

DG INFORMATION SOCIETY AND MEDIA
ICT Policy Support Programme
Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme



GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Instrument: Pilot Type A

Call for proposals ICT PSP 2

(Specific information for the preparation of proposals for the ICT PSP call for proposals 2008-2 published in the Official Journal of the European Union in April 2008).

Call identifier CIP-ICT-PSP-2008-2

Version 2.0 (29-04-08)

Further copies of this Guide, together with all information related to this Call for Proposals, can be downloaded via http://ec.europa.eu/ict_psp

About this Guide

This is version number 2 of the CIP ICT PSP Guide for 'Pilot Type A' Applicants for calls for proposals.

The Guide will be revised during the course of CIP ICT PSP for each call (in particular section 2 and the Annexes) and will then be given a different version number. This version refers to the second ICT PSP call, **CIP-ICT-PSP-2008-2**

Please note:

This Guide is based on the rules and conditions contained in the legal documents relating to CIP and ICT PSP (in particular the CIP Framework Programme, and the CIP ICT PSP Work Programme, all of which can be consulted via the EUROPA web-site http://ec.europa.eu/ict_psp. The Guide does not in itself have legal value, and thus does not supersede those documents.

Table of Contents

1. GETTING STARTED	4
2. ABOUT THE INSTRUMENT 'PILOT TYPE A'	4
2.1. GENERAL INFORMATION	4
2.2. MAIN IMPLEMENTATION INSTRUMENTS	4
2.3. INSTRUMENT: PILOT TYPE A.....	6
3. HOW TO APPLY.....	7
3.1. TURNING YOUR IDEA INTO AN EFFECTIVE PROPOSAL	7
3.2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION	9
4. CHECK LIST.....	12
4.1. PREPARING YOUR PROPOSAL	12
4.2. FINAL CHECKS BEFORE SUBMISSION	13
4.3. THE DEADLINE: VERY IMPORTANT!.....	14
5. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?	14
ANNEX 1 TIMETABLE AND SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR THIS CALL	16
ANNEX 2 INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING PART A OF THE PROPOSAL.....	17
ANNEX 3 INSTRUCTIONS FOR DRAFTING PART B OF THE PROPOSAL	26
ANNEX 4 FORM: CERTIFICATION OF NATIONAL AUTHORISED REPRESENTATIVE.....	36
ANNEX 5 FORM: NON EXCLUSION DECLARATION	37
ANNEX 6 EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PILOT TYPE A PROPOSALS IN THIS CALL AND THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	38
GLOSSARY.....	45

1. Getting Started

Funding decisions in the ICT Policy Support Programme (ICT PSP) are made on the basis of **proposals** submitted by applicants. Proposals describe planned activities, information on who will carry them out, and how much they will cost. The Commission evaluates all eligible proposals in order to identify those whose quality is sufficiently high for possible funding. This **evaluation** is a peer-review carried out by independent experts.

The Commission services then **negotiate** with some or all of those whose proposal was positively evaluated, depending on the budget available. If negotiations are successfully concluded, **grant agreements** providing for a Community financial contribution are established with the participants.

This **Guide for Applicants** contains the essential information to guide you through the mechanics of preparing and submitting a proposal for a **Pilot Type A** project. It is important that you have the correct Guide! If you are preparing a Pilot type B or a Thematic Network project, this is NOT the correct guide for you!

You must also refer to the **ICT PSP Work Programme** related to this call. This provides a detailed description of the objectives and topics which are open for proposals, and will describe the wider context of activities in this area. Work Programmes are revised each year, so make sure you refer to the 2008 version before preparing your proposal.

Please check that this is the right guide for you by consulting the Work Programme, including the section called the "call fiche", and the description of the instrument in the next section.

This Guide and the Work Programme are essential reading. However, you may also wish to consult other reference and background documents, particular those relating to negotiation and the grant agreements, which will be made available on the Commission's ICT PSP web site (see Annex 1 of this guide).

This Guide for Applicants is intended to help applicants preparing their submissions. It assumes that the reader has fully acquainted him/herself with the ICT PSP Work Programme 2008 and the Call for Proposals.

2. About the instrument 'Pilot Type A'

2.1. General information

The 2008 call for proposals foresees a number of instruments to implement projects in ICT PSP. These instruments are "Pilot Type A", "Pilot Type B" and "Thematic Network".

This Guide covers Pilot Type A only. For the other two instruments separate Guides are available.

However before proceeding you are advised to consult the summary table below to make sure that the proposal you have in mind fits with the objectives and funding instruments called for in the Work Programme 2008.

Note: Your proposal will be evaluated according to the instrument which you select. It will not be re-examined or re-assigned on your behalf.

2.2. Main implementation instruments

The different nature and specificities of the objectives detailed in the Work Programme require distinctive implementation instruments. Three types of instruments have been identified:

- Pilot Type A - building on initiatives in Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries;
- Pilot Type B - stimulating the uptake of innovative ICT based services and products;
- Thematic Networks - providing a forum for stakeholders for experience exchange and consensus building.

These instruments are defined in detail in the Work Programme. They provide complementary financing tools in order to reach the ICT PSP objective of a wider uptake and best use of ICT by citizens, governments and businesses, in particular SMEs.

Summary table: Themes, objectives, funding instruments, intentions of funding

Themes and objectives	Funding Instrument	Intended number of proposals to be funded
Call for proposals		
<i>Theme 1 : ICT for user friendly administrations; public services and inclusion</i>		
1.1: Preparing the implementation of the Services Directive	<i>Pilot A</i>	1
1.2: Reduction of Administrative Burdens across the EU	<i>Pilot B</i>	up to 2
1.3: Emergency Services Accessible to All – Total Conversation	<i>Pilot B</i>	1
1.4: ICT for ageing well with cognitive problems, combining assistive and independent living technologies	<i>Pilot B</i>	several
1.5: Capacity building for eInclusion	<i>Thematic Network</i>	2
1.6: Improving certification of eHealth products	<i>Thematic network</i>	1
<i>Theme 2 : ICT for energy efficiency and sustainability in urban areas</i>		
2.1: ICT for energy efficiency in public building and spaces, including lighting	<i>Pilot B</i>	several
2.2: ICT for adaptive urban transport management infrastructure and services	<i>Pilot B</i>	up to 2
2.3: Consensus building and experience sharing for ICT for energy efficiency and sustainability in urban areas	<i>Thematic network</i>	2
<i>Consensus building, experience sharing on Internet evolution and security</i>		
3.1: A European concerted effort on RFID	<i>Thematic network</i>	1
3.2: Trusted Information Infrastructures and Biometric technologies	<i>Thematic network</i>	2
3.3: Leveraging IPv6 take-up in Europe for scaling the expected growth of the Internet	<i>Thematic network</i>	1

2.3. Instrument: Pilot Type A

Instrument description

This type of pilot focuses on implementing and demonstrating interoperability by creating service operations between cooperating Member States (and/or ICT PSP Associated countries) in the context of agreed policy priorities.

Services should be already operational at national, regional or local level in the Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries participating in the operation of the proposed pilot. Alternatively the services should be in advanced phase of national/regional testing. The main outcome of this type of pilot is an implementation of an open, common interoperable service solution based on an initial common specification agreed amongst participants in the pilot. During the course of the pilot it is expected that the initial common specification will be further developed and gain a wider agreement in view of eventual scalability.

The “common specifications”, the periodic progress statements and a final assessment of the pilot operation should all be made available in the public domain.

Pilot Type A projects are expected to demonstrate service interoperability across the Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries participating in the pilot and to achieve a sufficient critical mass to realise significant and meaningful impact. The evaluation of proposals will make an assessment in terms of impact at EU level and give priority in terms of funding to those having the highest potential.

The participants should anticipate the eventual scalability of the proposed service with a view to wider EU deployment and include the necessary resources to enable proactive work in this respect. In particular, participants should develop a long term viability plan for the services beyond the scope and duration of the proposed pilot.

The duration of the pilot is expected to be up to 36 months within which there should be a 12 month operational phase. An operational phase is defined as the situation in which the interoperable services and technologies are functioning in a real-life setting.

Consortium Composition

It is essential that the relevant administrations having competence and expertise on the subject are involved in the definition and execution of the pilot projects and in the development of the common specifications. The consortium should also comprise all necessary stakeholders in the value-chain (e.g. service and content providers, industries including SMEs, end-user representatives, etc). The organisation proposed to manage the project should be able to demonstrate competence and experience of managing large-scale international cooperation projects.

