



GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS FOR THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AWARDS

Science in Society Part 5

**COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION
(SUPPORTING)**

FP7-Science-in-Society-2007-2

Only electronic submission for topic SiS-2007-3.0.5.1: European Research Awards: Descartes Prize for trans-national collaborative research

Only paper submission for topic SiS-2007-3.0.5.2: European Research Awards: Prize for Science Communication

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

<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/calls>

About this Guide

This is version number 2 of the FP7 Guide for Applicants for the European Research Awards.

This guide describes the procedures:

for the online submission of proposals for the: "European Research Award: Descartes Prize for Trans-national Collaborative Research" (hereafter "Descartes Prize for Research")

for the paper submission of proposals for the "European Research Award: Prize for Science Communication" (hereafter, "Prize for Science Communication").

If it is revised during the course of FP7, the new Guide will be given a different version number and the changes will be indicated in this box.

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

Contents

1. GETTING STARTED: SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR THIS CALL	4
1.1. DESCARTES PRIZE FOR RESEARCH.....	4
1.2. PRIZE FOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATION.....	5
1.3. ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES AND SPONSORING ORGANISATIONS	6
2. HOW TO APPLY	7
2.1. STRUCTURE OF THE PROPOSAL	7
2.2. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION	8
2.2.1. <i>Descartes Prize for Research</i>	8
2.2.2. <i>Prize for Science Communication</i>	11
3. CHECK LIST.....	13
3.1. PREPARING THE PROPOSAL.....	13
3.2. FINAL CHECKS BEFORE SUBMISSION	13
3.2.1. <i>Descartes Prize for Research</i>	13
3.2.2. <i>Prize for Science Communication</i>	14
4. WHAT HAPPENS NEXT.....	15
GLOSSARY	16
ANNEXES	21
ANNEX 1: TIMETABLE AND SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR THIS CALL.....	22
ANNEX 2: EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES TO BE APPLIED FOR THIS CALL.....	24
ANNEX 3 INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING "PART A" OF THE PROPOSAL	31
ANNEX 3.1 DESCARTES PRIZE FOR RESEARCH.....	31
ANNEX 3.2 PRIZE FOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATION	31
ANNEX 3.3 NOTES ON FORMS A1 AND A2	35
ANNEX 4 PART B OF THE PROPOSAL.....	39
ANNEX 4.1 DESCARTES PRIZES FOR RESEARCH	39
ANNEX 4.2 PRIZE FOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATION	46

1. Getting started: Specific information for this call

1.1. Descartes Prize for Research

Due to the specific nature of the Descartes Prize for Research, the application of the evaluation criteria for Specific Support Actions have been adapted to the characteristics of this prize. As such, the Descartes Prize for Research does not reward research proposed for the future, but research (and therefore research results) that has been already performed. It is awarded to teams having achieved outstanding scientific or technological results from European collaborative research in any field of science, including the economic, social and human sciences.

- **Proposer(s):**

1. Proposals may be submitted by the team who conducted the research. In this case, the coordinator of the team fills in the electronic file for on-line submission in accordance with the instructions found both in this guide and on the electronic submission website.
2. Proposals may be also be submitted by appropriate public or private organisations (for example: research centres, foundations) in which they nominate a candidate team for the award. In this case, the sponsoring organisation fill in the electronic file for on-line submission in accordance with the instructions found both in this guide and on the electronic submission website.

Proposals for the Descartes Prize for Research can **only be submitted electronically using the online¹ submission procedure** described in the relevant parts of this guide. The proposal will consist of a file in which the candidates for the Descartes Prize for Research present themselves, or are presented, along with the work that is being put forward to the Commission for evaluation. Only one candidature will be accepted per proposal.

- **Proposals are evaluated by independent experts** who are grouped into thematic panels. A meeting of the presidents of thematic panels will be held in order to reach an agreement on a shortlist of proposals for the Descartes Prize for Research which will be forwarded to the Grand Jury. The Grand Jury members will then interview the coordinators of the shortlisted projects (in the presence of the presidents of the thematic panels). The Grand Jury will propose the definitive list of projects they have selected in accordance with the following three categories: nominee, finalist or laureate. This list might not necessarily include all the teams in the shortlist proposed by the president of the panels. The Commission will make a final decision on the basis of the Grand Jury's recommendations and following the internal procedures required.
- **The final number** of nominees, finalists and laureates to share the prize is to be determined by the Grand Jury.
- **Nominees are** all candidates who have passed the threshold and who were selected by the presidents of the thematic panels to be interviewed by the Grand Jury are nominees. They will receive a diploma stating their participation in the Descartes Prizes for Research. Among these nominees, the Grand Jury will select the finalists and laureates. For information on the maximum number of finalists and laureates as well as the prize monies that will be awarded, please consult the Call Fiche of the Science in Society 2007 work programme

¹ see also Section 2.2 of this guide

- **The prize:** Whether the research teams were proposed by an organisation or by themselves, it is the research teams themselves that will receive the distinction and the prize money, if awarded. **The prize monies will be awarded by means of a grant letter.**

1.2. Prize for Science Communication

The Prize for Science Communication is awarded to organisations or individuals that have achieved outstanding results in science communication. It is therefore a prize that is also awarded for work already completed and, in this particular case, for work having been officially recognised. In consequence, the evaluation criteria for this Coordination and Support Action (Support) have also been adapted to the characteristics of this prize as well as the submission procedure.

- **Proposers:** These must be organisations (hereinafter referred to as “prize organisers”) which award a prize or prizes in the field of science communication. At the time of the of the submission deadline for the Prize for Science Communication, the prize organisers must have awarded, at least, one prize in any of the categories established in the Science in Society Work Programme to the candidate who they are putting forward.
- **Proposals** for the Prize for Science Communication can **only be submitted on paper** with any relevant material attached as an annex. This is because of the diverse nature of the material that could be eligible for consideration for a prize (for example books, videos etc). Proposals are submitted by the prize organiser and not by the candidate him or herself. Only one candidature will be accepted per proposal.
- **Proposal are evaluated by independent experts** who are grouped into thematic panels. These panel propose a shortlist directly to the Commission in which they will identify the nominees. All candidates who have passed the threshold will be nominees. They will receive a diploma stating their participation in the Prize for Science Communication. .The finalists and laureates will be selected amongst this list. For information on the maximum number of finalists and laureates as well as the prize monies that will be awarded, please consult the Call Fiche of the Science in Society 2007 workprogramme.
- **Prize:** In the case of diverse actors involved in the communication product (e.g. a producer, a director, etc.) the money will be transferred to the same actor who was previously awarded a prize by the prize organiser. **The prize monies will be awarded by means of a grant letter.**

1.3. Eligible Candidates and Sponsoring organisations

For the **Descartes Prizes for Research**, the research teams must comprise a minimum of two mutually independent legal entities* (organisations or individuals) of which one must be a Member state, and the other one from any other country (Member States, Associated Country or from rest of the world).

