iii) The method described in (ii) will then be applied to the remaining *ex aequos* in the group.

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 ethics 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;
- A record of the hearings, if applicable.

Since the same panel may have considered proposals submitted to various parts of a call (for example different funding schemes, or different topics that have been allocated distinct indicative budgets in the work programme), the report will contain two lists accordingly.

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

7. Ethics Review of project proposals

A further special ethical review of above-threshold proposals may be organised by the REA together with the Commission. The Ethics Review is carried out by independent experts with a special expertise on ethics. Reviewing research projects on ethical grounds at the EU level is a legal requirement under FP7. The Review evaluates aspects of the design and methodology of the proposed research such as intervention on humans, use of animals, data protection issues, terms of participation of children and vulnerable populations groups.

The Panel drafts an Ethics Review Report that summarises its opinion on the ethical soundness of the project proposal under consideration. The requirements put forward by the Panel are taken into account in any subsequent negotiations on the grant agreement, and may lead to obligatory provisions in the conduct of the research.

8. Scrutiny of sensitive proposals⁴

The outcome of the evaluation of proposals will be two ranked list. The Commission informs the relevant Programme Committee of the outcome of the evaluation. A "short-list" containing proposals to be negotiated to cover the available budget plus a "reserve-list" is established by the Commission.

Any RTD action on such short-list(s) will undergo a scrutiny procedure. This will be performed by an ad-hoc committee, the "**Security Scrutiny Committee**", of representatives of the competent national security authorities, supported if appropriate by representatives of the FP7 Security theme programme committee, in a configuration representing the countries of the proposal participants. This committee is chaired by a representative of the Commission.

This Committee will verify if all security aspects are properly taken into account by the applicants. Proposals will be scrutinized by Committee members from the same countries as the proposal participants.

⁴ See Annex 5

This process should reach a common position between the concerned national representatives, resulting in one of the following recommendations:

- Classification is not required: negotiation of the RTD action can start (though some recommendations for negotiations may be issued, if relevant).
- Classification is required: specific recommendations for the negotiation are given and the negotiation will be subject to certain conditions to be met in the Grant Agreement. The RTD action will become a **Classified RTD Action**⁵ and will be EU-classified at the level of the highest classification of the information used/produced by the RTD action as indicated in the SAL and its annexed SCG.
- The proposal is too sensitive to be financed because the participants have not the appropriate experience, skills or permissions to handle properly the classified information. In that case, the proposal may be rejected. If so, the Commission will explain the reasons for rejection.

Based on this common position, the Commission will take a decision on the level of classification. As a result of such a decision, the Commission, together with all the relevant national security authorities, will then verify, during negotiation and implementation of grants, that all the necessary procedures and actions are put in place in order to guarantee that classified information is dealt with in the appropriate way.

⁵ Treatment of classified information is governed by all the relevant community legislation, including the Commission decision n°2001/844/EC amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001).

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 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 the EPSS may differ slightly from these below.