Minimum participation requirements

The consortia must be comprised by a minimum of six relevant national administrations or a legal entity designated to act on their behalf from six different EU Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries.

If a national administration is represented in the consortium by a designated legal entity, then the national administration will need to certify that the legal entity has been designated to act on its behalf for the purpose of the pilot (see Annex 4).

The minimum requirement stated above is an eligibility criterion, hence proposals not meeting this criterion will not be accepted for evaluation (see Annex 6).

Given the nature and purposes of Pilots Type A, consortia should be ideally composed by an indicative number of six – the minimum legal requirement - to ten Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries. However there is no upper legal limit for the number of participants and Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries as long as the indicative budget provisions are respected.

Extensibility of the consortium during implementation

Proposals for Pilots Type A may foresee an extension of the partnership during the course of execution. The need for this extension is for specific tasks, needs to be duly justified and resources for such purpose should typically not exceed 15% of the total budget of the pilot. The budget required for such an extension should be foreseen at the proposal stage and allocated to the co-ordinator.

Mechanisms such as steering and/or monitoring groups could be put in place involving, in addition to the participating States and organisations, other States, industry and relevant stake holders in view of developing consensus and harmonising and agreeing on common specifications.

Funding for Pilots Type A

Community funding is granted in accordance with the principles of co-financing and non-profit for the funded activities of each individual partner and in compliance with the Community Framework for State Aid for Research and Development and Innovation (OJ C 323, 30.12.2006, p. 1). Community grants shall be calculated on the basis of eligible costs. A detailed description on eligible costs for each of the instruments can be found in the model grant agreement.

It is expected that the work will be implemented in the broader context of significant investments in national or regional services. Community funding for Pilots Type A will be up to 50% of those costs exclusively related to work needed to achieve the proposed interoperability goal. The Community contribution for this type of pilot would typically range from 5 to 10 M€ per pilot. However, in the work programme 2008 for the objective *1.1 Preparing the implementation of the Services Directive* it is intended to support one Pilot A for an EU contribution of up to 7 M€.

Eligible direct costs for Pilots Type A include personnel, subcontracting, and other specific direct costs exclusively related to interoperability carried out in the context of existing national initiatives. Indirect costs are eligible in accordance with the provisions in the model grant agreement. Other specific direct costs and subcontracting will be possible when it is anticipated and clearly justified in the proposal. For public entities the applicable public procurement rules and practices are to be respected.

Pilot Type A – Overview of key characteristics	
Maximum reimbursement rate of eligible costs	50%
Typical EC contribution	See above
Duration	Up to 36 months
Minimum number of Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries/ relevant national administrations involved	Minimum of six Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries, i.e. minimum of six relevant national administrations (or their designated representatives)

3. How to apply

3.1. Turning your idea into an effective proposal

Focusing your planned work

The work you set out in your proposal must correspond to one of the themes/objectives, and associated instruments, indicated in the call for proposals.

Refer to Annex 6 of this Guide, and the Work Programme, to check the evaluation criteria (eligibility, selection and award criteria) against which your proposal will be assessed. Keep these in mind when you develop your proposal as your proposal will be evaluated against the listed criteria and subcriteria.

Which entities can participate?

The Call for Proposals is open to legal entities established in the Member States and ICT PSP Associated countries.

The EU Member States are:

Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

The ICT PSP Associated countries are:

Croatia, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway

More countries may become associated to the ICT PSP during the course of the programme.

The latest news will be posted at

http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/ict_psp/about/third_country/index_en.htm

Legal entities are:

- legal persons;
- natural persons: They may, however, participate only in so far as required by the nature or characteristics of the action. For natural persons, references to establishment are deemed to refer to habitual residence.

Exceptionally, entities which do not have legal personality under the applicable national law may participate, provided that their representatives have the capacity to undertake legal obligations on their behalf and assume financial liability. Subject to these conditions, such entities will be considered as legal entities.

The Community may allow participation of entities from countries which are not associated to the Programme - by means of an agreement with the Community - in individual actions on a case-by-case basis. Such entities will not receive Community funding.

Who is who in a project?

The participants in a project may take the following roles:

- **Co-ordinating beneficiary (co-ordinator):** The co-ordinator represents the consortium and bears overall project management responsibility. The responsibilities of the co-ordinator are described in the ICT PSP model grant agreement. All proposals must include a co-ordinator.
- **Beneficiary:** These are the remaining partners in the consortium that carry out the work. A beneficiary is a signatory to the grant agreement with the European Commission.

A beneficiary may choose to subcontract part of the work for which it is responsible.

- **Sub-contractor:** They provide services to a beneficiary during the course of a project. They are selected by the beneficiaries through a call for tender procedure or any other procedure respecting the relevant procurement rules (provided the beneficiary is subject to public procurement rules), and in any case according to the principle of best value for money. Costs for subcontracting can be eligible for funding, if in accordance with the grant agreement in force. A sub-contractor is not a signatory to the grant agreement.

Proposal language

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

Presenting your proposal

A proposal has two parts.

Part A will contain the administrative and budget information about the proposal and the participants. The information requested includes a brief summary of the work, contact details and characteristics of the participants, and information related to the funding requested (see Annex 2). This information will be encoded in a structured database for further computer processing to produce, for example, statistics and evaluation reports. This information will also support the experts and Commission staff during the evaluation process.

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

Part B is a "template", or list of headings (see Annex 3 of this Guide). You should follow this structure when presenting the content of your proposal. The list of headings is designed to highlight those aspects that will be assessed against the **evaluation criteria** (eligibility, award and selection criteria) as set out in Annex 6 to this guide. It covers, among other things, the objectives and the nature of the proposed work, the participants and their roles, and the impact that is expected to arise from the proposed work.

Only black and white copies of Part B are used for evaluation and you are strongly recommended, therefore, not to use colour in your document. Do not insert hypertext links, only the text of your Part B will be read, not any documents linked to it.

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

A maximum length may be specified for Part B as a whole (see Annex 3 of this Guide). If so, you must keep your proposal within these limits.

3.2. Proposal Submission

About the EPSS

Proposals must be submitted electronically, using the Commission's **Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)**. Proposals arriving at the Commission by any other means are regarded as 'not submitted', and will not be evaluated¹.

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

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

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

The most important points are explained below.

Use of the system by the proposal coordinator

As a coordinator you can:

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

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

- submit the complete proposal Part A and Part B.

Use of the system by the other participants

Other participants can:

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

Submitting the proposal

Only the coordinator is authorised to submit the proposal.

Completing the Part A forms in the EPSS and uploading a Part B does not yet mean that your proposal is submitted. Once there is a consolidated version of the proposal, you must press the button "SUBMIT NOW". (If you don't see the button "SUBMIT NOW", first select the "SUBMIT" tag at the top of the screen).

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

After reading the information page that then appears, it is possible to submit the proposal using the button marked "*Press this button to submit the proposal*". The EPSS then performs an automatic validation of the proposal. A list of any problems ("validation error message") such as missing data, viruses, wrong file format or excessive file size will then appear on the screen. **Submission is blocked until these problems are corrected.** When corrected, the coordinator must then repeat the above steps to achieve submission.

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

When successfully submitted, the coordinator sees a message that indicates that the proposal has been received. This automatic message is not the official acknowledgement of receipt (see Section 5). The coordinator may continue to modify the proposal and submit revised versions overwriting the previous one right up until the deadline. The sequence above must be repeated each time.

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

You are advised to clean your document before converting it to PDF (e.g. accept all tracked changes, delete notes).

Check that your conversion software has successfully converted all the pages of your original document (e.g. there is no problem with page limits).

Check that your conversion software has not cut down landscape pages to fit them into portrait format. Check that captions and labels have not been lost from your diagrams

Please note that the Commission prints out proposals in black and white on plain A4 paper. The printable zone on the print engine is bounded by 1.5 cm right, left, top bottom. No scaling is applied to make the page "fit" the window. Printing is done at 300 dots per inch.

Please note that by submitting the proposal the coordinator declares that

1) (s)he is acting on behalf of the consortium, all of whom

- are aware of the proposal;
- agree with its content and submission;
- have the necessary internal authorisations to participate;
- are aware of the Commission Policy on data protection, i.e. are aware that the personal data collected in the context of the call will be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data.