For the **Prize for Science Communication**, proposals must be submitted by a legal entity (organisations or individuals) from a Member States (MS) or an Associated Country (AC) that is awarding science communication prizes on a national and/or international level ("prize organisers"). The candidates proposed (for whom there are no restrictions as to their nationality) must be winners of a science communication award of such a "prize organiser".

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

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

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

The EU Member States are:

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

*(*from 1 January 2007)*

The Associated Countries are:

a) Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway (subject to amendment procedure of EEA agreement)

b) Switzerland, Israel (subject to satisfactory conclusion of bilateral S/T agreements)

c) Turkey, Croatia, Serbia and FYR of Macedonian (subject to satisfactory completion of the decision-making procedure associating these countries via a Memorandum of Understanding)

Other countries may become associated during the course of FP7. The latest news will be posted on the CORDIS web site.

The following can participate in the European Research Awards:

- Any legal entity established in a Member State or an Associated country (including the European Commission's Joint Research Centre), or created under Community law (e.g. a European Economic Interest Grouping),
- Any international European interest organisation (see glossary).
- Any legal entity established in an FP7 International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC). The list of ICPC can be found on the CORDIS web-site, and is given in annex 1 of the related work programme.

2. How to apply

2.1. Structure of the proposal

A proposal has two parts:

Part A will contain the administrative information about the work conducted and the participants. The information requested includes a brief description of the work, contact details and characteristics of the participants. 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. See Annex 3 of this guide.

Part B is a "template", or list of headings, rather than an administrative form. This structure should be followed when presenting the scientific and technical content of the work conducted. The template is designed to highlight those aspects that will be assessed against the **evaluation criteria** (see annex 2 of this guide). It covers, among other things, the nature of the work and the impacts that have arisen, and in the case the Descartes Prize for Research the participants and their roles in the proposed project. Only black and white copies are used for evaluation and you are strongly recommended, therefore, not to use colour in your document (this may not apply to annexes that are attached to the paper submission for the Prize for Science Communication).

A maximum length may be specified for the different sections of Part B, or for Part B as a whole (see annex 4 of this Guide). You must keep your application within these limits. Even where no page limits are given, or where limits are only recommended, it is in your interest to keep your text concise since over-long documents are rarely viewed in a positive light by the evaluating experts.

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.

Ethical principles

Please remember that the work submitted for the European Research Awards should respect fundamental ethical principles, including those reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. These principles include the need to ensure the freedom of research and the need to protect the physical and moral integrity of individuals and the welfare of animals. For this reason, the European Commission carries out an ethical review of proposals when appropriate. The following fields of are **not eligible** for consideration for the European Research Awards:

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

Other sources of help

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

- The Commission's general **enquiry service** on any aspect of FP7. Questions can be sent to a single e-mail address and will be directed to the most appropriate department for reply.
- A dedicated help desk has been set up to deal with technical questions related to the **Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)**.
- A further help desk providing assistance on intellectual property matters.
- Any other guidance documents or background information relating specifically to this call.

2.2. Proposal submission

Please note that as part of the start-up of FP7, the Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS) is expected to become available at least four weeks before the call deadline. Further information will be given on the CORDIS site.

2.2.1. Descartes Prize for Research

Online Electronic Submission through the Electronic Proposal Submission Service (EPSS)

Proposals for the Descartes Prizes for Research 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 evaluated².

All the data uploaded 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 will be found in the "EPSS preparation and submission guide". This will be available from the CORDIS site early in 2007.

The most important points are explained below.

² 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. 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.

Use of the system by the proposal coordinator

As a coordinator you can:

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

Use of the system by the other participants

Other participants can:

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

Submitting the proposal

Completing the Part A forms in the EPSS and uploading a Part B does **not** yet mean that the proposal is submitted. **Once there is a consolidated version of the proposal the coordinator must expressly submit it by pressing the “SUBMIT” button.** Only the coordinator is authorised to submit the proposal.

On submission, the EPSS performs an automatic validation of the proposal. An automatic message is sent to the coordinator if the system detects any apparent problems. This automatic validation does not replace the more detailed eligibility check later carried out by the Commission.

Irrespective of any page limits specified in annex 4 of 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 the part B file. You should only use alphanumeric characters. Special characters and spaces must be avoided.

If successfully submitted, the coordinator receives a message that indicates that the proposal has been received. The coordinator may continue to modify the proposal and submit revised versions overwriting the previous one (by pressing the “SUBMIT button” each time!) right up until the deadline.

If the 'SUBMIT' button is never pressed, the Commission considers that no proposal has been submitted.

For the proposal Part B you must use exclusively PDF (“portable document format”, compatible with Adobe version 3 or higher, with embedded fonts). Other file formats will not be accepted by the system.

About the deadline

Proposals must be submitted on or before the deadline specified in the Call fiche.

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

Call deadlines are absolutely firm and are strictly enforced.

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

Leaving your first submission attempt to the last few minutes of the call will give you no time to overcome even the smallest technical difficulties, proposal verification problems or communications delays which may arise. Such events are never accepted as extenuating circumstances; the 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. 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 the 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.

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

Such a failure is a rare and exceptional event, therefore do not assume that there will be an extension to this call. If you have difficulty in submitting the 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 the proposal well before the deadline to have time to solve any problems.