NETWORKS OF EXCELLENCE

| 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.</p> |
| Call (part) identifier | <p>[pre-filled] 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. A call identifier looks like this: <i>FP7-KBBE-2008-1</i></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 co-ordinator of a proposal is always number one . |
| Participant Identification Code | The Participant Identification Code (PIC) enables organisations to take advantage of the Participant Portal. 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/portal . Organisations not yet having a PIC are strongly encouraged to self-register (at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal) before submitting the proposal and insert in section A2 the temporary PIC received at the end of the self |
| Legal name | <p>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;</p> <p>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.</p> <p>For a natural person, it is for e.g. 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 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.</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:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&StrNom=NACE_1_1&StrLanguageCode=EN&StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC .</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)</p> | <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 an SME you can use the on-line tool at http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm</p> |
| <p>Dependencies with (an)other participant(s)</p> | <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>Control: 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> |
| <p>Character of dependence</p> | <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. |
| <p>Contact point</p> | <p>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 to contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, invitation to hearings, sending of evaluation results, convocation to negotiations).</p> |
| <p>Title</p> | <p>Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.</p> |
| <p>Sex</p> | <p>This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.</p> |
| <p>Phone and fax numbers</p> | <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 | <p>Summary description (as displayed on EPSS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. The 60% flat rate will apply for grants awarded under calls for proposals closing before 1st January 2010; for grants awarded under calls closing after 31 December 2009, an appropriate level of flat rate which should be an approximation of the real indirect costs concerned but not lower than 40% of the direct costs will apply. <p>Further guidance</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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..</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. <p><i>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...)</i></p> <p>The simplified method does not require previous registration or certification by the REA.</p> |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p>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.</p> <p>3. Also, a transitional flat rate is foreseen for certain types of organisations. This flat rate is called a "transitional flat rate" because it will apply to grants awarded under calls for proposals closing before 1st January 2010. This means that the 60% flat rate will apply for the whole duration of any grant agreement signed under any call closed before 1st January 2010 (even if that grant agreement lasts beyond 2010). The objective is to help the organisations during the transition from a flat rate calculation of their overheads (organisations using the "additional cost" cost basis in previous Framework Programmes) to an actual cost calculation. After that date, this 60% flat rate will be revised, the REA shall establish an appropriate level of flat rate which should be an approximation of the real indirect costs concerned but not lower than 40%. At that moment, a special clause will be adopted and inserted in subsequent grant agreement. The use of this flat rate is subject to three cumulative conditions :</p> <p>(i) Status of the organisation</p> <p>The flat rate is reserved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-profit public bodies - secondary and higher education establishments - research organisations - SMEs <p>If these participants change their status during the life of the project, <i>"this flat rate shall be applicable up to the moment they lose their status"</i>. Therefore, from that moment on, they will not be able to use the 60% flat rate in subsequent financial statements. From then on, the indirect costs will have to be declared either on the basis of actual costs or using the 20% flat rate choice for indirect costs.</p> <p>(ii) Accounting system of the organisation</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> 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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - either opt for the 60% flat rate, knowing that it will be revised at the end of 2009, or - 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. <p>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.</p> <p>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 transitional 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.</p> <p>(iii) Type of funding scheme</p> <p>The flat rate is reserved to funding schemes which include research and technological development and demonstration activities: Network of Excellence and Networks of Excellence (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 this specific 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).</p> |
|--|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <p style="text-align: center;">Indirect Costs - Decision Tree</p> <p>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</p> <p style="text-align: center;"> ↓ YES ↓ ↓ No ↓ </p> <p>Real indirect costs or costs calculated using a simplified method</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>20% of total direct eligible costs (1)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">or</p> <p>60% of total direct eligible costs (1), for :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs - When participating in funding schemes which include research and technological development <p>Coordination and support actions : In any case Maximum 7% of the direct eligible costs (1)</p> <p>(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</p> |
| <p>International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC)</p> | <p>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.</p> |
| <p>Lump sum funding method</p> | <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>The maximum EU contribution is calculated by applying the normal upper funding limits shown under "requested EU contribution". This amount is all inclusive, covering support towards both the direct and the indirect costs.</p> <p>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</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Type of Activity</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RTD activities means activities directly aimed at creating new knowledge, new technology, and products including scientific coordination. • 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. <p>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.</p> |
| <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 prior to the beginning of the project that are according to 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.</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | |
| <p>Total Budget</p> | <p><i>Note: The "total budget" is not the requested EU contribution.</i></p> <p>A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.</p> |
| <p>Requested EU contribution</p> | <p>The requested EU 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"> • Research and technological development = 50% or 75%* • Other activities (including management) = 100% <p>(*) For participants that are non profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs.</p> |
| <p>Total Receipts</p> | <p><i>Note: The term "receipts" is not the requested EU contribution.</i></p> <p>Receipts of the project may arise from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties: <ul 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. b) Income generated by the project: <ul 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>The Community financial contribution may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for the participants. For this reason, the total requested EU funding plus receipts cannot exceed the total eligible costs.</p> |

Annex 4

Instructions for drafting "Part B" of the proposal

Network of Excellence

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 (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.