2) (s)he is in the possession of

- a written declaration (signed by a legal representative) of each participant (including the coordinator itself) on its honour that the organisation is not subject to one of the situations of exclusion as specified in the Financial Regulation (using the form in Annex 5).
- the necessary "Certification of national authorised representative" form(s) – signed by the responsible national administration(s) - for each participant acting in the proposal as authorised national representative (using the form in Annex 4).

Attention: The above mentioned signed documents do not form part of the actual proposal, but must be in the possession of the coordinator at the time of proposal submission. The Commission can request them at any time during the evaluation / negotiation process. Failure to comply with this request within 10 days can lead to the proposal's removal from the evaluation / negotiation process.

About the deadline

Call deadlines are absolutely firm and are strictly enforced.

The EPSS will be closed for this call at the call deadline. After this moment, access to the EPSS for this call will be impossible. Do not wait until the last moment before submitting your proposal!

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

Leaving your first submission attempt to the last few minutes of the call will give you no time to overcome even the smallest technical difficulties, proposal validation problems or communications delays which may arise. Such events are never accepted as extenuating circumstances; your proposal will be regarded as not having been submitted.

Submission is deemed to occur at the moment when the proposal coordinator presses the "submit" button and completes the full submission process. It is not the point at which you start the upload. If you wait until too near to the close of the call to start uploading your proposal, there is a serious risk that you will not be able to submit in time.

If you have registered and submitted your proposal in error to another call which closes after this call, the Commission will not be aware of it until it is discovered among the downloaded proposals for the later call. It will therefore be classified as ineligible because of late arrival.

*The submission of a proposal requires some knowledge of the EPSS system, a detailed knowledge of the contents of the proposal and the authority to make last-minute decisions on behalf of the consortium if problems arise. **You are advised not to delegate the job of submitting your proposal!***

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

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

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

Correcting or revising your proposal

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

Once the deadline has passed, however, the Commission cannot accept further additions, corrections or re-submissions. The last version of your proposal received before the deadline is the one which will be evaluated, and no later material can be submitted.

Ancillary material

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

Withdrawing a proposal

You may withdraw a proposal by submitting a revised version with an empty Part B section, with the following words entered in the abstract field of form A1:

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

4. Check list

4.1. Preparing your proposal

- **Does your planned work fit with the call for proposals?** Check that your proposed work does indeed address the topics described in the current ICT PSP Work Programme.
- **Are you applying for the correct objective, theme or implementation instrument?** Check that your proposed work falls within the scope of this call, and that you have applied for one of the eligible themes, objectives and implementation instruments (see the Work Programme).
- **Is your proposal eligible?** The eligibility criteria are given in the Work Programme. See also section 2 and Annex 6 of this Guide. In particular, make sure that you satisfy the minimum requirements for the composition of your consortium. Have any specific eligibility criteria been set for this instrument in this Call? Check whether you comply with any budgetary limits that may have been set on the requested Community contribution. Any proposal not meeting the eligibility requirements will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- **Is your proposal complete?** Proposals must comprise a Part A, containing the administrative and budget information including participant and project cost details on standard forms; and a Part B

containing the description of your proposal as described in this Guide. A proposal that does not contain both parts will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.

- **Does your proposal follow the required structure?** Proposals should be precise and concise, and must follow exactly the proposal structure described in this document (see Annex 3 of this Guide). This proposal structure is designed to correspond to the evaluation criteria which will be applied. Omitting requested information will almost certainly lead to lower scores and possible rejection.
- **Have you maximised your chances?** Edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator; refer to the evaluation criteria given in Annex 6 of this Guide. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.
- **Has the coordinator collected the signed "Certification of national authorised representative" form, for all respective legal entities?** In Pilot Type A projects a minimum number of relevant national administrations must be participating. The respective national administration (e.g. the responsible ministry) can also authorise a legal entity (e.g. a regional administration, an agency, a private company, etc.) to act on its behalf as national authorised representative. This has to be certified through the "Certification of national authorised representative" form (filled and signed by the national administration, see form in Annex 4). The signed form must be collected by the coordinator and kept in his possession, but is not part of the proposal itself.
- **Has the coordinator collected written declarations of each participant on its honour (using the "Non Exclusion Form" in Annex 5) that the organisation is not subject to any of the situations of exclusion as specified in the Financial Regulation?** This document should be signed by a legal representative of the respective participant. The signed form must be collected by the coordinator and kept in his possession, but is not part of the proposal itself.
- **Do you need further advice and support?** You are strongly advised to inform your National Contact Point of your intention to submit a proposal (see Annex 1 of this Guide). Remember also the ICT PSP Help Desk listed in Annex 1 of this Guide.

4.2. Final checks before submission

- **Do you have the authorisation** of all the partners in the consortium to submit this proposal on their behalf?
- **Are you using the correct Part A forms and Part B format and templates** as given in this document? If you have in error registered for the wrong instrument, discard that registration (usernames and passwords) and re-register and re-submit correctly. If there is no time to do this, or the call deadline has already passed, notify the EPSS Helpdesk.
- **Is your Part B in portable document format (PDF)**, including no material in other formats?
- Is your Part B filename made up only of the letters A to Z and numbers 0 to 9 **without special characters or spaces**?
- **Have you printed out your Part B**, to check that it really is the file you intend to submit, and that it is complete, printable and readable? After the call deadline it will not be possible to replace your Part B file.
- **Is your Part B file within the size limit of 10 Mbytes?**
- **Have you virus-checked your computer?** The attempted submission of files containing a virus is automatically blocked.

4.3. The deadline: very important!

- **Have you, as coordinator, taken the responsibility to submit your proposal?**
- **Have you made yourself familiar with the EPSS in good time?**
- **Have you allowed time to submit a first version of your proposal well in advance of the deadline** (at least several weeks before), and then to continue to improve it with regular resubmissions?

Have you pressed the ‘SUBMIT’ button after your final version and completed the full process?

Only after reception of the email confirming the completion of the submission you can consider the proposal as being correctly submitted.

5. What happens next?

Shortly after the call deadline, the Commission will send an **acknowledgement of receipt** to the e-mail address of the proposal coordinator given in the submitted proposal. This is assumed to be the individual named as “person in charge” on the A2 form of participant no. 1. Please note that the brief electronic message given by the EPSS system after each submission is not the official acknowledgement of receipt.

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

If you have not received an acknowledgement of receipt within 12 working days after the call deadline, you should contact the ICT PSP Help Desk without further delay (see Annex 1 of this Guide).

The Commission will check that your proposal meets the **eligibility criteria** that apply to this call and instrument (see the Work Programme and Annex 6 of this Guide).

All eligible proposals will be evaluated by independent experts. The evaluation criteria which will be applied to each submitted proposal are described in Annex 6 of this Guide.

Soon after the completion of the evaluation, the results will be finalised and all coordinators will receive a letter containing initial information on the results of the evaluation, including the **Evaluation Summary Report** giving the opinion of the experts on their proposal. However, even if the experts viewed your proposal favourably, the Commission cannot at this stage indicate if there is a possibility of Community funding.


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

The Commission also informs the relevant programme committee (ICT PSP Committee, i.e. CIP – ICTC), consisting of delegates representing the governments of the Member States.

Based on the results of the evaluation by experts, the Commission draws up the final list of proposals for possible funding, taking account of the available budget.

Summary of the evaluation and selection process

The sequence of steps in the evaluation and selection procedure is summarised in the following flow chart:



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

Negotiations between the applicants and the Commission aim to conclude a grant agreement which provides for EU funding of the proposed work. They cover both a description of the work, and the administrative and financial aspects of the project. The officials conducting these negotiations on behalf of the Commission will be working within a predetermined budget envelope. They will refer to any recommendations which the experts may have made concerning modifications to the work presented in the proposal. At this stage the legal existence and the financial viability of the participants will be verified. For the verification of its legal existence a participant will have to complete and sign a 'Legal Entity Form' and supply supporting documents as described on http://ec.europa.eu/budget/execution/legal_entities_en.htm. For financial viability checking organisations may have to provide a recent balance sheet and profit and loss accounts.

A description of the negotiation process and the necessary details of the financial viability checking documents are provided in the "ICT PSP Negotiation Guidance Notes" (available on the ICT PSP web site). Participants of the proposal consortium may be invited to Brussels to facilitate the negotiation.

Annex 1 Timetable and specific information for this call

The **ICT PSP Work Programme 2008** 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 ICT PSP web page. You must consult this document.