Correcting or revising your proposal

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

Once the deadline has passed, however, the Commission can accept no further additions, corrections or re-submissions. The last eligible version of the 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

A proposal may be withdrawn by submitting a revised version with an empty part B section, with the following words entered in the abstract field of form A:

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

2.2.2. Prize for Science Communication

Submission on paper

The nature of the content of proposals for the Prize for Science Communication can be extremely diverse and it is not possible for the Electronic Proposal Submission Service to foresee and handle all the items that could be submitted for consideration for an award. For this reason proposals along with any relevant annexes must be submitted on paper to the address given below, and received by the Commission before the deadline given.

The proposal will comprise two parts, Part A (Annex 3 of this guide) and Part B (Annex 4 of this guide):

Preparing your proposal for submission

Your proposal should be submitted as one complete unbound Part A and one complete unbound Part B.

The Commission will reproduce the number of copies needed by the evaluators, therefore:

- **Print your proposal on white A4 paper (80 g/m²)**
- **Print on one side of the paper only; no two-sided copies please**
- **Do not convey information using colour; the copies will be made in black and white**
- **Do not use glossy or surfaced paper**
- **Do not include paper clips or staples**
- **Do not include front or back covers of plastic, card, etc.**
- **Do not bind your proposal**

Prize organisers are strongly advised to securely retain an additional complete unbound copy of your proposal.

3. Check list

3.1. Preparing the proposal

- **Does the work fit with the requirements for European Research Award (Descartes Prize for Research or Prize for Science communication) ?** (See the current version of the work programme).
- **Is the proposal eligible?** The eligibility criteria are given in the work programme. In particular, make sure that you satisfy the minimum requirements for the makeup of your consortium. Have any special eligibility criteria been set for this call? Any proposal not meeting the eligibility requirements will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- **Is the proposal complete?** Proposals must comprise a Part A and a Part B containing the scientific and technical description of the proposal as described in this guide. A proposal that does not contain both parts will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- **Does the work raise ethical issues?** Ethical, safety or regulatory aspects of the work undertaken and how they have been dealt with must be identified. An ethical check will take place during the evaluation and an ethical review will take place for proposals dealing with sensitive issues. Proposals may be rejected on ethical grounds if such issues are not dealt with satisfactorily.
- **Does the proposal follow the required structure?** Proposals should be precise and concise, and must follow exactly the proposal structure described in this document (annex 4 of this guide), which is designed to correspond to the evaluation criteria which will be applied (annex 2 of this guide). Omitting requested information will almost certainly lead to lower scores and possible rejection.
- **Maximising chances of successes?** There will be strong competition and the proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria given in annex 2 of this guide. Therefore, it should be tightly edited and any obvious weak points strengthened or eliminated. It is recommended that drafts are "reviewed" by experienced colleagues; their advice could be used to improve the proposal before submission.

3.2. Final checks before submission

3.2.1. Descartes Prize for Research

- **Is there authorisation** of all the members of the consortium to submit this proposal on their behalf?
- **Is your Part B in portable document format (PDF)**, including no material in other formats?
- **Is the filename made up of the letters A to Z, and numbers 0 to 9?** You should avoid special characters and spaces.

- **Has Part B been printed out** 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 the Part B file within the size limit of 10 Mbytes?**
- **Has the computer from which the submission will be made been virus-checked?** The EPSS will automatically block the submission of any file containing a virus.
- **It is the responsibility of the research team coordinator or the proposing organisation to submit the proposal. Familiarity with the EPSS should therefore be made in good time**
- **Has time been allowed to submit a first version of the proposal well in advance of the deadline** (at least several days before), and then to continue to improve it with regular resubmissions?
- **Has the on-screen 'SUBMIT' command been selected and "pressed" after the final version?**

3.2.2. Prize for Science Communication

- Has the necessary authorisation from the candidate be obtained to submit the proposal (the Commission does not prescribe in which form the authorisations are made and will not check them)?
- Are both standard forms Part A and Part B complete?
- Use only copies of the forms at annexes 3 and 4 of this guide.
- Is each page of your Part B headed with the proposal acronym.
- Is each of the pages of your Part B numbered (page X of Y)?
- Is the proposal prepared as one complete unbound single-sided paper copy (plus one additional copy to be held in reserve)?

Is the copy of the proposal complete, with no pages missing?

- Is the copy of the proposal placed in an appropriate package in accordance with section 2.2.2?
- Last but not least: have all possible arrangements been made to ensure that the proposal arrives at the Commission before the deadline?

Please note that for the Prize for Science Communication, proposals must be received **before the deadline at the address specified in the call**. If you send or deliver your proposal at any other Commission address, its time of receipt is still based on its time of arrival at the address specified in the call.

4. 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 (In the case of the Prize for Science Communication, the acknowledgement of receipt will be sent to the Prize organisers) given in the submitted proposal. This is assumed to be the individual named on the A2 form for participant no. 1. Please note that the brief electronic message given by the EPSS system after each submission is not the official Acknowledgement of Receipt.

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

If you have not received an acknowledgement of receipt within 12 working days after the call deadline (or cut-off date, in the case of a continuously open call), you should contact the FP7 Enquiry Service 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 (see the work programme and annex 2 of this Guide).

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

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

Based on the results of the evaluation by experts, the Panel Presidents and the Grand Jury, the Commission draws up the final list of nominees, finalists and laureates.

There will be no contract negotiations as such in the case of the Descartes Prize for Research and the Prize for scientific communication. The prize monies will be awarded by means of a grant letter.

Glossary

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

A

Acknowledgement of receipt :

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

Associated countries

Non-EU countries who have agreed, negotiated and paid to participate in the Framework Programme. In the context of proposal consortia, organisations from these countries are treated on the same footing as those in the EU. The list of associated countries is given in the body of this guide.

Applicant

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

C

Call for proposals (or "call")

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

Call fiche

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

Consortium

Most *funding schemes* require proposals from a number of participants (usually at least three) 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.

Co-ordinator

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

CORDIS service

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

Cut-off date

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

D**Deadline**

For a particular *call*, the moment after which proposals 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 workpackage will produce one or more deliverables during its lifetime. Deliverables are often written reports but can also take another form, for example the completion of a prototype etc.

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 *CORDIS* web-site, or via a specific site.