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

| Section | Maximum pages |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Scientific and/or technical quality, relevant to the topics addressed by the call | 20 pages for whole section*, |
| 1.1 Concept and objectives | No specific limit |
| 1.2 Long-term integration | No specific limit |
| 1.3 The Joint Programme of Activities (JPA) | 1 page for section 1.3 (i) ("Overall strategy") [OPTION: 2 pages for each work package description in section 1.3 (d)] |
| 2.1 Management structure and procedures | 5 pages |

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 2.2 | Individual participants | 1 page per participant |
| 2.3 | Consortium as a whole | No specific limit |
| 2.4 | Resources to be committed | 2 pages |
| 3. | Impact | 10 pages for whole section |
| 4. | Ethics Issues | No limit |
| 5. | Consideration of gender aspects | 1 page |
| 6. | Security sensitivity Issues | No specific limit |

* This limit does not include the Gantt chart under 1.3 ii), the tables 1.3a- e, and the Pert diagram under 1.3 iv).

Cover Page

Proposal full title:

Proposal acronym:

Type of funding scheme:

Collaborative Project

If a distinction is made in the call, please state which type of collaborative project your proposal relates to: (i) Small or medium-scale focused research project; (ii). Large-scale integrating project;

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

Table of Contents

Proposal

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

1.1 Concept and objectives

Explain the overall concept of your proposal, and in particular the key contributions that it offers to more rationally organise and structure European research in the area

addressed. Explain how the Network would build on existing European excellence in your research area, and how it will foster and further promote this excellence.

Describe in detail the S&T objectives. Show how they relate to the topics addressed by the call, which you should explicitly identify. The objectives should be those achievable within the project, not through subsequent development. They should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form, including through the milestones that will be indicated under section 1.3 below.

1.2 Long-term integration

Indicate how the research domain addressed by your network will benefit from long term integration of the participants' activities and capacities, how the implementation of the Joint Programme of Activities will contribute to the creation of a "virtual centre of excellence", and how the Joint Programme of Activities entails for its implementation the combination and complementary use of a significant volume of resources from the partners.

1.3 The Joint Programme of Activities (JPA)

The Joint Programme of Activities comprises all activities carried out jointly by the participants. It should entail, for example, mutual access to infrastructure, equipment, material, data and knowledge; exchanges of researchers, managers and technicians; redesign of the research portfolios and the research priorities, and reallocation of the resources. It can also include joint training schemes and joint research projects. The JPA should be designed in a way that increases the number and the quality of the results produced, while optimising the use of the participants' capacities.

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages⁶ (WPs) which should include consortium management and assessment of progress and results. (Please note that your overall approach to management will be described later, in section 2).

Please present your plans as follows:

- i) Describe the overall strategy of the work plan (*maximum length: 1 page*).
- ii) Show the timing of the different WPs and their components (Gantt chart or similar)
- iii) Provide a detailed work description broken down into work packages:
 - Work package list (please use table 1.3a);
 - Deliverables list (please use table 1.3b);
 - List of milestones (please use table 1.3c);
 - Description of each work package (please use table 1.3d);
 - Summary effort table (please use table 1.3e)

⁶ A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed project with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable or an important milestone in the overall project.

- iv) Provide a graphical presentation of the components showing their interdependencies (Pert diagram or similar)
- v) Describe any significant risks, and associated contingency plans.

Note:

- The number of work packages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work and the overall value of the proposed project. The planning should be sufficiently detailed to justify the proposed effort and allow progress monitoring by the Commission or by the REA..

Maximum length for the whole of Section 1: Twenty pages. This limit does not include the Gantt chart under 1.3 ii), the tables 1.3a- e, and the Pert diagram under 1.3 iv).

Table 1.3 a: Work package list

| Work package No ⁷ | Work package title | Type of activity ⁸ | Lead participant No ⁹ | Lead participant short name | Person-months ¹⁰ | Start month ¹¹ | End month ^E <small>Bookmark not defined.</small> |
|------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | TOTAL | | | | | |

⁷ Work package number: WP 1 – WP n.