Indicative timetable for ICT PSP Call 2

Publication of Work Programme 2008	<i>April 2008</i>
Second Call for Proposals launched	<i>29th April 2008</i>
Deadline for submission of proposals	<i>9th September 2008; 17h00 CET</i>
Evaluation, selection	<i>October 2008</i>
Letters to applicants	<i>end October 2008</i>
Signature of first grant agreements	<i>January 2009</i>

Further information and help

The ICT PSP 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.

General sources of help

National Contact Points: A network of National Contact Points (NCPs) has been established to provide advice and support to organisations which are preparing proposals. **You are highly recommended to get in touch with your NCP at an early stage.**

Please note that the Commission will give the NCPs statistics and information on the outcome of the call (in particular, details of participants, but not proposal abstracts or funding details) and the outcome of the evaluation for each proposal. This information is supplied to support the NCPs in their service role, and is given under strict conditions of confidentiality

You can find contact details here:

http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/ict_psp/contacts/index_en.htm

ICT Help Desk

Questions can be sent to a single e-mail address and will be directed to the most appropriate department for reply.

email: info-ict-ppsp@ec.europa.eu

tel: +32 2 296 8596

fax: +32 2 296 8388

EPSS helpdesk

Technical questions related to the Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS) can be sent.

email: support@epss-fp7.org

tel.: +32 2 233 37 60

Legal documents generally applicable

- Decision establishing Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (2007-2013)
- Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules
- ICT PSP Work Programme 2008

Contractual information

- Model Grant agreement

All the above are available at http://ec.europa.eu/ict_ppsp.

Annex 2 Instructions for completing Part A of the proposal

Proposals in this call must be submitted electronically, using the Commission's Electronic Proposal Submission System. 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 3).

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

Section A2 gives legal and administrative information. It also identifies if a participant has been designated as the representative for a national administration. In such a case the coordinator must collect for each legal entity, acting in the proposal as authorised representative, the 'Certification of national authorised representative' form, filled by the responsible national administration (see template in Annex 4). The signed version has to be kept in the files of the coordinator.

Please note:

- The coordinator fills in the section A1 and section A3.
- The participants already identified at the time of proposal submission (including the coordinator) each fill in section A2.
- Subcontractors are not required to 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 envisaged role, profile and tasks are described in Part B of the proposal.

When you complete Part A, please make sure that:

- Numbers are always rounded to the nearest whole number
- *You have inserted zeros ("0") where there are no costs or funding figures. Leaving cells empty will block the submission of your proposal*
- All costs are given in Euros (**not thousands of Euros**), and must exclude value added tax.

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

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
ICT Policy Support Programme
Competitiveness and Innovation
Framework Programme

ICT Policy Support
Programme

Pilot Type A

A1: Summary

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym	
-----------------	--	------------------	--

GENERAL INFORMATION

Proposal Title			
Duration in months		Call (part) identifier	
Activity code(s) most relevant to your topic			
Free keywords			
Abstract (max. 2000 char.)			
Similar proposals or signed grant agreements?			
a) Has this proposal (or a very similar one) been previously submitted to a call for proposals of the CIP ICT PSP?			YES/NO/Don't KNOW [drop down]
IF YES			
- please give the call identifier		[free format] if YES above	
- please give the proposal or grant agreement number (if known)		[free format] if YES above	

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
ICT Policy Support Programme
Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme

ICT Policy Support Programme

Pilot Type A

A2.1: Participants

Each participant should complete their own section "Participants"

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym	<i>[filled in from A1]</i>	Participant number	
-----------------	--	------------------	----------------------------	--------------------	--

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS (ONE FORM PER PARTICIPANT)

If your organisation has already registered for CIP (Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme) or FP7 (7th Framework Programme for Research), enter your Participant Identity Code

Organisation legal name

Is your organisation a national administration or a certified representative of a national administration? [yes/no]

Basic administrative data of your organisation

Legal address			
Street name		Number	
Town			
Postal Code / Cedex			
Country ¹			
Internet homepage (optional)			

Status of your organisation

The Commission collects data for statistical purposes.

The guidance notes will help you to complete this section.

Please 'tick' the relevant box(es) if your organisation falls into one or more of the following categories.

- Public body / representative of administration
- Commercial organisation
- Standardisation body
- Other

Main Area of activity (NACE code): [dropdown list]

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
ICT Policy Support Programme
Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme

ICT Policy Support Programme

Pilot Type A

A2.2: Participants

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym	[filled in from A1]	Participant number	
-----------------	--	------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS (ONE FORM PER PARTICIPANT)

1. Is your number of employees smaller than 250? (full time equivalent)	[yes/no]
2. Is your annual turnover smaller than € 50 million?	[yes/no]
3. Is your annual balance sheet total smaller than € 43 million?	[yes/no]
4. Are you an autonomous legal entity?	[yes/no]
You are not an SME if your answer to question 1 is "NO" and/or your answer to both questions 2 and 3 is "NO". In all other cases, you might conform to the Commission's definition of an SME. Please check the additional conditions given in the guidance notes to the forms.	
Following this check, do you conform to the Commission's definition of an SME	[yes/no].

Organisation short name	
-------------------------	--

Dependencies with (an)other participant(s)

Are there dependencies between your organisation and (an)other participant(s) in this proposal? (Yes or No)		
If Yes:		
Participant Number	Organisation Short Name	Character of dependence
Participant Number	Organisation Short Name	Character of dependence
Participant Number	Organisation Short Name	Character of dependence

Contact points

Person in charge (For the co-ordinator (participant number 1) this person is the one who the Commission will contact in the first instance)			
Family name		First name(s)	
Title		Sex (Female – F / Male – M)	
Position in the organisation			
Department/Faculty/Institute/Laboratory name/ ...			
Address (if different from the legal address)			
Street name		Number	
Town			
Postal Code / Cedex			
Country			
Phone 1		Phone 2	
E-mail		Fax	

In ICT PSP, there are different methods for identifying **indirect costs**. The various options are explained in the guidance notes. Please indicate the way in which you will report your indirect costs:

- Real indirect costs
- Standard flat rate

Proposal Submission Forms



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
 ICT Policy Support Programme
 Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme

ICT Policy Support Programme

A3: Budget

Pilot Type A

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym	(From A1)	Participant number in this proposal	
-----------------	--	------------------	-----------	-------------------------------------	--

	Personnel costs	Sub-contracting	Other specific direct costs	Indirect costs	TOTAL COSTS	Requested reimbursement rate	Requested EC contribution
(1) Coordinator							
(2) Participant							
(3) Participant							
(4) Participant							
(5) Participant							
(6) Participant							
...							
Total							

Please use as many copies of form A3 as necessary for the number of participants	Form A3 page		of	
--	--------------	--	----	--

Pilots Type A – Guidance notes for Part A of the proposal

These notes will also be provided on-line via the EPSS service.

Section A1: Summary	
Proposal Acronym	The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this call. It should be of no more than 20 characters (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please). The same acronym should appear on each page of Part B of your proposal.
Proposal Title	The title should be no longer than 200 characters that should be understandable to a non-specialist in your field.
Duration in months	Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months.
Call (part) identifier	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 ICT PSP call page The call identifier is pre-filled in the forms from the EPSS. For this call it is <u>CIP-ICT-PSP-2008-2</u>. If you do not have this identifier on your forms, you have registered for the wrong call. Discard this registration and register again].
Activity code	Please input as activity code the main theme objective identifier. The theme identifiers are mentioned in the call text and explained in the Work Programme.
Free keywords	This allows you to freely choose keywords describing the scope of your proposal. There is a limit of 100 characters including spaces, commas, etc.
Abstract	The abstract should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the Work Programme. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to the programme management committee and other interested parties. It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information. Please use plain typed text. If the proposal is written in a language other than English, please include an English version of the proposal abstract in Part B. There is a limit of 2000 characters.
Similar proposals or signed grant agreements	A 'similar' proposal or grant agreement is one that differs from the current one in minor ways, and in which some of the present consortium members are involved.

Section A2.1: 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 number assigned to you by the Commission's Unique Registration Facility. If you have no PIC, enter 0
Organisation Legal name	For Public Law Body , it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Entity, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body; For Private Law Body , it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register.