Eligibility criteria

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

Enquiry service

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

Evaluation criteria

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

Evaluation Summary Report

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

F**Funding scheme**

The type of support that can be given to a project within a call. The funding schemes have different objectives, and are implemented through different grant agreement conditions.

G

Grant agreement

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

H

hearing

Applicants whose proposals have been favourably evaluated are sometimes invited to Brussels to answer any specific questions raised by the experts.

I

Individual assessment

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

Information Days

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

International Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC)

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

International organisations of European interest

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

J

Joint Research Centre (JRC)

The Commission's own research laboratories.

M

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

N

National Contact Points (NCP)

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

Negotiation

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

P**Part A**

The part of a proposal dealing with administrative data.

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.

Participants

The members of a consortium in a proposal or project.

Programme committee

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

Proposal

In the case of the European Research Awards this is a description of the work being put forward for recognition and the persons responsible for it.

R**RTD**

Research and technological development.

S**SME**

Small and medium sized enterprise.

Specific international cooperation actions (SICA)

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

T**Thresholds**

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

W

Weightings

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

Work Programme

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

Annexes

- Annex 1 Timetable and specific information for this call
- Annex 2 Evaluation criteria and procedure
- Annex 3 Instructions for completing "part A" of the proposal
- Annex 4 Instructions for drafting "part B" of the proposal

Annex 1: Timetable and specific information for this call

- The **work programme** provides the essential information for submitting a proposal to this call. It describes the content of the topics to be addressed, and details on how it will be implemented. The work programme is available on the CORDIS call page (<http://cordis.europa.eu>). The part giving the basic data on implementation (deadline, budget, special conditions etc) is also posted as a separate document ("call fiche"). These documents must be consulted.
- Indicative timetable for this call**

Publication of call	13 April 2007
Deadline for submission of proposals	17 July 2007 17:00
Evaluation of proposals	Descartes Prize for Research: 1 st week September 2007 Prize for Science Communication: 3 rd week September
Grand Jury meeting for the selection of the laureates for the Descartes Prize for Research	2 nd week of October
Letter to successful/unsuccessful applicants	From 3 rd week November 2007

- Further information and help**

The CORDIS call page contains links to other sources that may be useful in preparing and submitting the proposal⁴. Direct links are also given where applicable.

Call information

CORDIS call page and work programme
Evaluation forms
Information Days related to this call

General sources of help:

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

National Contact Points http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ncp_en.html

⁴ Not all documents will be available at the moment of the first call for publication of FP7.

Additional Sources of Help:

Information about the Descartes Prizes for Research and the Prize for Science Communication can be found at the following website:

http://ec.europa.eu/research/descartes/index_en.htm

Furthermore, subject to availability, brochures identifying past winners and their projects can be obtained on request via the FP7 Enquiry Service (<http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries>)

Specialised and technical assistance:

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

EPSS Help desk support@epss-fp7.org

IPR helpdesk <http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org>

Legal documents generally applicable

Decision on the Framework Programme
Rules for Participation
Specific Programmes
Rules for proposal submission, evaluation selection and award

Other supporting information

Brochure "The FP7 in Brief"
European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment
International cooperation

Annex 2: Evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied for this call

Annexe 2.1 General

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

Commission staff ensure that the process is fair, and in line with the principles contained in the Commission's rules⁵.

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 will 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 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 will not express views on the proposals under examination or the experts' opinions on the proposals.

Annexe 2.2 Before the evaluation

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

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

- It is received by the Commission before the deadline given in the call fiche
- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call fiche
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)
- The content of the proposal relates to the topic(s) and funding scheme(s), including any special conditions set out in the relevant parts of the work programme

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

⁵ Rules on Proposal Submission, Evaluation, Selection and Award Procedures (to be posted on CORDIS)

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

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

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

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

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

Annexe 2.3 Individual evaluation of proposals

This stage will be carried out in Brussels.

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 area/objective, and other relevant material (including the integration of the international cooperation dimension).

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

The proposal will be evaluated against pre-determined evaluation criteria.

<i>Evaluation criteria applicable to the Descartes Prizes for Research</i>	
EXCELLENCE AND QUALITY	EUROPEAN ADDED VALUE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and novelty of the results achieved • Contribution to addressing key scientific and technological issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To extent to which the results of the research could only have been achieved if carried out at European level and beyond

<i>Evaluation criteria applicable to the Prize for Science Communication</i>		
S/T QUALITY	Relevance and impact	European added value
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy, competence and innovativeness of the technical means invested in the communication • Accuracy, appropriateness and soundness of the scientific content 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of the communication activity in raising the profile science, engineering or technology, soon through the eyes of the intended public • Capability of the science communication to address the main concerns and/or expectations of the European society 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capability of the communication activity, or of the professional engaged in communication, to offer a model for its transposition into different cultural backgrounds • Capability of the communication activity or of the professional engaged in communication, to open new lines of thought and trigger subsequent initiatives in a wider context

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

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

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

- 0 - *The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*
- 1 - *Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.*
- 2 - *Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.*
- 3 - *Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.*
- 4 - *Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.*
- 5 - *Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*

For the Descartes Prizes for Research the scores for the different criteria will be weighted as follows

- Excellence and quality – weighting: 3
- European added value – weighting: 1

For the Prizes on science communication, the scores for the different criteria will be as follows:

- Excellence and quality – weighting: 1
- Relevance and impact – weighting: 1
- European added value – weighting 2

Thresholds will be applied to the scores. For the Descartes Prizes for Research, the threshold for individual criteria will be 4 for Scientific quality and 4 for European added value.. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the two individual scores plus 1, will be 17.

For the prize on science communication, threshold for the individual criteria will be 4 for scientific quality, 3 for relevance and impact and 3 for European added value. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores plus three, will be 16.

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

Conflicts of interest: Under the terms of the 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.

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 Assessment Report (IAR), giving scores and also comments against the evaluation criteria.

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

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

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

The experts will also indicate whether, in their view, the proposal deals with sensitive ethical issues,

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

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

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

Annexe 2.4 Consensus meeting

Once all the experts to whom a proposal has been assigned have completed their IAR, 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. They also come to a common view on the questions of scope, ethics

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

Ethical issues (above threshold proposals): If one or more experts have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, and the proposal is considered to be above threshold,

the relevant box on the consensus report (CR) will be ticked and an Ethical Issues Report (EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues. Exceptionally for this issue, no consensus is required.

