SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

COORDINATION AND SUPPORT ACTION (SUPPORTING)

Annexes, specific to call:

Call identifier FP7-PEOPLE-2012-NIGHT

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

Annex 1:

Timetable and specific information for this call

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

- **Indicative timetable for this call**

Publication of call	*27 September 2011*
Deadline for submission of proposals	*10 January 2012*
Evaluation of proposals	*From 13 to 18 February 2012*
Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators ("initial information letter")	*Week 8 (as from 20 February 2012)*
Invitation letter to successful coordinators to launch grant agreement negotiations with REA services	*Week 11 (as from 27 February 2012*
Letter to unsuccessful applicants	Week 11 (as from 27 February 2012)
Signature of first grant agreements	As from June 2012

Information on 2012 budget €4 million of the 2012 budget. The final budget awarded to this call, following the evaluation of projects, can however vary by up to 10 % of the total value of this call.

- **Further information and help**

The Participant Portal call pages contain links to other sources that you may find useful in preparing and submitting your proposal. Direct links are also given where applicable.

Call information

Participant Portal — http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/ *(select tab "FP7 calls")*

Self-Evaluation forms

Information Days related to this call — *10 October 2011, REA, COVENT GARDEN, 16, Place Rogier 1000 Brussels*

Other background docs — Documents accompanying the call (presentation note, specific requirements, frequently asked questions)

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.htm

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

Contact person

Colette RENIER colette.renier@ec.europa.eu, phone + 32 2 2951769

A list of contact details of REA officers can be found on a separate document on the call page.]

Specialised and technical assistance:

eFP7 Service Desk http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/contactus

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

EPSS Help desk support@epss-fp7.org

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

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

You may also wish to consult the following documents that can be found at http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html

FP7 Legal basis documents generally applicable

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

Legal documents for implementation

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

Guidance documents

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

Other supporting information

- Brochure “The FP7 in Brief”
- European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment
- International cooperation
- Risk Sharing Financing Facility and the European Investment Bank
- Documents accompanying the call (presentation note, specific requirements, frequently asked questions)

Ethics Review

- Ethics check list
- Supporting documents

Annex 2:

Evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied for this call

1. General

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

REA staff ensure that the process is fair, and in line with the principles contained in the REA's rules[1].

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

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

2. Before the evaluation

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

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

- It is received by the REA before the deadline given in the call fiche
- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call fiche
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present). To satisfy this condition, part B of the proposal must be readable, accessible and printable.
- The content of the proposal relates to the topic(s) and funding scheme(s), including any special conditions set out in the relevant parts of the work programme
- Any additional eligibility criteria *specified in the work programme*

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Evaluation of proposals

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

Each proposal will first be assessed independently by at least three experts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

No weightings will be applied.

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

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

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

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

4. Individual evaluation

This part of the evaluation will be carried out in Brussels

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

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

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

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

The experts will also indicate whether, in their view, the proposal raises research ethics issues.

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

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

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

5. Consensus meeting

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

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

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

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

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

Outcome of consensus

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

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

The signing of the consensus report completes the consensus step.

6. Panel review

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

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

One panel will cover the whole call.

The tasks of the panel will also include:

- recommending a priority order for proposals with the same consensus score;
- making recommendations on possible clustering or combination of proposals.

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

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

Priority order for proposals with the same score

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. The following approach will be applied successively for every group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

(i) Proposals having obtained an equal overall score will be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion *scientific and/or technological excellence*. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion *impact.*

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

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

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

Annex 3:

Instructions for completing "Part A" of the proposal

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

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

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

Please note:

- The coordinator fills in sections A1 and A3.
- The participants already identified at the time of proposal submission (including the coordinator) each fill in their respective section A2.
- Subcontractors shall not fill in section A2 and should not be listed separately in section A3.
- The estimated budget planned for any future participants (not yet identified at the time of the proposal) is not shown separately in form A3 but <u>should be added to the coordinator's budget</u>. Their role, profile and tasks are described in Part B of the proposal.