⁸ Please indicate one activity per work package:

RTD = Research and technological development ; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable in this call including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and coordination activities) According to the description of the funding scheme given previously.

⁹ Number of the participant leading the work in this work package.

¹⁰ The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

¹¹ Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

Table 1.3 b: Deliverables List

| Del. no. ¹² | Deliverable name | WP no. | Nature ¹³ | Dissemination level ¹⁴ | Delivery date ¹⁵ |
|------------------------|------------------|--------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

¹² 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.

¹³ Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

R = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

¹⁴ Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

PU = Public

PP = Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission and/or REA Services).

RE = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission and/or REA Services).

CO = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission and/or REA Services).

CL restricted = Classified as "EU Restricted" (see Annex 5)

CL confidential = Classified as "EU Confidential" (see Annex 5)

CL secret = Classified as "EU Secret" (see Annex 5)

¹⁵ Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

Table 1.3 c List of milestones

Milestones are control points where decisions are needed with regard to the next stage of the project. For example, a milestone may occur when a major result has been achieved, if its successful attainment is required for the next phase of work. Another example would be a point when the consortium must decide which of several technologies to adopt for further development.

| Milestone number | Milestone name | Work package(s) involved | Expected date¹⁶ | Means of verification¹⁷ |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

¹⁶ Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

¹⁷ Show how you will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype completed and running flawlessly; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated.

Table 1.3 d: Work package description

For each work package:

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|
| Work package number | | Start date or starting event: | |
| Work package title | | | |
| Activity Type¹⁸ | | | |
| Participant number | | | |
| Participant short name | | | |
| Person-months per participant: | | | |

| |
|-------------------|
| Objectives |
|-------------------|

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

| |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|

¹⁸ Please indicate one activity per work package:
 RTD = Research and technological development; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable (including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and coordination activities).

Table 1.3 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 | ... | Total person months |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Part.1 short name | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | |
| ... | | | | | |
| Total | | | | | |

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.

Explain how the annual performance of this NoE will be monitored with respect to

a) progress in integration; and

b) continued excellence.

Show how the outcome of the annual review will translate into dynamic planning of NoE activities and budget allocations.

(Maximum length for Section 2.1: five pages)

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 page per participant. However, where two or more departments within an organisation have quite distinct roles within the proposal, one page per department is acceptable.)

The maximum length applying to a legal entity composed of several members, each of which is a separate legal entity, is one page per member, provided that the members have quite distinct roles within the proposal.)

2.3 Consortium as a whole

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.

Demonstrate that the participants have made a mutual commitment towards a deep and durable integration continuing beyond the period of Community financial support (for example, by attaching letters of commitment from the executive bodies of the organisations).

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.

ii) Other countries: If one or more of the participants requesting EU funding is based in a country that is outside the EU, and is not an Associated Country, and is not on the list of International Cooperation Partner Countries¹⁹, explain in terms of the project's objectives why such funding would be essential.

¹⁹ See CORDIS web-site, and annex I of the work programme.

iii) Additional partners: If there are as-yet-unidentified participants in the project, the expected competences, the role of the potential participants and their integration into the running project should be described.

(No maximum length applies to this section)

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. Pay particular attention to the two major impact aspects characteristic for an NoE: durable integration and excellence of the research. Mention the steps that will be needed to bring about these impacts. 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 Spreading excellence, exploiting results, disseminating knowledge

Outline how you intend to engage with relevant stakeholders outside the network, how to recruit next-generation researchers into the thematic area (e.g. through appropriate training measures), how to link up with any other relevant consortia and industry users, and how to use the media and the internet to engage the public at large etc.

Outline how the networks research work will be scrutinised for exploitable results and how these will be made available to potential users.

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

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

4. Ethics Issues

Proposed activities shall be carried out in compliance with fundamental ethical principles. If ethical issues, including privacy are raised, they should be addressed in the core of the proposed activity. The potential impact of the resulting technologies and activities on Fundamental Rights, ethical principles and societal values should be addressed as part of the proposed research.

In addition, the benefit and burden of the experiments and the effects it may have on the research subject should be also explained.