The EIR will be signed by the Commission moderator and one member of the consensus group (normally, the proposal rapporteur).

Outcome of consensus

The outcome of the consensus step is the consensus report. 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.

Evaluation of a resubmitted proposal

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

Annexe 2.5 Panel evaluation and shortlist of nominees for Descartes Prizes for Research - selection of finalists and laureates for Prize on Science Communication

Descartes Prize for Research

A meeting of the presidents of the thematic panels will be held in order to reach an agreement on a recommended shortlist for the Descartes Prizes for Research. The shortlist will be produced on the basis of the list of proposed nominees produced by the thematic panels and the relevant Consensus Reports.

The decision made by the thematic panel presidents will be transferred to a written document with the signatures of all of them plus a Commission official.

The shortlist of nominees will not necessarily include those proposals which have scored highest in each thematic panel. Thematic panel presidents are free to decide if and to what extent there have been one or more thematic panels which have scored noticeably higher or lower than the average, and to amend the marks accordingly. If this is the case, the shortlist will include a written explanation of how they have decided to make up for these differences.

Finally, the shortlist of nominees will be forwarded to Grand Jury members, along with a copy of the short listed entries for a first assessment of their content.

Prize for Science Communication

A meeting of the panel presidents of the different categories will be held in order to reach an agreement on a definitive list of finalists and laureates for the Prize for Science Communication. The list will be produced on the basis of the Consensus Reports of those proposals having passed the overall threshold.

The decision made by the panel presidents will be transferred to a written document with the signatures of all of them.

The list of laureates will not necessarily include those proposals which have scored highest in each category. The panel presidents are free to recommend on and to what extent there have been one or more categories which have scored noticeably higher or lower than the average, and to amend the marks accordingly. If this is the case, the list of laureates will include a written explanation of how they have decided to make up for these differences.

The Commission will make a final decision on the basis of the panel presidents' recommendations, and following the internal procedures required. The decision will be announced publicly either before or during the official award ceremony.

Annexe 2.6 Descartes Prize for Research: selection of laureates and finalists by the Descartes Grand Jury

There will be an independent Grand Jury which will choose the teams to be awarded or to be finalists among those nominees presented by the thematic panel presidents at the end of Step 5 of the evaluation process. The Commission will appoint the Grand Jury members; however, scientific organisations are free to propose names to the Commission. They will be independent experts from different countries and covering the broadest spectrum of scientific disciplines, drawn from the widest possible base (e.g. academia, industry, universities and media). The Commission will nominate a Jury member to be the President of the Descartes Grand Jury, on an annual basis. It is possible to be a member of the Descartes Grand Jury for a maximum of four years, but not more than three times as President.

Once the Jury members have received the copies of the Descartes Prize for Research nominee entries, they will be invited by the Commission to a further meeting in order to make the final selection of laureates and finalists. During that meeting, they will interview the co-ordinators of the nominee projects (in presence of the respective panel presidents). Finally, with the assistance of the panel presidents, the Grand Jury will propose the definitive list of projects they have selected to be laureate or finalist for the Descartes Prize for Research.

The Commission will make a final decision on the basis of the Grand Jury's recommendations, and following the internal procedures required. The decision will be announced publicly either before or during the official award ceremony.

The Commission will inform all the participants about the state of play of their submitted projects by letter at the end of the official decision procedure.

Please note that any detailed information about the selection of the project, whether it is in the shortlist of nominees or not, will only be given if a written request addressed to the Commission is made by the proposers.

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

Annex 3 Instructions for completing "part A" of the proposal

Part A records certain administrative details that will be used in the evaluation and further processing of the proposal. Part A forms are an integral part of the proposal. Details of the work performed must be described in part B (annex 4).

Annex 3.1 Descartes Prize for Research

Section A1 gives a snapshot of the proposal and section A2 concerns the organisation and its partners that are candidates for the Prize.

Proposals for the Descartes Prizes for Research must be submitted electronically, these forms will be become available on EPSS upon the publication of the call.

Please note:

- The coordinator (or sponsor) fills in the section A1.
- The participants in the research team each fill in section A2.
- In the case in which an organisation wishes to nominate a research team the sponsoring organisation must liaise with the nominee team to ensure that the A2 forms are nonetheless as complete as possible. Where some information is missing "-" should be entered in the respective box. The sponsoring organisation must also fill out the relevant parts of the part B (annex 4), again in collaboration with the nominee team.

The table at Annex 3.3 provides an explanation of all areas the needs to be filled in forms A1 and A2.

Annex 3.2 Prize for Science Communication

Proposals will be submitted in paper using the forms which can be found in this section of this Guide as well as in Annex 4.2. The prize organiser (who is proposing a candidate for the Prize for Science Communication), should fill in forms A1, A.2.1 and A.2.2.

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
7th Framework Programme on
Research, Technological
Development and Demonstration

**Prize for Science
Communication**

A1: Content

Proposal Number ⁶		Proposal Acronym	
------------------------------	--	------------------	--

GENERAL INFORMATION

<i>Proposal Title</i>			
<i>Duration in months</i>		<i>Call (part) identifier</i>	
<i>Activity code(s) most relevant to your topic</i>			
<i>Free keywords</i>			

<i>Abstract (max. 2000 char.)</i>			

Similar proposals or signed contracts?			
<i>a) Has this proposal (or a very similar one) been previously submitted to a call for proposals of the 7th EU RTD Framework Programme?</i>			YES/NO/Don't KNOW
IF YES			
<i>- please give the call identifier</i>			
<i>- please give the proposal or contract number (if known)</i>			
<i>b) Is this proposal (or a very similar one) currently being submitted to another call under FP7?</i>			YES/NO
IF YES			
<i>- please give the call identifier</i>			

⁶ For the Prize for Science Communication, the proposal number shall be sent to the applicants upon reception of the proposal, accompanied by an acknowledgment of receipt.