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

- ***Numbers are always <u>rounded to the nearest whole</u> number***
- ***All costs are given <u>in Euros</u>. Do not express your costs in thousands of Euros ("KEUROS") etc. This can affect decisions on the eligibility of your proposal***
- ***You have inserted zeros ("0") if there are no costs, or if no funding is requested. <u>Do not leave blanks.</u>***
- ***Costs <u>do not include value added tax</u>.***

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

Coordination and support actions (Supporting)

Section A1: Summary	
Proposal Acronym	The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this call. It should be of no more than 20 characters (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please). The same acronym should appear on each page of Part B of your proposal. For what regards Researchers' nights, keep in mind that you are planning a communication action addressing the public at large. It could be relevant to pay a special attention to the acronym chosen with a view to allow the public easily remembering the title, which should also be explicit and whether possible refer to the content of the event.
Proposal Title	The title should be no longer than 200 characters and should be understandable to the non-specialist in your field.
Duration in months	Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months. For what regards the Researchers' nights, project duration will be at least 5 months and not more than 7 months.
Call (part) identifier	FP7-PEOPLE-2012-NIGHT The call identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you are addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union, and on the call page. A call identifier looks like this: *FP7-KBBE-2008-1*
Topic code(s) most relevant to your proposal	Please refer to the topic codes /objectives listed in the work programme call fiche. All activities and topics of FP7 have been assigned unique codes, which are used in the processing of data on proposals and subsequent contracts. The codes are organised hierarchically. The choice of the first topic code will be limited in the drop-down menu to one of the topics open in this call. Select the code corresponding to the topic most relevant to your proposal. The choice for the second code is also limited to topics open in the call in question. Enter a second code if your proposal also addresses another of these. Select 'none' if this is not the case. Select a third code if your proposal is also relevant to another theme. This time, the available codes will simply correspond to broad themes. Select 'none' if this is not the case.
Free Keywords	Please enter a number of keywords that you consider sufficient to characterise the scope of your proposal. There is a limit of 100 characters.
Abstract	The abstract should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the Work Programme. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to the programme management committees and other interested parties. It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information. Please use plain typed text, avoiding formulae and other special characters. **If the proposal is written in a language other than English, please include an English version of the proposal abstract in Part B.** There is a limit of 2000 characters.
Similar proposals or signed contracts	A 'similar' proposal or contract is one that differs from the current one in minor ways, and in which some of the present consortium members are involved.

Section A2/ Participants	
Participant number	The number allocated by the consortium to the participant for this proposal. The **co-ordinator** of a proposal is always **number one**.
Participant Identification Code	The Participant Identification Code (PIC) enables organisations to take advantage of the Participant Portal. Organisations who have received a PIC from the REA are encouraged to use it when submitting proposals. By entering a PIC, parts of section A2 will be filled in automatically. An online tool to search for existing PICs and the related organisations is available at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal. **Organisations not yet having a PIC are strongly encouraged to self-register (at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal) before submitting the proposal and insert in section A2 the temporary PIC received at the end of the self-registration.**
Legal name	**For Public Law Body,** it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Entity, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body; **For Private Law Body,** it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register. **For a natural person**, it is for e.g. Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT.
Organisation Short Name	Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents. This short name should not be more than 20 characters exclusive of special characters (./;…), for e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, for e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac.
Legal address	For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office. For Individuals it is the Official Address. If your address is specified by an indicator of location other than a street name and number, please insert this instead under the "street name" field and "N/A" under the "number" field.
Non-profit organisation	Non-profit organisation is a legal entity qualified as such when it is recognised by national or, international law.
Public body	Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.
Research organisation	Research organisation means a legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.
NACE code	**NACE** means " Nomenclature des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne". Please select **one** activity from the list that **best** describes your professional and economic ventures. If you are involved in more than one economic activity, please select the **one** activity that is **most** relevant in the context of your contribution to the proposed project. For more information on the methodology, structure and full content of NACE (rev. 1.1) classification please consult EUROSTAT at: http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&StrNom=NACE_1_1&StrLanguageCode=EN&StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC
Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)	SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003. The full definition and a guidance booklet can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/sme_definition/index_en.htm To find out if your organisation corresponds to the definition of an SME you can use the on-line tool at http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm

<table>
<tr><td>Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)</td><td>Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them:

– A legal entity is under the same direct or indirect control as another legal entity (SG);
or
– A legal entity directly or indirectly controls another legal entity (CLS);
or
– A legal entity is directly or indirectly controlled by another legal entity (CLB).

<u>Control:</u>
Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:

– A, directly or indirectly, holds more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of B,
or
– A, directly or indirectly, holds in fact or in law the decision-making powers in B.

The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:

(a) The same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50 % of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates;

(b) The legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Character of dependence</td><td>According to the explanation above mentioned, please insert the appropriate abbreviation according to the list below to characterise the relation between your organisation and the other participant(s) you are related with:

• SG: Same group: if your organisation and the other participant are controlled by the same third party;
• CLS: Controls: if your organisation controls the other participant;
• CLB: Controlled by: if your organisation is controlled by the other participant.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Contact point</td><td>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 REA will contact concerning this proposal (e.g. for additional information, invitation to hearings, sending of evaluation results, convocation to negotiations).</td></tr>
<tr><td>Title</td><td>Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Sex</td><td>This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Phone and fax numbers</td><td>Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Section A3/Budget</td></tr>
<tr><td>Indirect Costs</td><td>Indirect costs are all those eligible costs which cannot be identified by the participant as being directly attributed to the project but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project. They may not include any eligible direct costs.</td></tr>
</table>

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

- research organisations
- SMEs

(ii) Accounting system of the organisation

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

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

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

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

(iii) Type of funding scheme

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

Indirect Costs - Decision Tree

Do either of these conditions apply? (1) your organisation possesses an analytical accounting system, or (2) you will declare overhead rates using a simplified method

YES

Real indirect costs or costs calculated using a simplified method

or

No

20% of total direct eligible costs (1)

or

60% of total direct eligible costs (1), for :

- Non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs

- When participating in funding schemes which include research and technological development

Coordination and support actions :
In any case Maximum 7% of the direct eligible costs (1)

(1) excluding direct eligible costs for subcontracting and the costs of reimbursement of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the beneficiary

International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC)

International Cooperation Partner Country means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income, lower-middle income or upper-middle-income country and which is identified as such in Annex I to the work programmes.

Lump sum funding method

Legal entities established in an ICPC may opt for lump sums. In that case the contribution is based on the amounts shown below, multiplied by the total number of person-years for the project requested by the ICPC legal entity.

- Low-income ICPC: 8,000 Euro/researcher/year
- Lower middle income ICPC: 9,800 Euro/researcher/year
- Upper middle income ICPC 20,700 Euro/researcher/year

The maximum EC contribution is calculated by applying the normal upper funding limits shown under "requested EC contribution". This amount is all inclusive, covering support towards both the direct and the indirect costs.

More information on ICPC lump sums can be found in the section II.18 of the "Guide to financial issues"
http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html
or on the Participant Portal http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home