Certified representative	<p>A national administration can be represented in the consortium by a designated legal entity. This designated legal entity is a proposal participant. The national administration will need to certify that the legal entity has been designated to act on its behalf for the purpose of the PilotType A. A template form is provided in Annex 4 to this Guide.</p> <p>If a project participant is a designated representative, then the cover page of Part B of the proposal needs to indicate which national administration this participant is representing.</p>
Legal address	<p>For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office.</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>
NACE code	<p>NACE means " Nomenclature des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne". 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>
Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)	<p>SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003. The full definition and a guidance booklet can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/sme_definition/index_en.htm</p> <p>An enterprise is considered as an SME, taking into account its partner enterprises and/or linked enterprises (please see the above mentioned recommendation for an explanation of these notions and their impact on the definition), if it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • employs fewer than 250 persons; • has an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or • an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million. <p>The headcount corresponds to the number of annual work units (AWU), i.e. the number of persons who worked full-time within the enterprise in question or on its behalf during the entire reference year under consideration. The work of persons who have not worked the full year, the work of those who have worked part-time, regardless of duration, and the work of seasonal workers are counted as fractions of AWU. The staff consists of:</p> <p>(a) employees;</p> <p>(b) persons working for the enterprise being subordinated to it and deemed to be employees under national law;</p> <p>(c) owner-managers;</p> <p>(d) partners engaging in a regular activity in the enterprise and benefiting from financial advantages from the enterprise.</p> <p>ATTENTION: Apprentices or students engaged in vocational training with an apprenticeship or vocational training contract can not be included as staff. The duration of maternity or parental leaves is also not counted.</p> <p>The data to apply to the financial amounts (e.g. turnover and balance sheet), as well as to the headcount of staff, are those relating to the latest approved accounting period and calculated on an annual basis. They are taken into account from the date of closure of the accounts. The amount selected for the turnover is calculated excluding value added tax (VAT) and other indirect taxes.</p> <p>In the case of newly-established enterprises whose accounts have not yet been approved, the data to apply is to be derived from a <i>bona fide</i> estimate made in the course of the financial year. These organisations must insert "N/A" for the two questions relating to the duration and the closing date of their last approved accounting period.</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 than 20 characters 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>

Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)	<p>Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them: A legal entity is under the same direct or indirect control as another legal entity (SG); or A legal entity directly or indirectly controls another legal entity (CLS); or A legal entity is directly or indirectly controlled by another legal entity (CLB).</p> <p>Control: Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:</p> <p>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> <p>The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:</p> <p>(a) the same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50 % of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates;</p> <p>(b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.</p>
Character of dependence	<p>According to the explanation above mentioned, please insert the appropriate abbreviation according to the list below to characterise the relation between your organisation and the other participant(s) you are related with:</p> <p>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>It is the team leader in charge of the proposal for the participant. For participant number 1 (the coordinator), this will be the person the Commission will contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, sending of evaluation results, convocation to negotiations).</p>
Title	<p>Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.</p>
Sex	<p>This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F (female) or M (male) as appropriate.</p>
Phone and fax numbers	<p>Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.</p>
Method for identifying indirect costs	<p>Indirect costs are eligible costs that cannot be identified as being directly attributed to the project, but which can be identified and justified as being incurred in direct relation with the direct eligible costs. Indirect costs shall represent a fair proportion of the overall overheads of the participant. They may be identified according to one of the following methods:</p> <p>1) Real indirect costs, for those participants which have an analytical accounting system to identify their indirect costs as indicated above.</p> <p>2) A participant may opt for a standard flat-rate of 30% of its personnel costs for Pilots Type A.</p>

Section A3: Budget

Personnel costs	<p>Personnel costs are the costs of the actual hours worked by the persons directly carrying out work under the project. Such persons must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – be directly hired by the participant in accordance with its national legislation, – work under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the participant, and – be remunerated in accordance with the normal practices of the participant, provided that these are regarded as acceptable by the Commission.
------------------------	---

Subcontracting	<p>A subcontractor does not sign the grant agreement.</p> <p>Any subcontract, for which the costs are to be claimed as eligible costs, must be awarded according to the principle of best value for money (best price-quality ratio), under the conditions of transparency and equal treatment. Framework contracts between a participant and a subcontractor, entered into prior to the beginning of the project that are in accordance with the participant's usual management principles may also be accepted.</p> <p>Participants may use external support services for ancillary tasks.</p>
Other direct costs	<p>Means direct costs (i.e. costs that can be attributed directly to the project and are identified by the participant as such, in accordance with its accounting principles and usual internal rules) that are not personnel costs and not subcontracting costs.</p>
Indirect Costs	<p>Indirect costs are all those eligible costs that 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>
Total Costs	<p>Total costs are the sum of personnel costs, subcontracting costs, other specific direct costs, and indirect costs.</p>
Requested reimbursement rate	<p>Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs:</p> <p>Pilots Type A = 50%</p>
Requested EC contribution	<p>The requested Community contribution shall be determined by applying the requested reimbursement rate indicated above per participant to the total costs.</p>

Annex 3 Instructions for drafting Part B of the proposal

The following template should be used for providing information on the rationale, objectives and work plan of the proposals.

*A description of the instrument '**Pilot Type A**' 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. An electronic version of this template can be obtained via the EPSS. 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/award criteria (see Annex 6).

IMPORTANT: Sections B.1, B.2 and B.3 each correspond to an award criterion. The subsections (B.1.1., B.1.2. etc.) correspond to the sub criteria. Please keep the evaluation criteria in Annex 6 always in mind and follow the instructions per section and subsection carefully when preparing Part B of the proposal.

It is in your interest to keep your text concise since over-long proposals are rarely viewed in a positive light by the evaluating experts.

Each page of Part B must be numbered and should be headed with the project acronym chosen for the proposed project.

Cover Page

A separate page with the following information:

PROPOSAL PART B

**ICT PSP second call for proposals 2008
Pilot Type A**

ICT PSP Main Theme identifier:
(e.g. 1.1. Preparing the implementation of the Services Directive)

Proposal acronym: _____

Proposal full title: _____

Proposal draft number and date of preparation: _____

Name of the coordinating person (organisation): _____

List of participants:

Participant no.*	Participant organisation name	Participant short name	Country	Certified representative of a national administration?
1 (Co-ordinator)				yes/no
2 (Participant)				yes/no
3 (Participant)				yes/no
4 (Participant)				yes/no
5 (Participant)				yes/no
6 (Participant)				yes/no
....				

**Please use the same participant numbering as that used in proposal submission forms A2.*

List of National Administrations which are represented by one of the above participants:

National Administration name	Country	represented by <participant no.>	represented by <participant short name>

<Page Break>

A: Table of Contents Page

<Page break>

PROJECT PROFILE (Short, precise, verifiable) – maximum 2 pages

Proposal Acronym: _____

Proposal Title: _____

Information on the service
<p><u>Service solution</u> Describe the common interoperable service solution that the Pilot aims to implement and demonstrate (maximum 10 lines)</p>
<p><u>Existing services</u> Describe the existing services related to the Pilot for each of the countries involved. Indicate the extent to which these services are already operational at national, regional or local level and the national initiatives/strategies to which they belong (maximum 1 page)</p>
<p><u>Methodology</u> Describe the methodology and the roadmap of main milestones and tasks to be carried out during the Pilot (maximum 10 lines)</p>
<p><u>Consortium</u> Describe briefly the composition of the consortium and the extent to which it includes the whole service value chain (maximum 10 lines)</p>
<p><u>Openness</u> Describe the mechanisms that will be put in place during the project to ensure the openness of the work and the involvement of other states and stakeholders not participating directly in the Pilot. (maximum 10 lines)</p>
<p><u>Impact</u> Describe the expected impact of the Pilot at EU level (maximum 10 lines)</p>

<page break>

B1. Project description and objectives

B1.1. Project objectives

This section should provide an analysis of the specific interoperability issue/problem that is going to be addressed. It should explain the concept of the project, i.e. its objectives and the proposed solution. The project objectives must be fully aligned with the objectives description of the chosen theme (provided in the Work Programme in chapter 3).

The objectives should be those achievable within the project, not through subsequent development. The results should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form, attainable with the available resources and realistic within the time span of the project.

This section should explain the project in technical terms; where legal, organisational and political terms are important these should also be explained. The section should:

- describe the interoperability issue it will tackle,
- describe the existing national infrastructures it will base itself on (i.e. the existing national, regional, local initiatives),
- describe the way how those national initiatives will be “connected” together,
- describe the expected final result of the project.

B1.2 EU dimension

Show how your pilot relates to the relevant policies, strategies and activities on European and national level. Indicate whether the outcome of the pilot will reinforce existing national initiatives. Give examples of references to national or European strategies.