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
7th Framework Programme on
Research, Technological
Development and Demonstration

Prize for Science
Communication

A2.1 Participants

Each participant should complete their own section "Participants"

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym		Participant number	
-----------------	--	------------------	--	--------------------	--

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS (ONE FORM PER PARTICIPANT)

If your organisation has already registered for FP7, enter your Participant Identity Code

Organisation legal name
(Proposing organisation)

Basic administrative data

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

Status of your organisation

Certain types of organisations benefit from special conditions under the FP7 participation rules. The Commission also collects data for statistical purposes.

The guidance notes will help you complete this section.

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

- | | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Non-profit organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Public body | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Research organisation | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Higher or secondary education establishment | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Proposal Submission



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

7th Framework Programme on
Research, Technological
Development and Demonstration

**Prize for Science
Communication**

A2.2 Participants

Each participant should complete their own section "Participants"

Proposal Number		Proposal Acronym		Participant number	
-----------------	--	------------------	--	--------------------	--

INFORMATION ON PARTICIPANTS (ONE FORM PER PARTICIPANT)

If your organisation has already registered for FP7, enter your Participant Identity Code	
---	--

Organisation legal name (Communication Candidate)	
---	--

Basic administrative data

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

Status of your organisation

Certain types of organisations benefit from special conditions under the FP7 participation rules. The Commission also collects data for statistical purposes.

The guidance notes will help you complete this section.

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

Non-profit organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public body	<input type="checkbox"/>
Research organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>
Higher or secondary education establishment	<input type="checkbox"/>

Annex 3.3 notes on forms A1 and A2

Section A1: Summary	
Proposal Acronym	<p>The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this call. It should be of <u>no more than 20 characters</u> (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please).</p> <p>The same acronym should appear on each page of part B of your proposal.</p>
Proposal Title	<p>The title should be <u>no longer than 200 characters</u> and should be understandable to the non-specialist in your field.</p>
Duration in months	<p>Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months.</p>
Call (part) identifier	<p>[pre-filled]</p> <p>The call identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you are addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union, and on the CORDIS call page. A call identifier looks like this: <i>FP7COOP-FOOD-???</i></p>
Activity code(s) most relevant to your topic	<p>All activities and topics of FP7 have been assigned unique codes, which are used in the processing of data on proposals and subsequent contracts. The codes are organised hierarchically.</p> <p>The choice of the first activity code will be limited in the drop-down menu to one of the topics open in this call. Select the code corresponding to the topic most relevant to your proposal.</p> <p>The choice for the second code is also limited to topics open in the call in question. Enter a second code if your proposal also addresses another of these. Select 'none' if this is not the case.</p> <p>Select a third code if your proposal is also relevant to another theme. This time, the available codes will simply correspond to broad themes. Select 'none' if this is not the case.</p>
Free Keywords	<p>Please enter a number of keywords that you consider sufficient to characterise the scope of your proposal.</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 100 characters</u>.</p>
Abstract	<p>The abstract should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the Work Programme. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to the programme management committees and other interested parties. It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information. Please use plain typed text, avoiding formulae and other special characters. If the proposal is written in a language other than English, please include an English version of the proposal abstract in part B.</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 2000 characters</u>.</p>
Similar proposals or signed contracts	<p>A 'similar' proposal or contract is one that differs from the current one in minor ways, and in which some of the present consortium members are involved.</p>

Section A2/ Participants¹	
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 Identify Code	Not applicable to the first call.
Legal name	<p>For Public Law Body, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Entity, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body;</p> <p>For Private Law Body, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register.</p> <p>For a natural person, it is for e.g. Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT.</p>
Organisation Short Name	<p>Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents.</p> <p>This short name should not be more <u>than 20 characters</u> exclusive of special characters (./;...), for e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, for e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus. Mac.</p>
Legal address	<p>For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office.</p> <p>For Individuals it is the Official Address.</p> <p>If your address is specified by an indicator of location other than a street name and number, please insert this instead under the "street name" field and "N/A" under the "number" field.</p>
Non-profit organisation	Non-profit organisation is a legal entity qualified as such when it is recognised by national or, international law.
Public body	Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.
Research organisation	Research organisation means a legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.
NACE code	<p>NACE means "<u>Nomenclature des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne</u>".</p> <p>Please select one activity from the list that best describes your professional and economic ventures. If you are involved in more than one economic activity, please select the one activity that is most relevant in the context of your contribution to the proposed project. For more information on the methodology, structure and full content of NACE (rev. 1.1) classification please consult EUROSTAT at:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&StrNom=NACE_1_1&StrLanguageCode=EN&StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC .</p>

¹ For the Prize for Science Communication the A2 forms are subdivided into A2.1 to be filled in by the proposing organisation and A2.2 to be filled in by the Communication prize candidate.

<p>Economic Activity</p>	<p>Trade activity irrespective of a profit or non profit purpose</p>
<p>Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)</p>	<p>SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) employees; (b) persons working for the enterprise being subordinated to it and deemed to be employees under national law; (c) owner-managers; (d) partners engaging in a regular activity in the enterprise and benefiting from financial advantages from the enterprise. <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> <p>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>Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)</p>	<p>Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A legal entity is under the same direct or indirect control as another legal entity (SG); or – A legal entity directly or indirectly controls another legal entity (CLS); or – A legal entity is directly or indirectly controlled by another legal entity (CLB). <p>Control: Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A, directly or indirectly, holds more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of B, or – A, directly or indirectly, holds in fact or in law the decision-making powers in B. <p>The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) the same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50 % of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates; (b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.
<p>Organisation Short Name</p>	<p>Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents.</p> <p>This short name should not be more <u>than 20 characters</u> exclusive of special characters (./;...), for e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, for e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac.</p>

Character of dependence	<p>According to the explanation above mentioned, please insert the appropriate abbreviation according to the list below to characterise the relation between your organisation and the other participant(s) you are related with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG: Same group: if your organisation and the other participant are controlled by the same third party; • CLS: Controls: if your organisation controls the other participant; • CLB: Controlled by: if your organisation is controlled by the other participant.
Contact point	It is the main scientist or team leader in charge of the proposal for the participant. For participant number 1 (the coordinator), this will be the person the Commission will contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, invitation to hearings, sending of evaluation results, convocation to negotiations).
Title	Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.
Sex	This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.
Phone and fax numbers	Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.