Type of Activity	• **Support activities** may cover activities**,** depending on their nature such as: monitoring and assessment; conferences; seminars; studies; high level scientific awards and competitions; operational support; data access and dissemination, information and communication activities; specific services activities related to research infrastructures, such as for example transnational access; preparatory technical work, including feasibility studies for the development of new infrastructures; contribution to the construction of new infrastructures; cooperation with other European research schemes; or a combination of these. **Management activities** are part of the other activities. They include the maintenance of the consortium agreement, if it is obligatory**,** the overall legal, ethical, financial and administrative management including for each of the participants obtaining the certificates on the financial statements or on the methodology, the implementation of competitive calls by the consortium for the participation of new participants and, any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities.
Personnel costs	Participants may opt to declare average personnel costs if these fulfil the four acceptability criteria defined by the Commission in its Decision of 24th January 2011 on the three simplification measures for FP7 (ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/c-2011-174-final_en.pdf). Detailed explanation can be fund in the FP7 Guide to Financial Issues (ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/financialguide_en.pdf). For the particular case of personnel costs to be claimed by SME owners and natural persons not receiving a salary, the Commission has set up a mandatory flat rate system. Detailed information on this flat-rate system can be fund in the FP7 Guide to Financial Issues (ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/financialguide_en.pdf).
Sub-contracting	A subcontractor is a third party which has entered into an agreement on business conditions with one or more participants, in order to carry out part of the work of the project without the direct supervision of the participant and without a relationship of subordination. Where it is necessary for the participants to subcontract certain elements of the work to be carried out, the following conditions must be fulfilled: - Subcontracts may only cover the execution of a limited part of the project; - Recourse to the award of subcontracts must be duly justified in Part B of the proposal having regard to the nature of the project and what is necessary for its implementation; - Recourse to the award of subcontract by a participant may not affect the rights and obligations of the participants regarding background and foreground; - - Part B of the proposal must indicate the task to be subcontracted and an estimation of the costs; Any subcontract, the costs of which are to be claimed as an eligible cost, must be awarded according to the principles of best value for money (best price-quality ratio), transparency and equal treatment. Framework contracts between a participant and a subcontractor, entered into prior to the beginning of the project that are according to the participant's usual management principles may also be accepted. Participants may use external support services for assistance with minor tasks that do not represent per se project tasks as identified in Part B of the proposal. If applicable, actual direct costs and real overhead costs of third parties that make available to the proposal resources otherwise unavailable within the consortium, can also be included under the category of subcontracting costs (provided that these costs are not related to proposal's core tasks).
Other direct costs	Means direct costs not covered by the above mentioned categories of costs.

<table>
<tr><td>Total Budget</td><td><u>Note:</u> The "total budget" <u>is not</u> the requested EC contribution.

A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Requested EC contribution</td><td>The requested EC contribution shall be determined by applying the upper funding limits indicated below, per activity and per participant to the costs accepted by the Commission, or to the flat rates or lump sums.

Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs

• Support activities = 100%
• Other activities (including management) = 100%

.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total Receipts</td><td><u>Note:</u> "Receipts" <u>are not</u> the requested EC contribution.

Receipts of the project may arise from:

a) Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties:

i. Shall be considered a receipt of the project if they have been contributed by the third party specifically to be used on the project.

ii. Shall <u>not</u> be considered a receipt of the project if their use is at the management discretion of the participant.

b) Income generated by the project:

i. Shall be considered receipts for the participant when generated by actions undertaken in carrying out the project and from the sale of assets purchased under the grant agreement up to the value of the cost initially charged to the project by the participant;

ii. Shall <u>not</u> be considered a receipt for the participant when generated from the use of foreground resulting from the project.

The EU financial contribution may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for the participants. For this reason, the total requested EC funding plus receipts cannot exceed the total eligible costs.</td></tr>
</table>

Annex 4:

Instructions for drafting "Part B" of the proposal

Coordination and support actions (Supporting)

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

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

IMPORTANT: Page limits: **remember to keep to the page limits where these are specified**.

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

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

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

As an indication, such a layout should lead to a maximum of between 5.000 and 6.000 possible characters per page (including spaces).

The REA will instruct the experts to disregard any excess pages.

Even where no page limits are given, or where limits are only recommended, it is in your interest to keep your text concise since over-long proposals are rarely viewed in a positive light by experts.

