



Methodology for expert fees for remote evaluation and ethics review

1. Methodology

As part of the revision of the H2020 expert model contract, the Commission has developed a **new simplified methodology** to determine the working days for the remote work of expert evaluators.

Under the new model contract, the fees for remote work will be composed of different **unit costs per task and proposal/ prize application**, in accordance with the tables set out below.

The unit cost per working day used previously (and also used for experts under Decision C(2007)5858¹) was broken down into a rate per work unit (i.e. EUR 45 per work unit; 10 work units are equivalent to EUR 450; 10 work units are equivalent to 1 working day) and each task was given the number of work units that correspond to the working time normally required for it.

The resulting breakdown of fees allows for a simple and straightforward remuneration of the different tasks to be performed remotely during evaluations.

The tasks and fees will be **fixed in advance for each expert** in his/her contract (Articles 3 and 4) and will apply automatically, depending on the number of tasks assigned.

The contract will moreover set out the additional conditions that must be fulfilled.

The new unit costs will cover remote evaluation for both **grants and prizes** and **ethics review**. They will not apply to observers.

¹ Commission Rules on the reimbursement of expenses incurred by people from outside the Commission invited to attend meetings in an expert capacity (Decision C(2007)5858) available at: http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/experts_manual/regl_experts_en.pdf.

2. Unit cost tables

Table 1 — Unit costs and methodology for evaluation

| | Task | Work unit(s) | Working days | Fee | |
|---|---|--------------|--------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | | | amount (in EUR) | per |
| Preparation and briefing | Reading and assimilating briefing documents (including webcast briefings) | [5] [10] | [0.5] [1] | [225] [450] | per evaluation session |
| Individual evaluation — Drafting of individual evaluation report | Standard | | | | |
| | Type* 1 | [1] | [0.1] | [45] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Type 2 | [2] | [0.2] | [90] | |
| | Type 3 | [3] | [0.3] | [135] | |
| | Type 4 | [4] | [0.4] | [180] | |
| | Complex | | | | |
| | Type 5 | [5] | [0.5] | [225] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Type 6 | [6] | [0.6] | [270] | |
| | Type 7 | [7] | [0.7] | [315] | |
| | Type 8 | [8] | [0.8] | [360] | |
| | Very complex | | | | |
| | Type 9 | [9] | [0.9] | [405] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Type 10 | [10] | [1] | [450] | |
| | Type 11 | [12] | [1.2] | [540] | |
| | Type 12 | [15] | [1.5] | [675] | |
| | Exceptionally complex | | | | |
| Type 13 | [17] | [1.7] | [765] | per proposal/prize application | |
| Type 14 | [20] | [2] | [900] | | |
| Type 15 | [30] | [3] | [1350] | | |
| Type 16 | [40] | [4] | [1800] | | |
| Consensus group — Participation in remote discussion — Evaluator or rapporteur | Standard –Types 1, 2, 3 & 4 | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Complex –Types 5, 6, 7 & 8 | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Very complex –Types 9, 10, 11 & 12 – | 3 | 0.3 | 135 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Exceptionally complex –Types 13, 14, 15 & 16 – | 4 | 0.4 | 180 | per proposal/prize application |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Consensus group — Full remote consensus — Evaluator or rapporteur | Standard— Types 1, 2, 3 & 4 | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Complex –Types 5, 6, 7 & 8 | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Very complex –Types 9, 10, 11 & 12 | 3 | 0.3 | 135 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Exceptionally complex –Types 13, 14, 15 & 16 | 4 | 0.4 | 180 | per proposal/prize application |
| Consensus group — Drafting of consensus report — Rapporteur (if they also participate as individual evaluator) | Standard –Types 1, 2, 3 & 4 – | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Complex –Types 5, 6, 7 & 8 – | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Very complex –Types 9, 10, 11 & 12 | 3 | 0.3 | 135 | per proposal/prize application |
| | Exceptionally complex –Types 13, 14, 15 & 16 | 4 | 0.4 | 180 | per proposal/prize application |
| Consensus group — Drafting of consensus report — Rapporteur (if they do NOT also participate as individual evaluator) | Standard Types 1 & 2 | [1] | [0.1] | [45] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Types 3 & 4 | [2] | [0.2] | [90] | |
| | Complex Types 5 & 6 | [3] | [0.3] | [135] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Types 7 & 8 | [4] | [0.4] | [180] | |
| | Very complex Types 9 & 10 | [5] | [0.5] | [225] | per proposal/prize application |
| | Types 11 & 12 | [6] | [0.6] | [270] | |
| | Exceptionally complex – Types 13, 14, 15 & 16 | 10 | 1 | 450 | per proposal/prize application |
| Panel review — Preparation | Panel review — preparation — panel member | 10 | 1 | 450 | per evaluation session |
| | Panel review — preparation — panel chair | [20] [30] | [2] [3] | [900] [1350] | per evaluation session |
| Other tasks | Other — [insert free text (e.g. remote review and quality checks of reports (IERs, CRs and ESRs), cross-reading of proposals/prize applications, assistance in evaluating the gender dimension, (on-site) testing of proposed solutions for inducement prizes, etc)] | [1] [2] [3] ... [10] | [0.1] [0.2] [0.3] ... [1] | [45] [90] [135] ... [450] | per [X] proposal(s)/ prize application(s) |

| | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | Assistance with the evaluation by chair and vice-chair. | [10] [20] [30] ... [100] | [1] [2] [3] ... [10] | [450] [900] [1350] ... [4500] | Per evaluation session |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---|------------------------|

* Type of proposal/prize application. The type of proposal/prize application will be classified according to the complexity linked to parameters such as budget, number of participants, number of pages etc.

Table 2 — Unit costs and methodology for ethics review

| Task | | Work unit(s) | Working day(s) | Fee | |
|--|--|--------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|
| | | | | amount (in EUR) | per |
| Preparation and briefing | Reading and assimilating briefing documents (including webcast briefings) | [5] [10] | [0.5] [1] | [225] [450] | per evaluation session |
| | Standard –Types* 1, 2, 3 and 4 | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per 2 proposals/ prize applications |
| Ethics pre-screening — Filling out ethics pre-screening form | Complex, very complex & exceptionally complex – Types 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 & 16 | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per 2 proposals/ prize applications |
| | All types | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics screening — Individual evaluation — Drafting of individual report | All types | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics screening — Participation in remote discussion — Evaluator or rapporteur | All types | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics screening — Full remote consensus — Evaluator or rapporteur | All types | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics Screening — | All types | 2 | 0.2 | 90 | per proposal/prize application |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----|-----|-----|--------------------------------|
| Drafting of consensus report — Rapporteur | | | | | application |
| Ethics screening — Panel review — Preparation — Panel member | All types | 10 | 1 | 450 | per evaluation session |
| Ethics Assessment — Individual evaluation — Drafting of individual evaluation report | All types | 4 | 0.4 | 180 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics Assessment — Participation in remote discussion — Evaluator or rapporteur | All types | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics Assessment — Moderate remote consensus — Chair | All types | 5 | 0.5 | 225 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics Assessment — Full remote consensus — Evaluator or rapporteur or chair | All types | 1 | 0.1 | 45 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics Assessment — Drafting of consensus report — Rapporteur | All types | 4 | 0.4 | 180 | per proposal/prize application |
| Ethics assessment — Panel review — Preparation — Panel | All types | 10 | 1 | 450 | per evaluation session |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| member | | | | | |
| Other tasks | Other — [insert free text (e.g. remote advice on ethics , etc)] | [1] [2] [3] ... [10] | [0.1] [0.2] [0.3] ... [1] | [45] [90] [135] ... [450] | per [X] proposal(s)/ prize application(s) |

* Type of proposal/prize application.