Annex 4 Part B of the proposal

Part B provides the structure of the proposal. It will help with the presentation of the important aspects of the work undertaken in a way that will enable the experts to make an effective assessment against the evaluation criteria

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

Annex 4.1 Descartes Prizes for Research

Given that proposals for Descartes Prize for Research will be submitted electronically, Part B will become officially available once the EPSS is operational for this call. Nevertheless, and in order to enable proposers to prepare in advance, an exact copy of the forms has been included in the pages below.

DESCARTES PRIZE FOR RESEARCH

PROPOSAL ACRONYM: _____

PLEASE INDICATE THE MAIN RESEARCH FIELD YOU ARE ADDRESSING IN YOUR ENTRY

Research field	Please tick only one
Earth Sciences	
Engineering	
Information science	
Life Sciences	
Basic Sciences (Chemistry)	
Basic Sciences (Mathematics)	
Basic Sciences (Physics)	
Socio-economic Sciences	

Proposal full title:

Proposal acronym:

Type of Funding Scheme: Coordination and Support Actions (Supporting)

Work programme topics addressed: SiS-2007-3.0.5.1

[List of participants]

Participant no. *	Participant organisation name	Country
1 (coordinator)		
2		
3		
4		

* (Please use the same participant numbering as that used in section A2 of the administrative forms!)

If the proposal is proposed (sponsored) by an appropriate public or private organisations (for example: research centres, foundations) please continue here. Otherwise go to the next page:

It is reminded the sponsoring organisation must fill in this section in collaboration with the nominee team.

Organisation name of the proposing organisation

Name of the contact person inside the proposing organisation

Contact person email

Contact person fax

Why are you proposing this research project?

(Recommended length – 2 pages)

Table of Contents

1. Excellence and quality of the work completed

Describe the objectives of the work completed. The objectives should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form.

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

Emphasis should be placed on the scientific excellence of the work undertaken, and more specifically on:

- a) The quality and novelty of the results achieved, i.e. what are the factors that render this work exceptional
- b) The project's contribution to addressing key scientific and technological issues by stating, amongst others, which groups could benefit from the work undertaken and how

(Recommended length – 10 pages)

2. European Added Value (Impact)

- i) Explain why this contribution required a European (rather than a national or local) approach.
- ii) Describe the measures that were taken for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and the management of knowledge, of intellectual property. More specifically:
 - a) Please list all joint publications arising from the undertaken research
 - b) Please state if there is there competing research/inventions/products/services/processes/techniques
 - c) Please state if the results have been patented and if yes, please give a full list of the corresponding patent applications

(Recommended length 10 pages)

Ethical Issues

Describe any ethical issues that have arisen in the proposal.

The following special issues should have been taken into account:

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

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

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

Human embryonic stem cells: Research proposals that involved human embryonic stem cells (hESC) should have addressed all the following specific points:

- the necessity to use hESC in order to achieve the scientific objectives set forth in the proposal.
- whether the applicants took into account the legislation, regulations, ethical rules and/or codes of conduct in place in the country(ies) where the research using hESC took place, including the procedures for obtaining informed consent;
- the source of the hESC
- the measures taken to protect personal data, including genetic data, and privacy;
- the nature of financial inducements, if any.

Identify the countries where research was undertaken and which ethical committees and regulatory organisations were approached during the life of the project.

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

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

Notes:

Only in exceptional cases will additional information be sought for clarification, which means that any ethical review will be performed solely on the basis of the information available in the proposal. Projects raising specific ethical issues such as research intervention on human beings¹; research on human embryos and human embryonic stem cells and non-human primates are automatically submitted for ethical review.

¹ Such as clinical trials, and research involving invasive techniques on persons (e.g. taking of tissue samples, examinations of the brain).

To ensure compliance with ethical principles, the Commission Services will undertake ethics audit(s) of selected projects at its discretion.
A web site is being prepared aiming to provide clear, helpful information on ethical issues.

ETHICAL ISSUES TABLE

	YES	PAGE
Informed Consent		
• Did the proposal involve children?		
• Did the proposal involve patients or persons not able to give consent?		
• Did the proposal involve adult healthy volunteers?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Genetic Material?		
• Did the proposal involve Human biological samples?		
• Did the proposal involve Human data collection?		
Research on Human embryo/foetus		
• Did the proposal involve Human Embryos?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells?		
Privacy		
• Did the proposal involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)		
• Did the proposal involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
Research on Animals		
• Did the proposal involve research on animals?		
• Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?		
• Were those animals transgenic farm animals?		
• Were those animals cloning farm animals?		
• Were those animals non-human primates?		
Research Involving Developing Countries		
• Use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)		
• Benefit to local community (capacity building i.e. access to healthcare, education etc)		
Dual Use		
• Research having potential military / terrorist application		
I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

Annex 4.2 Prize for Science Communication

Proposals will be submitted in paper using the forms which can be found in pp. 49-57 of this Guide. The prize organiser (who is proposing a candidate for the Prize for Science Communication), should fill in the B-forms.

PART B

SCIENCE IN SOCIETY

CALL IDENTIFIER: FP7- SCIENCE-in-SOCIETY-2007

-2

PRIZE FOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

NAME/TITLE OF THE CANDIDATURE: _____

PLEASE INDICATE THE PRIZE CATEGORY
TO WHICH YOU ARE PROPOSING:

Prize category	Please tick only one
The communicator of the year: scientists or professionals engaged in communicating science to the public.	
The writer of the year: popularising science through the written word (e.g. newspaper articles, popular science books, editorial policies, innovative actions).	
The audiovisual documentary of the year: popularising science through audiovisual and electronic media (e.g. scientific television or radio documentaries, websites, editorial policies, innovative actions).	

I. GENERAL INFORMATION AND SIGNATURE

Title/name of the candidature proposed IN CAPITAL LETTERS	Prize category ² for EU Prize for Science Communication	Prize ³ already won

Name of the organisation/consortium of organisations proposing the candidature⁴ and complete description of its activities (NB! this information will be used for the 2006 brochure)

Have you obtained the agreement of your candidates concerning the submission of his/her work to the EU Prize for Science Communication? Please tick YES or NO⁵
<p>YES</p> <p>NO</p>

I declare that all the information provided is correct. I agree that my proposal is declared ineligible by the European Commission if any of the details contained in this forms is found to be false:

Name of the person in charge from the organisation/consortium of organisations proposing the

candidature(s)⁶:

Date: _____

Signature: _____

² Possible categories are only these:

- Professional scientists and/or communicators engaged in science communication to the public
- Popularising science through the written word (e.g. newspaper articles, popular science books, editorial policies)
- Popularising science through audio-visual and electronic media (e.g. scientific television or radio documentaries, websites, editorial policies)
-

³ Please note that if the prize certificate is missing, the proposal will not be evaluated.