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

Section	Maximum pages
1: Scientific and/or technical quality, relevant to the topics addressed by the call	10 pages for whole section*,
1.1 Concept and objectives	1 page maximum
1.2 Quality and effectiveness of the support mechanism, and associated work plan	Maximum 2 pages page for section "Overall strategy" 1 page maximum per Work Package description (with the exception of Work Package 2 "Activities during the night"
2.1 Management structure and procedures	1 page maximum
2.2. Contingency plan	1 page maximum
2.3 Individual participants	Maximum half a page per participant
2.4 Consortium as a whole Subcontracting	Maximum half a page

2.5	Subcontracting	Maximum 1 page
2.6	Resources to be committed	Maximum 3 pages
3.	Impact	Maximum 2 pages
4.	Ethics Issues	N.A.

<u>Cover Page</u>

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

Work programme topics addressed: Researchers' night

Name of the coordinating person:

List of participants:

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

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

<u>Table of Contents</u>

Proposal

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

1.1 Concept and objectives

- o Describe the overall concept and main ides on which your proposal relies;
- o List the specific objectives pursued, keeping in mind that the common main objective consists of "enhancing public recognition of researchers and their work";
- o Clearly indicate your quantitative targets:
    - o Total number of people likely to be made aware of the Researchers' nights through all communication means mobilised;

    Expected number of attendees to the various events planned.

    .

Recommended length: Maximum 1 page

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

Overall strategy

Presentation of the detailed work plan broken down into the following 4 work packages[2] shortly described:

- o 1. Awareness campaign;
- o 2. Activities during the night (including preparatory activities);
- o 3. Impact assessment;
- o 4. Management (Do NOT describe it here, it will be subject to a detailed description under section 2)
- o

Recommended length: Maximum 2 pages

Overall scheduling of Work Packages

Work Package	**Month 1**	**Month 2**	**Month 3**	**Month 4**	**Month 5**	**Month 6 (if relevant)**	**Month 7 (if relevant)**
1. Awareness campaign (necessarily BEFORE the event)							
2. Activities during the night (Including							

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

preparatory activities, up to the date of the event)							
3. Impact assessment (Ending necessarily AFTER the event)							
4. Management (Lasting from the very first to the very last month of the project)							

Work Package List

Table 1.2 a: Work package list

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

1 Work package number: WP 1 – WP n.

2 Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:

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

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

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

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

Table 1.2. b: Deliverables List

Del. no. [1]	Deliverable name	WP no.	Nature[2]	Dissemi-nation level [3]	Delivery date[4]
1	Report in awareness campaign + samples of promotional material	1	R + P	PU	Last month of the project
2	Report on the activities during the night + possibly pictures, videos, DVDs…	2	R + O	PU	Last month of the project
3	Report on Impact Assessment + Samples of questionnaires, interviews in English	3	R + P	PU	Last month of the project
4	Management final report	4	R	PU	Last month of the project + 60 days

Tables 1.2 c: Work package description

Work package number	1	**Start date or starting event:**				
Work package title	**Awareness campaign**					
Activity Type[5]	SUPP					
Participant number							
Participant short name							
Person-months per participant:							

Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

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

Description of work

CONTENT

- o Identification of the main target (public at large, possibly with a special focus on certain categories to be determined);
- o Identification of the communication tools to be used:
  - o Off line: such as written press, radio, TV, mailings, direct visits, meetings…
  - o On line: such as project website, blogs, social networks, e mailings….
- o Identification of the main messages to be conveyed (main one: "researchers are amongst us" meaning that researchers are ordinary people with an extraordinary job);
- o Promotional material to be used:
  - o Written material: such as leaflets, booklets, folders, flyers, posters, programmes…
  - o Other: such electronic banners, city lights, billboards, videos, DVDs….
  - o Promotional gadgets (to be displayed through the EU corner and marked with the European flag)

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Plan the awareness campaign sufficiently early (keep in mind that project's start date, determining the eligibility of your costs, may be prior to the Grant agreement signature) with a view to reaching schools and universities usually closed during summer;*