All countries where research will be undertaken should be identified. You should be aware of the legal framework that is applicable and the possible specific conditions that are relevant in each country (EU and non-EU countries alike).

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.

Clinical Trials: Approvals from national competent authorities are required

Clinical Trials. Approval from national competent authorities are required.

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. Data protection issues require authorization from the national data protection authorities.

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. The use of animals requires permits and/or authorizations from the national competent authorities.

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, ethics 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

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

Include the Ethics issues table below. If you indicate YES to any issue, please identify the pages in the proposal where this ethics issue is described. Answering 'YES' to some of these boxes does not automatically lead to an ethics review. It enables the independent experts to decide if an ethics 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)

Note:

Only in exceptional cases will additional information be sought for clarification, which means that any ethics review will be performed solely on the basis of the information available in the proposal.

Projects raising specific ethics issues such as research intervention on human beings²⁰; research on human embryos and human embryonic stem cells and non-human primates are automatically submitted for ethics review.

To ensure compliance with ethical principles, the REA or Commission Services will undertake ethics audit(s) of selected projects at their 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 The site includes guidance documents on privacy and data protection, developing countries, informed consent procedures etc.

²⁰ Such as research and clinical trials involving invasive techniques on persons (e.g. taking of tissue samples, examinations of the brain).

ETHICS ISSUES TABLE

(Note: Research involving activities marked with an asterisk * in the left column in the table below will be referred automatically to Ethics 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 Animal²¹ | | 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 | | | |

²¹ The type of animals involved in the research that fall under the scope of the Commission's Ethical Scrutiny procedures are defined in the Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes Official Journal L 358 , 18/12/1986 p. 0001 - 0028

| Research Involving ICP Countries ²² | | YES | Page |
|------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|------|
| | Is the proposed research (or parts of it) going to take place in the one or more of the ICP countries? | | |
| | Is any material used in the research (e.g. personal data, animal and /or human tissues samples, genetic material, live animal, etc) a) collected in any of the ICP countries? | | |
| | b) Exported to any other country (including ICPC and EU Member States)? | | |
| | I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL | | |

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

5. Consideration of gender aspects

You may give an indication of the sort of actions that would be undertaken during the course of the project to promote gender equality in your project, or in your field of research. (These will not be evaluated, but will be discussed during negotiations should your proposal be successful).

These could include actions related to the project consortium (e.g. improving the gender balance in the project consortium, measures to help reconcile work and private life, awareness raising within the consortium) or, where appropriate, actions aimed at a wider public (e.g. events organised in schools or universities)

(Maximum length for section 5 – one page)

6. Security sensitivity Issues

Special procedures will apply to security-related research, due to the sensitive nature of the subjects addressed, and the particular capability gaps that need to be addressed to protect Europe's citizens. RTD actions may be classified²³ if they are considered as sensitive.

Describe if your proposal is security sensitive or not.

If it is security sensitive, describe why, which are the participants concerned by the sensitivity, what are the measures foreseen to cope with it and annex to your proposal a first version of the Security Aspects Letter (SAL) using the template provided below.

Describe also your experience in managing security sensitive projects if relevant.

²² In accordance with Article 12(1) of the Rules for Participation in FP7, 'International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC) means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income (L), lower-middle-income (LM) or upper-middle-income (UM) country. The list of countries is given in annex 1 of the work programme. Countries associated to the Seventh EU Framework Programme do not qualify as ICP Countries and therefore do not appear in this list

²³ As defined in the Commission decision n°2001/844/EC (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001) amending its internal rules of procedure regarding provisions of security and its successive amendments. See the Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures.

In addition, a proposal may also be considered as sensitive, independently of any security classification, if it plans to exchange material subject to transfer or export licensing. If export licences (or intra EU licences) are required for carrying out the planned work, applicants must clarify the requirement to have such export or transfer licences and must provide a copy of export or transfer licences (or of the requests)

For further information on security sensitive issues relevant to this Call, see Annex 5.

Security Aspects Letter (SAL) TEMPLATE

The following security requirements shall be complied with for handling and storage of the elements and parts of the grant agreement that are mentioned in the Security Classification Guide in Appendix to this SAL for the grant agreement.