⁴ Please check that this information is consistent with what you filled in Annexe A, sheet A2.1 of the forms to be submitted.

⁵ Failure to obtain this agreement may make the concerned candidature INELIGIBLE thus not evaluated.

⁶ Please check that this information is consistent with what you filled in Annex 3, sheet A2.2 of the forms to be submitted.

II. SPECIFIC INFORMATION ON THE CANDIDATE PROPOSED BY THE PRIZE ORGANISER

Contact details of author/professional of science communication/representative of media company*	
Family name	
First name	
Title (Mr/Mrs/Ms, etc.)	
Date and place of birth	
Nationality	
Postal address	
Telephone	
Mobile phone	
Fax	
E-mail	

1. Summary description of the candidature (maximum 2 pages) and date of the of the achievement of the project

* The details given in this form must relate to the person(s) or organisation(s) that were explicitly awarded the prize in question. This form can therefore be duplicated in the case of joint awards for the same science communication prize.

2. If available, please transcribe the decision of your Jury concerning the candidature presented (maximum 2 pages)

3. If you award more than one prize, please write down the reasons why you have chosen this candidature among your different prizes (maximum 1 page)

4. In terms of evaluation criteria applicable to the Prize for Science Communication. Please justify the selection of your winning candidate in terms of : a) S/T quality, b) Relevance and Impact and c) European added value

III. ANNEXES

1. COMPULSORY

- Copy of the prize certificate issued by the prize organiser stating the denomination/rank of the prize and the details of its winner.⁷
- Information brochures/reports on the prize you organise, containing at least the following information (if applicable):
 - Period of the prize (annual, bi-annual, etc.)
 - Number of prizes awarded
 - Categories of prizes awarded
 - Brief account of the selection process
 - Information on the last prize laureates
- Depending on the prize category, the following items will need to be attached to this application:

Prize category	Compulsory item to be attached
The communicator of the year: scientists or professionals engaged in communicating science to the public.	Complete CV. Complete transcription of your Jury's decision, along with proof of the work conducted.
The writer of the year: popularising science through the written word (e.g. newspaper articles, popular science books, editorial policies, innovative actions).	Article, in any format, <u>4</u> copies of the book. Complete transcription of your Jury's decision. Item demonstrating the innovative nature of the action, if any. Complete transcription of your Jury's decision.
The audiovisual documentary of the year: popularising science through audiovisual and electronic media (e.g. scientific television or radio documentaries, websites, editorial policies, innovative actions).	<u>4</u> video tapes (masters), <u>4</u> audio tapes (masters), <u>4</u> CD-Rom, DVD, or electronic files. ⁸ Complete transcription of your Jury's decision. Item demonstrating the innovative nature of the action, if any. Complete transcription of your Jury's decision.

⁷ Please note that if the prize certificate is missing, the proposal will not be evaluated.

⁸ If the language of the documentary is not English, French, or German, subtitles in one of those three languages will help the evaluators in their tasks. Please send subtitled items if possible.

2. OPTIONAL (INDICATIVE LIST)

- **Statistics (distribution of communication product, public actually reached, etc.)**
- **Information brochures, CVs, and any other material with direct relation to the candidature.**

Ethical Issues

Describe any ethical issues that have arisen in the proposal.

The following special issues should have been taken into account:

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

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

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

Human embryonic stem cells: Research proposals that involved human embryonic stem cells (hESC) should have addressed all the following specific points:

- the necessity to use hESC in order to achieve the scientific objectives set forth in the proposal.
- whether the applicants took into account the legislation, regulations, ethical rules and/or codes of conduct in place in the country(ies) where the research using hESC took place, including the procedures for obtaining informed consent;
- the source of the hESC
- the measures taken to protect personal data, including genetic data, and privacy;
- the nature of financial inducements, if any.

Identify the countries where research was undertaken and which ethical committees and regulatory organisations were approached during the life of the project.

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

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

Notes:

Only in exceptional cases will additional information be sought for clarification, which means that any ethical review will be performed solely on the basis of the information available in the proposal. Projects raising specific ethical issues such as research intervention on human beings¹; research on human embryos and human embryonic stem cells and non-human primates are automatically submitted for ethical review.

¹ Such as clinical trials, and research involving invasive techniques on persons (e.g. taking of tissue samples, examinations of the brain).

To ensure compliance with ethical principles, the Commission Services will undertake ethics audit(s) of selected projects at its discretion.
 A web site is being prepared aiming to provide clear, helpful information on ethical issues.

ETHICAL ISSUES TABLE

	YES	PAGE
Informed Consent		
• Did the proposal involve children?		
• Did the proposal involve patients or persons not able to give consent?		
• Did the proposal involve adult healthy volunteers?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Genetic Material?		
• Did the proposal involve Human biological samples?		
• Did the proposal involve Human data collection?		
Research on Human embryo/foetus		
• Did the proposal involve Human Embryos?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Foetal Tissue / Cells?		
• Did the proposal involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells?		
Privacy		
• Did the proposal involve processing of genetic information or personal data (eg. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)		
• Did the proposal involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
Research on Animals		
• Did the proposal involve research on animals?		
• Were those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?		
• Were those animals transgenic farm animals?		
• Were those animals cloning farm animals?		
• Were those animals non-human primates?		
Research Involving Developing Countries		
• Use of local resources (genetic, animal, plant etc)		
• Benefit to local community (capacity building i.e. access to healthcare, education etc)		
Dual Use		
• Research having potential military / terrorist application		
I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

ENDPAGE

PART B

SCIENCE IN SOCIETY

CALL IDENTIFIER: FP7- SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY 2007-2

PRIZE FOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATION

NAME/TITLE OF THE CANDIDATURE: _____