➲ *Modulate the messages according to the specific target audience;*

➲ *Express your availability for synergies (common awareness, common website, common logo, some joint actions…) with possible other EU funded projects in your area.*

Deliverables

Report on the awareness campaign (actions, media feedback, activities on Internet such as hits on website, blogs, social networks …)

Samples of promotional material (posters, leaflets, programmes, gadgets…)

Last month of the project

Work package number	2	**Start date or starting event:**					
Work package title	**Activities during the night**						
Activity Type[1]	SUPP						
Participant number							
Participant short name							
Person-months per participant:							

Objectives

Offering all the categories of the public at large, regardless of age and scientific background as broad as possible a range of activities :

- o Directly and actively involving both researchers and audience;
- o Combining in a balanced way entertainment and "education to science through researchers" ;
- o Contributing to enhancing the public recognition and appraisal of researchers and their work.

Description of work

CONTENT

- o List of locations involved (cities);
- o Type of venues envisaged (such as public squares, university campuses, shopping malls, others);
- o Type of activities planned (such as science shows, hands on experiments, demos, simulations, guided tours, circuits, dating with researchers, exhibitions, debates, roundtables, conferences, science investigations, workshops, quizzes, games, competitions,…)
- o Detailed programme (whether available), organised around the various locations (if relevant and when activities differ from one location to another)

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Allow the evaluators getting an overview of the activities planned (without necessarily detailed description) ;*

➲ *keep in mind the necessary balance between entertainment and other activities, as well as the necessity of planning activities likely to comply with all categories of the public at large' s expectations ;*

➲ *Clearly show the overall consistency of the programme, in particular when several locations are involved (common theme, complementarity, common features, links…)*

---

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

Deliverables

Report on the activities of the Night (list, participation, success rate, possible lessons learnt…), possibly accompanied by pictures, videos, DVDs…

Last month of the project

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

Objectives

- o Assessing the impact of the event, special attention being paid to possible evolutions of the public perception of researchers and their work (possibly taking into consideration a several years period in case of similar events having been organised during the previous years);
- o Identifying the types of activities that proved the most effective towards the achievement of the objectives

Description of work

- o Description of the current situation regarding public perception of researchers (relying on existing studies or necessitating a specific enquiry);
- o Description of the tools planned to be used (questionnaires on website and during the event, face to face interviews, polls conducted during the events, collection of comments via website and blogs…)
- o Description of indicators to be applied:
    - o Quantitative: number of responses expected, of inquiries, interviews, quantitative evaluation of public satisfaction (generally 1 to 5), minimum percentage share of the overall audience to be interviewed;
    - o Qualitative: elements allowing the assessment of the public opinion about researchers (such as: qualification of the job researchers, interest for a researcher career, …)

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Clearly describe the current situation, which will serve as reference for assessing the project's impact;*

➲ *If relevant, identify more specific a target for promoting researchers and their work (students, pupils, women…);*

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

Deliverables

Report on impact assessment (number of responses, tools used, main trends and conclusions)
Samples of questionnaires/interviews in English

Last month of the project

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

Objectives

Ensure a sound management of the project in all its components

Description of work

Coordinating institutions and coordinator in charge:

Other organs: (examples)

- Steering/advisory committees;
- Working packages leaders;
- Local coordinators (when multi location projects);

Decision making process (such as consensus, simple majority, qualified majority…)

Internal communication flows

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Keep the structure clear, simple and flexible, clearly identify the responsibilities of each organ;*

➲ *Keep in mind that your project will have a duration of not more than 7 months; in such a context, limit both number and complication of structures created therefore;*

➲ *Allow for easy adaptation of programmes, or actions planned; too heavy a structure would prevent such adaptation and flexibility;*

➲ *When several locations involved, too centred a management might generate huge management costs, not always favourably seen by evaluators; allow for a certain flexibility margin at local level within an overall consistent framework at project level.*

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

Deliverables

Final management report (template circulated on due time by REA)