This section should explain in detail the relevance of the proposed project to EU political objectives. It should

- describe the relevance of the project to EU directives,
- describe the relevance of the proposed solution to political objectives,
- explain the EU relevance of the solution to be demonstrated.

B2. Impact

B2.1. Target outcomes and expected impact

Describe how your project will contribute towards the expected target outcome and characteristics listed in the addressed specific objective in the ICT PSP Work Programme.

This section should describe in detail

- what the final outcome of the project will be,
- what building block(s) will be delivered,
- what common specifications will be defined.

Describe how your project will contribute towards the expected impacts listed in the Work Programme in relation to the objective in question. Mention the steps that will be needed to bring about these impacts. Mention any assumptions and external factors that may determine whether the impacts will be achieved, including the main barriers and foreseeable risk factors.

Further, this section must detail the way in which benefits of the pilot will be measured and assessed. The proposal needs to define both quantitative and qualitative criteria to measure the progress of the pilot and the benefits achieved by the pilots' services. These figures should be available both on a country-by-country basis, as well as collectively.

B2.2. Long term impacts

You should explain the intended long term impact at European level. Describe how the consortium intends to reach viability, sustainability and scalability after the end of the project. Attention should be given to the support by public entities and the capability to build support across the EU in view of reaching EU wide consensus.

This section should also describe how the envisaged solution will be maintained and should/could be further developed beyond the end of the project and the Community funding. As regards viability you should address all aspects of financial technical and political nature. The project should explain how legal barriers could be lifted to enable an effective EU wide interoperable service.

B2.3. Availability of results

Outline how you intend to spread results and disseminate knowledge of the specification of interfaces, protocols, architecture, etc, as well as – where appropriate - open source reference implementations of necessary components and building blocks for interoperability.

This section should particularly describe

- how IPR (intellectual property rights) will be managed in line with the Work Programme requirements, and
- how public procurement rules will be respected beyond the project phase for the full deployment of the service

B3. Implementation

B3.1a. Chosen approach

Explain the structure of your work plan, its overall strategy, and the methodology used to achieve the objectives.

B3.1b. Work plan

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages (WPs). A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed project with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable in the overall project. Work packages should follow the logical phases of the implementation of the project, and include consortium management, assessment of progress and evaluation work package, dissemination activities.

Present your plans as follows:

- Show the timing and dependencies of the different WPs and their components through a **GANTT chart**.
- Provide a detailed work description broken down into work packages:
 - **Work package list** (use table 1 template);
 - **Deliverables list** (use table 2 template);
 - **Work package description** (use table 3 template);
 - **Summary effort table** (use table 4 template)

Note that the figures in these tables must equal the corresponding figures in the cost breakdown table (section A3).

- *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.*
- *Any significant risks should be identified, and contingency plans described.*

Table 1: Template - Work package list:

Work package No.(i)	Work Package Title	Lead Participant No. (ii)	Lead Participant Short name (iii)	Total person months per WP (iv)	Start Month (v)	End Month (vi)
WP 1						
WP 2						
WP 3						
-						
-						
	TOTAL					

Notes:

- i. Work package number: WP 1 – WP n.
- ii. Number of the participant leading the work in this work package.
- iii. As chosen in section A3
- iv. The total number of person months allocated to each work package.
- v. Relative start date for the work in the specific work packages, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date. Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).
- vi. Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all ends dates being relative to this start date. Measured in months from the project start date (month 1).

Table 2: Template - Deliverables list

Deliverable No (i)	Deliverable name	WP No.	Nature (ii)	Dissemination level (iii)	Delivery date (proj. month) (iv)

Notes:

- i. *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.*
- ii. *Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:
P = Prototype; R = Report; D = Demonstrator, SP = Specification, O = Other.*
- iii. *Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

P = Public, for wide dissemination (public deliverables shall be of a professional standard in a form suitable for print or electronic publication);

C = Confidential, limited to project participants. Irrespective of the status, all reports and deliverables must be made accessible to the other project participants and the responsible European Commission services.*
- iv. *Month in which the deliverables will be available. Month 0 marking the start of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.*

Table 3: Template – Work package description

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

Objectives (i)

--

Description of work (ii)

--

Deliverables (iii)

--

Notes

- i. Provide a concise description of the objectives to be achieved within the work package and how these objectives will be pursued. Use quantifiable and verifiable elements. Refer to the tasks to be carried out.*
- ii. Provide a short description of the work broken down into tasks of the work package. State the role of the participants for each task. State the amount of effort (in person months) per participant and task.*
- iii. Provide a brief description of the deliverables including the month of delivery.*

Table 4: Template – Summary of staff effort

A summary of the staff effort is useful for the evaluators. Please indicate in the table number of person months over the whole duration of the planned work, for each work package (WP) by each participant.

Identify the work package leader for each WP by showing the relevant person months figure in bold.

Participant No.	Participant Short name	WP1	WP 2	WP 3	...	Total person months
1						
2						
3						
etc.						
Total						

B3.1.c. Project management

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

The proposal should outline plans for the Pilot Type A that conform to governmental standards for large scale ICT-projects. Plans should be produced for project management, document and software life cycle management, quality management and software development management. The project management plan should outline clearly resources, milestones, review and reporting procedures.

Organisational and change management should be properly addressed in the Pilot Type A proposal, with a detailed specification of the approach and methods to be used.

B3.2. Capability and commitment of the partnership

Describe each consortium partner, highlight their specific expertise for and their role in the project and indicate the key personnel (brief CV) foreseen to work on the project. Clearly indicate the co-ordinator, all of the participants of the consortium (including public entities, sub-contractors – if known at the stage of the submission) and the role of each in the proposed project. Include all necessary stakeholders in the value-chain. The organisation proposed to manage the project should be able to demonstrate prior competence and experience of managing large-scale international cooperation projects.

The composition of the consortium should be justified, in terms of presenting its capabilities and commitment for the tasks to be carried out in the project phase and to reach the objectives of the project.

Indicate whether a national administration is represented in the consortium by a designated legal entity to act on its behalf for the purpose of the project and explain why this representative was chosen.

If you are planning to enlarge the consortium during the course of the project, please include the profile of the envisaged new partners.

B3.3. Resources to be committed

In addition to the costs indicated on form A3 of the proposal, and the summary of staff effort shown in B3.1b table 4 above, please identify and substantiate any other major cost items (e.g. equipment, software, subcontracting). Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised,

including any resources that will complement the EC contribution. Show how the resources will be integrated in a coherent way, and show how the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

For personnel costs only the actual monthly rate needs to be given here, as the rationale on the amount of effort should be given in the project work plan. For "subcontracting", "indirect cost" and "other costs" a detailed breakdown and rationale must be given here.

Eligible costs of Pilots type A cover only activities and costs related to the interoperability issue. Applicants cannot claim costs related to national activities/services.

B3.4. Security, privacy, inclusiveness, interoperability; standards and open-source

State clearly how interoperability between products and services from different sources will be ensured and, where appropriate, how interconnection and interoperability of networks and services will be achieved.

State any security and privacy issues involved in the proposal and/or nature of the proposed service, and if so, how they are addressed in the proposal.

If they exist, the main standards being used should be identified. The proposal must (where applicable) clearly identify where a proprietary approach is used and the reasons for its use.

Proposals addressing problems connected with standardisation or regulation should explain what these problems are and how they will be addressed. The architecture should be compliant with the guidelines that each Member State has produced (if any), regarding the interoperability of information systems in both the public administration and in the application sector.

Describe the inclusiveness and accessibility of the service, both by its nature and the way it shall be provided

Annex 4 Form: Certification of National Authorised Representative

The co-ordinator must collect for each legal entity, acting in the proposal as authorised national representative the "Certification of national authorised representative" form (see below), filled and signed by the responsible national administration.

This is an official written declaration from the national administration on administration letter head paper, stamped, and signed by a legal representative.

Certification of national authorised representative

I hereby declare that [*full name of the legal entity receiving the authorisation*] is authorised to represent and act on behalf of [*name of the national authority giving the authorisation*] in the project [*project acronym and title*].

This delegation is limited to the scope of the project, but enables the representative to engage the National Authority in the definition of common specifications, and its future possible endorsement at the national level.

Further specific conditions can be added.