General

- The performance of the grant agreement will involve information classified "EU restricted", "EU confidential" or "EU secret" (see Annex 5).
- A Facility Security Clearance is [or is not] required.
- Persons who need to access EU classified information (EUCI) must have an EU personal security clearance and be briefed as to their responsibility for security²⁴.
- The beneficiaries concerned shall take all measures prescribed by the National Security Authority/Designated Security Authority (NSA/DSA) for safeguarding EUCI.
- The beneficiaries concerned shall appoint a Facility Security Officer (FSO).
- The beneficiaries concerned, through the FSO, shall maintain a continuing relationship with their NSA/DSA.
- The beneficiaries concerned shall maintain a record of their employees taking part in the project and who have been cleared for access to EUCI.
- EU classified information for the purpose of these instructions is to be understood as information classified and marked "EU restricted", "EU confidential" or "EU secret" or its equivalent national classification.
- Information generated by the beneficiaries concerned will require EU classification and marking.
- The beneficiaries concerned must obtain the approval of the Contracting Authority before beginning negotiations with a view to subcontract.
- The Commission Security Directorate may - in co-ordination with the responsible NSA/DSA - conduct inspections at concerned beneficiaries' facilities to verify the implementation of the security requirements for the handling of EUCI.
- The beneficiaries concerned shall report all cases of unauthorised disclosure or loss of EUCI to the responsible NSA/DSA, the Commission Security Directorate and the Contracting Authority.
- All EUCI provided or generated under this grant agreement shall continue to be protected in the event of termination of the grant agreement.
- The beneficiaries concerned shall undertake not to use, other than for the specific purpose of the grant agreement No ... [to be completed].
- Handling and storage instructions for information classified "EU restricted", "EU confidential" or "EU secret" (see Annex 5).

²⁴ Commission decision n°2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001), Section 19.1

Annex to the Security Aspects Letter (SAL) Security Classification Guide (SCG) TEMPLATE

This template should be filled in for all sensitive projects and will be part of the grant agreement

| Production of classified <u>Background</u> | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | Classification level | Beneficiaries involved in production or wanting to access | | Comments including purpose of the access and planned use |
| | | Responsabilty | Date of production | |
| number and name of the reports | proposed Classification level | entities name only | | |
| | | owner | | |
| | | | | |
| | | entities name only | | |
| | | reader | | |
| | | ... | | |
| | | ... | | |

| Production of classified <u>Foreground</u> | | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Subject | Classification level | Beneficiaries involved in production or wanting to access | | Comments including purpose of the access and planned use |
| | | Responsabilty | Date of production | |
| number and name of the deliverable | proposed Classification level | entities name only | | |
| | | owner | | |
| | | entities name only | | |
| | | contributor | | |
| | | entities name only | | |
| | | reader | | |
| | | ... | | |

Annex 5

Security sensitive proposals

1. Introduction

Security sensitive proposals are required to follow special procedures.

RTD actions may be classified²⁵ if they are considered as sensitive.

These procedures are described below. They will apply to all RTD actions under the theme 'Security' in the Specific Programme 'Co-operation'. They apply to other themes if so specified in the relevant call, or when the subjects addressed are considered as sensitive.

2. Identification of potential classified RTD Actions

A security-sensitive RTD action is an action that may need to handle classified information

A "security considerations" *flag* will be associated with a proposal:

- when the proposer him/herself declare his/her proposal as sensitive;
- if the expert evaluators, the Commission, or members of the relevant "Programme Committee", detect or suspect any of the following conditions:
 - Classified information is, or may be, used as background information
 - Some foreground is planned to be classified

A "security considerations" flag will be associated to all proposals under this call.

Whenever a "security considerations" flag is associated with a proposal, the circumstances of the planned work will be further scrutinised according to the procedure described in section C below.

All proposals must identify - if needed - the classified background required for carrying the RTD action and the classified foreground that will be produced by the action.