End date of the project + 60 days

Table 1.2 d: Summary of staff effort

Participant no./short name	**WP1**	**WP2**	**WP3**	**WP4**	**Total person months**
Part.1 short name					
…					
…					
…					
Total					

- This table is an estimates at this stage;
- One person /month corresponds to: one person during one month, two persons each for 2 weeks…, one person employed during one week should be referred to as 0,25 person/month

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Keep consistency between the person/month figures and the related costs;*

➲ *Keep in mind that you should mention person/month for all the Work Packages;*

➲ *Personnel employed by subcontractors are NOT taken into account in the table above;*

Recommended length for the section 1 as a whole: maximum 10 pages

2. Implementation

2.1. Management structure and procedures

Coordinating institutions and coordinator in charge:

- Overall administrative, legal, accounting and financial project management;
- Interfacing with relevant EU services (negotiation, reporting);
- Possibly other direct responsibilities in WPs…

Other organs: (examples)

- Steering/advisory committees;
- Working packages leaders;
- Local coordinators (when multi location projects);

Decision making process (such as consensus, simple majority, qualified majority…)

Internal communication flows

- Daily communication via phone, electronic mailing, Skype..;

- Video conferences, meetings (partial or plenary);
- Frequency (can be according to the needs)

Recommended length: Maximum 1 page

2.2. Contingency plan

Describe the main risks your project is likely to face and the way you will mitigate or prevent them:

- Bad weather conditions (for open air activities);
- Insufficient mobilisation of researchers/ participating institutions
- Insufficient response form targeted audience

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *When planning outdoors activities, plan at the same time an alternative indoors location close to the outdoors one (identifying an alternative location at the last minute might prove very hard and expensive);*

➲ *Do not list too short of money as a potential risk: you are expected to have a reliable financial plan;*

Recommended length: Maximum 1 page

2.3 Individual participants

- Briefly describe the activities and sphere of expertise of each participant;
- Briefly describe the relevance of their involvement in the project;
- Briefly describe the staff involved.

Recommended length: Maximum half a page per participant

2.4 Consortium as a whole (obviously for multi partners projects only)

Briefly describe why you consider that all the necessary skills and expertise are gathered in a way likely to allow the successful achievement of the project's goals.

Recommended length: Maximum half a page

2.5 Subcontracting

- List the tasks that you intend to subcontract;
- Provide a rough estimate of the related subcontracting costs.

Recommended length: Maximum 1 page

2.6. Resources to be committed

- Provide a comprehensive overview of all the resources necessary to the achievement of the project, i.e. the project's total costs, whichever their funding source;
- Mention the main costs indispensable for project's successful achievement.

TIPS FOR SUCCESS

➲ *Keep a perfect consistency between this chapter and the data provided at a more general level in part A of the proposal;*

➲ *Keep in mind that the budget should also appear consistent with the data contained in the "summary staff effort" table under 1.2.d ;*

Recommended length: Maximum 3 pages

3. Impact

3.1 Expected impacts listed in the work programme

- Describe how your project is likely to contribute to enhancing the public recognition of researchers and their work;
- Explain which would be the added value of the EU contribution for reinforcing your project's impact;
- If relevant explain how other similar or complementary initiatives at national or European level have been taken into consideration for creating synergies and increasing effectiveness.

3.2 Spreading excellence, exploiting results, disseminating knowledge

- If relevant, describe any measure planned for disseminating projects results (good practices, type of activities most effective towards the achievement of the objectives…);
- If such measures are planned, explain how they could contribute to a reinforced effectiveness of the action at European and national levels.

Recommended length: Maximum 2 pages

4. Ethics related issues

Areas Excluded From Funding Under FP7 *(Art. 6)*

(i) Research activity aiming at human cloning for reproductive purposes;

(ii) Research activity intended to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable (Research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads can be financed);

(iii) 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;

All FP7 funded research shall comply with the relevant national, EU and international ethics-related rules and professional codes of conduct.