[Signature]
 [Name First name(s)]
 [Full Legal Name of organisation]
 [Date]

Stamp of organisation and **Signature** of the administrative official authorised to sign (legal representative).

Annex 5 Form: Non Exclusion Declaration

Certification and Declaration on Honour

I certify

- that our organisation is committed to participate in the above mentioned project (*Project Acronym and Title*).
- that the information relating to our organisation set out in the A2 forms is accurate and correct,
- that the estimated costs meet the criteria for eligible costs for ICT PSP projects, as established by the ICT PSP model grant agreement and our normal cost accounting principles, and that they reflect the estimated costs expected to be incurred in carrying out the work described in Part B of the proposal (Description of work).

As required by Article 114 of the Financial Regulation and Article 174 of the Implementing Rules to the Financial Regulation **I declare on my honour** that our organisation is NOT in any of the following situations of exclusion as specified in Articles 93 and 94 of the Financial Regulation:

- it is bankrupt or being wound up, is having its affairs administered by the courts, has entered into an arrangement with creditors, has suspended business activities, is the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, or is in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations
- it has been convicted of an offence concerning its professional conduct by a judgement which has the force of res judicata;
- it has been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authority can justify;
- it has not fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which it is established or with those of the country of the contracting authority or those of the country where the contract is to be performed;
- it has been the subject of a judgement which has the force of res judicata for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity detrimental to the Communities' financial interests;
- it is currently subject to an administrative penalty imposed the European Community, consisting in the exclusion from contracts or grants financed by the Community budget, and/or the payment of financial penalties;
- is subject to a conflict of interest or;
- is guilty of misrepresentation in supplying information required by the European Community as a condition of participation in a procurement procedure or grant award procedure or failed to supply this information.

[Signature]
[Name First name(s)]
[Full Legal Name of organisation]
[Date]

Stamp of organisation and **Signature** of the legal representative of the organisation

Annex 6 Evaluation criteria for Pilot Type A proposals in this call and the evaluation process

This Annex describes the evaluation criteria for Pilot Type A proposals and the evaluation process / procedures. Its purpose is to explain the different steps of the evaluation and to help applicants in drafting their proposal from the viewpoint of evaluation. This Annex does not substitute the requirement to have read and understood the contents of the Call for Proposals and the relevant ICT PSP Work Programme.


General considerations

The evaluation will be carried out by the Commission with the assistance of independent experts. Three sets of criteria (eligibility, award and selection criteria) have been defined in the ICT PSP Work Programme and will be applied to each submitted proposal. The descriptions of the three sets of criteria are presented in the different sections below

- Only proposals meeting the requirements of the eligibility criteria shall be evaluated further. The evaluation of proposals will be based on the principles of transparency and of equal treatment. Commission staff ensures that the process is fair.
- 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 confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration before beginning their work. Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

In addition, an independent expert or experts may be appointed by the Commission to observe the evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The role of the observer(s) is to give independent advice to the Commission 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(s) will not express views on the proposals under examination or the experts' opinions on the proposals.

Overview of the Evaluation Process – the different steps



1. Selection of Independent Experts

The independent experts to assist with the evaluation of proposals shall be identified by the Commission on the basis of a call for independent experts, leading to the establishment of a list of experts appropriate to the requirements of the Programme. Experts will be selected from this list on the basis of their ability to perform the tasks assigned to them, taking into account the thematic requirements of the call, and with consideration of geographical and gender balance.

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

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

Conflicts of interest: Under the terms of their appointment letter, experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform a Commission staff member if one becomes apparent during the course of the evaluation. The Commission 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 Commission to ensure this. Under no circumstance may an expert attempt to contact an applicant on his own account, either during the evaluation or afterwards.

2. Eligibility check

After receipt, proposals are registered and acknowledged. Their contents will be transferred from the EPSS servers into a database to support the evaluation process. All proposals will be assessed in accordance with the eligibility criteria to ensure that they conform to the eligibility requirements of the call, and to the submission procedure.

Eligibility criteria

The following must be complied with:

- E1) Timely submission as specified in the relevant Call for Proposals;
- E2) Submission of a complete proposal (i.e. both the requested administrative forms Part A and the proposal description Part B are present).
- E3) Compliance of the consortium composition to the rules set out in the relevant ICT PSP Work Programme.

Only proposals meeting the requirements of the eligibility criteria shall be evaluated further.

Furthermore, applicants will be excluded from participation if:

- (a) they are bankrupt or being wound up, are having their affairs administered by the courts, have entered into an arrangement with creditors, have suspended business activities, are the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, or are in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;
- (b) they have been convicted of an offence concerning their professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of res judicata;
- (c) they have been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the Community can justify;
- (d) they have not fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which they are established or with those of the country of the contracting authority or those of the country where the grant agreement is to be performed;
- (e) they have been the subject of a judgment which has the force of res judicata for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity detrimental to the Communities' financial interests;
- (f) they are currently subject to an administrative penalty imposed by the Community in accordance with Article 96(1) of the Financial Regulation¹;
- (g) they are subject to a conflict of interest;
- (h) they have made false declarations in supplying information required by the Community as a condition of participation in a procurement procedure or grant award procedure or fail to supply this information;

Applicants must certify that they are not in one of the situations listed above. Applicants making false declarations expose themselves to financial penalties and exclusion from grants and contracts².

3. Expert Briefing, Award and Selection Criteria

At the beginning of the evaluation, experts will be briefed by Commission staff, covering the evaluation procedure, the experts' responsibilities, the issues involved in the particular instrument/objective, and other relevant material.

Each of the eligible proposals will be assessed individually by the experts in accordance with the pre-determined award criteria.

Award criteria

Award criteria are grouped in three categories (a detailed description of criteria including Pilot Type A specific sub-criteria can be found below):

- A1) Relevance,
- A2) Impact,
- A3) Implementation

¹ Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2006 of 25 June 2002 (OJ L 248, 16.09.2002, p. 1), as amended

² Art. 175 of Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No. 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 (OJ L 357, 31 December 2002), as amended.

	Award criteria for Pilot Type A proposals
A1) Relevance	a) The alignment with the general objectives of the Work Programme and with the addressed specific objective.
	b) Alignment and coordination with – and reinforcement of - relevant policies, strategies and activities on European and national level.
A2) Impact	a) The contribution of the project to the target outcome and expected impact as defined in the specific objective addressed
	b) Long term impact: viability, sustainability and scalability beyond the phases of work sponsored by the Community in view of EU-wide operations. Attention should be given to the support by public entities and the capability to build support across the EU in view of reaching EU wide consensus
	c) The free availability of common results in view of implementing interoperability on EU wide level (specifications of interfaces, protocols, architecture, etc, as well as – where appropriate - open source reference implementations of necessary components and building blocks for interoperability)
A3) Implementation	a) Quality of the approach (taking into account specificities of the participation of administrations) and convincing work plan with well-defined work packages, schedule, partner roles and deliverables; effectiveness of the management approach
	b) Capability and commitment of the partnership to reach the objectives of the project. Attention should be given to the involvement of relevant stakeholders to achieve the objectives of the proposal
	c) Appropriateness of resource allocation and estimated cost in view of the achievement of the objectives of the proposal
	d) The appropriate attention to security, privacy, inclusiveness and accessibility; the appropriate use of interoperable platforms; open standards and open-source components

A score will be applied to each of the three award criteria (not for the sub-criteria). The sub-criteria are issues which the expert should consider in the assessment of that criterion. They also act as reminders of issues to be raised later during the evaluation process.

For each award criteria a score from 0 to 5 is given (half points possible for scores >3):

- 0 - the proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 - Very poor
- 2 - Not satisfactory
- 3 - Good
- 4 - Very Good
- 5 - Excellent

The respective thresholds for the award criteria are:

Criterion	Threshold
A1	3
A2	3
A3	3

If a proposal fails to achieve one or more of the threshold scores, it will nevertheless be evaluated on all criteria in order to provide feedback to the consortium.

Based on the scores of the individual award criteria, a total score will be calculated for each proposal by adding the individual scores without any weighting factor.

Proposals responding to each of the objectives of the call will be ranked in groups on that basis. In the case of proposals with equal scores, their scores for the award criteria will be used to differentiate them by taking account of the scores in A1, A2 and A3 in descending order of priority.

Selection criteria

Selection criteria will be applied to assess the applicant's financial and operational capacity to carry out the project (refer to S1) and S2) below)

S1) Financial capacity to carry out the project:

- a) Applicants must have stable and sufficient sources of funding to maintain their activity throughout the period during which the action is being carried out.