In the case of a proposal involving classified information (background and/or foreground), a Security Aspects Letter (SAL)²⁶ and its annexed Security Classification Guide (SCG)²⁷ must be part of the proposal.

The SCG will cover:

- The level of classification of background and foreground;
- Which participant will have access to what information;

²⁵ As defined in the Commission decision n°2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001).

²⁶ 'Security Aspects Letter (SAL)': "a set of special contractual conditions, issued by the contracting authority, which forms an integral part of a classified contract involving access to or generation of EU classified information, and that identifies the security requirements or those elements of the classified contract requiring security protection", as defined in section 27 of Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom.

²⁷ 'Security Classification Guide (SCG)': "a document which describes the elements of a programme, contract or grant agreement which are classified, specifying the applicable security classification levels. The SCG may be expanded throughout the life of the programme, contract or grant agreement, and the elements of information may be re-classified or downgraded. The SCG must be part of the SAL", as defined in section 27 of Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom.

In addition, the following documents are required as part of the proposal:

- A copy of the Facility Security Clearances (FSC) (or the FSC requests). The validity of the FSC will be checked by the European Commission' Security Directorate through the appropriate formal channel with the National Security Authorities (NSAs) involved;
- Formal written authorization by the relevant security authorities to use the classified background;

The SAL and the SCG, accompanied by supporting documents, will also be examined in the scrutiny procedure described below.

3. Scrutiny of potential classified RTD Actions

The outcome of the evaluation of proposals will be one (or more) ranked list(s). The Commission informs the relevant Programme Committee of the outcome of the evaluation. A "short-list" containing proposals to be negotiated to cover the available budget plus a "reserve-list" is established by the Commission.

Any proposal on such short-list(s) for this call, will undergo a scrutiny procedure. This will be performed by an ad-hoc committee, the "**Security Scrutiny Committee**", of representatives of the competent national security authorities, supported if appropriate by representatives of the FP7 Security theme programme committee, in a configuration representing the countries of the proposal participants. This committee is chaired by a representative of the Commission.

This Committee will verify if all security aspects are properly taken into account by the applicants. Proposals will be scrutinized by Committee members from the same countries as the proposal participants.

This process should reach a common position between the concerned national representatives resulting in one of the following recommendations:

- Classification is not required: negotiation of the RTD action can start (though some recommendations for negotiations may be issued, if relevant).
- Classification is required: specific recommendations for the negotiation are given and the negotiation will be subject to certain conditions to be met in the Grant Agreement. The RTD action will become a **Classified RTD Action**²⁸ and will be EU-classified at the level of the highest classification of the information used/produced by the RTD action as indicated in the SAL and its annexed SCG.
- The proposal is too sensitive to be financed because the participants do not have the appropriate experience, skills or permissions to handle properly the classified information. In that case, the proposal may be rejected. If so, the Commission will explain the reasons for rejection.

Based on this common position, the Commission will determine the level of classification. As a result of such a decision, the Commission, together with all the relevant National Security Authorities (NSAs), will then verify, during negotiation and implementation of grants, that all the necessary procedures and actions are put in place in order to guarantee that classified information is dealt with in the appropriate way.

²⁸ Treatment of confidential data is governed by all the relevant community legislation, including the Institutions' internal rules such as the Commission decision n°2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ, L 317, 3.12.2001).

4. Export & Transfer Licences

In addition, a proposal may also be considered as sensitive, independently of any security classification, if it is planned to exchange material subject to transfer or export licensing. If export licences (or intra EU licences) are required for carrying out the planned work, applicants must clarify the requirement to have such export or transfer licences and must provide a copy of export or transfer licences (or of the requests);

5. International cooperation

Security concerns can not be invoked as a reason for the rejection of proposals for non-classified RTD actions that involve the participation of entities from a third country²⁹. The only exceptions to this will occur if:

- The topic was described in the work programme as not open to international cooperation: in that case any proposal containing international cooperation will be declared as ineligible;
- The "security considerations" flag has been raised, in which case the proposal will be scrutinised according to the procedure described above.

²⁹ "Third country" means any country that is neither an EU Member State nor a country associated to FP7.