S2) Operational capacity to carry out the project: Applicants must have:

- a) Professional competencies and qualifications required to complete the proposed work in the project;
- b) The capacity to allocate adequate human resources to carry out the project in question.

Selection criteria are initially applied on the basis of the information supplied in the proposal. If weaknesses (e.g. in terms of their financial capacity) are identified compensating actions such as financial guarantees or other mitigating measures may be considered. Successful proposals called to

negotiations will be the subject of a formal legal and financial validation as a requirement to the issuing of a grant agreement.

4. Evaluation – individual assessment

Each proposal will first be assessed independently by several experts, chosen by the Commission from the pool of experts taking part in this evaluation. 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 criteria.

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

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

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

5. Evaluation - 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 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.

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

The outcome of the consensus step is the **Consensus Report** (CR). This will be signed (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 Commission 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.

6. Evaluation - Panel review

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

The panel comprises experts involved at the consensus step with the experts who reviewed the other proposals in the area.

The main task of the panel is to examine and compare the consensus reports for a given area (which normally will be at the level of an objective but may also be at the level of a theme, if appropriate), to check on the consistency of the marks applied during the consensus discussions and, where necessary, propose a new set of consensus scores.

The tasks of the panel will also include:

- resolving cases where a minority view was recorded in the consensus report
- recommending a priority order for proposals with the same score for all three award criteria,
- making recommendations on possible clustering or combination of proposals.

The panel is chaired by the Commission. The Commission 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.

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

- An Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) for each proposal;
- A list of proposals passing all thresholds, along with a final score for each proposal passing the thresholds and the panel recommendations for priority order;
- A list of evaluated proposals having failed one or more thresholds;
- A list of any proposals having been found ineligible;
- A summary of the deliberations of the panel.

If a panel has considered proposals submitted to various parts of the call (e.g. different objectives or themes) the panel report may contain accordingly several priority lists, if appropriate.

The panel report is signed by at least three panel experts and the Commission chairperson. A copy of the Evaluation Summary Report will be sent to each proposal coordinator.

Glossary

The following explanations are provided for clarity and easy-reference. They have no legal authority, and do not replace any official definitions set out in the relevant legal acts (e.g. Decision establishing the CIP, Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules, model grant agreement for ICT PSP).

A

acknowledgement of receipt

Applicants are informed electronically after the deadline that a proposal has been successfully submitted (but not that it is necessarily eligible). Contact the ICT PSP Help Desk urgently if you do not receive such an acknowledgement.

applicant

The term used generally in this guide for a person or entity applying to the ICT Policy Support Programme. The term 'participant' is used in the more limited sense of a member of a proposal or project consortium.

award criteria

These are part of the evaluation criteria on the basis of which proposals will be assessed. The award criteria are generally the same for all proposals throughout ICT PSP, and relate to relevance, impact and implementation. However, specific criteria may apply to certain instruments, and applicants should check the relevant Work Programme, and Annex 6 to this Guide.

B

Beneficiary

Signatory to a grant agreement with the European Community, represented by the European Commission

C

call for proposals (or "call")

An announcement, usually in the Official Journal, that opens parts of a Work Programme for proposals, indicating what types of actions are required. Full information on the call can be found on the ICT PSP website.

CIP

Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme (CIP), established by Decision No 1639/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 2006 (O J L 310, 9.11.2006, p. 15).

consortium

All instruments require proposals from a number of participants who agree to work together in a consortium.

consensus discussion

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

coordinator

The member of the consortium who acts as the point of contact with the Commission.

D

deadline

For a particular call, the moment after which proposals will not be received by the Commission, and when the Electronic Proposal Submission Service closes for that call. Deadlines are strictly enforced.

deliverable

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

data protection policy

The personal data collected in the context of the call for proposals will be processed in accordance with the Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data (OJ L8,12.01.2001, p.1).

E

Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)

A web-based service which must be used to submit proposals to the Commission. Access is given through the ICT PSP website, or via a specific site.

eligible costs

These are costs accepted by the Commission as being reimbursable (up to the limits established in the grant agreement). The nature of these costs varies between the different instruments (Pilots Type A, Pilots Type B and Thematic Networks).

eligibility criteria

The minimum conditions which a proposal must fulfil if it is to be evaluated. Some of the eligibility criteria are applicable for all proposals throughout ICT PSP (e.g. relating to submission before the deadline, completeness of the proposal), and some criteria are different for the different instruments (in particular the minimum participation requirements).

evaluation

The process by which proposals are, or are not, retained with a view to selection as projects. Evaluation is conducted through the application of eligibility, award and selection criteria identified in a work programme. The evaluation is conducted by the Commission assisted by independent experts.

evaluation criteria

The eligibility, award and selection criteria against which proposals are assessed.

Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)

The assessment of a particular proposal following the evaluation by independent experts. It normally contains both comments and scores for each evaluation criterion.

F

Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules

Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1606/2002 of 25 June 2002 on the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities (Official Journal L 248, 16.09.2002, p. 1), as amended by Regulation No 1995/2006 of 13 December 2006 (OJ L 390, 30.12.2006, p. 1).

Commission Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 2342/2002 of 23 December 2002 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of the Financial Regulation (OJ L 357, 31.12.2002, p.1), as last amended by Commission Regulation No 478/2007 of 23 April 2007 (OJ L 111, 28.04.2007, p. 13).

G

grant

Grants are direct financial contributions covered by a written agreement, by way of donation, from the Community budget in order to finance either an action intended to help achieve an objective forming part of a European Union policy; or the functioning of a body which pursues an aim of general European interest or has an objective forming part of a European Union policy.

grant agreement

Agreement between the Commission and the beneficiaries setting out the conditions of the awarding of Community grants.

ICT PSP

The "Information and Communication Technologies Policy Support Programme" (ICT PSP) is one of the three specific programmes of the "Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme" (CIP).

ICT PSP Associated countries

Non-EU countries which have agreed, negotiated and paid to participate in the ICT Policy Support Programme as part of the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme. In the context of proposal consortia, organisations from these countries are treated on the same footing as those in the EU. The up to date list of ICT PSP Associated countries can be found via the ICT PSP website.

individual assessment

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

information day

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

initial information letter

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

instruments

In the context of the ICT PSP, the instruments are the financing tools that allow achieving the objectives defined in the Work Programme for each of the themes. There are three types of instruments: Pilot Type A and Pilot Type B and Thematic Networks. The Work Programme indicates for each of the objectives the instrument that must be used.

N

National Contact Points (NCP)

Persons officially nominated by the national authorities to provide tailored information and advice on each instrument of ICT PSP, in the national language(s).

negotiation

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

O

objectives

In the context of the ICT PSP and for the themes identified in the 2008 Work Programme (eGovernment, Energy efficiency, Consensus building & Internet evolution), a number of objectives have been defined and described in the Work Programme. Each proposal must address one of these objectives.

OJ

P

Part A

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

Part B

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

participants

The members of a consortium in a proposal or project.

pilot Type A

ICT PSP instrument supporting large scale actions building on Member States or ICT PSP Associated countries existing initiatives that will help to ensure the EU-wide interoperability of ICT-based solutions.

pilot Type B

ICT PSP instrument supporting the implementation and uptake of and innovative service addressing the needs of citizens, governments and businesses. The pilot should be carried out under realistic conditions.

programme committee for ICT PSP

A group of official national representatives who assist the Commission in implementing the ICT PSP.

proposal

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

R

reserve list

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

S

selection criteria

These are part of the evaluation criteria on the basis of which proposals will be assessed. The selection criteria relate to the applicant's financial and operational capacity to carry out the project.

SME

Small or medium sized enterprise. An enterprise that satisfies the criteria laid down in Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC of 6 May 2003 concerning the definition of micro, small and medium-sized enterprises (OJ L 124, 20.05.2003, p. 36.) employs fewer than 250 persons; has an annual turnover not exceeding 50 million Euro, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding 43 million Euro.

T

thematic network

ICT PSP instrument supporting experience sharing and consensus building on ICT policy implementation around a common theme. The network may instigate working groups, workshops and exchanges of good practices.

themes

In the context of ICT PSP, the funding is concentrated on a limited set of actions in predefined themes where Community funding is needed. For 2008 the three main themes identified are eGovernment, Energy efficiency and Consensus building & Internet evolution.

thresholds

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

W

work package

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

Work Programme

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