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About this Guide

This is version number V1.3 of the FP7 ICT Guide for Applicants for the FET-Open Xtrack scheme, based on the Guide for Applicants version number 10 for calls, using continuous submission and two stages evaluation procedures.

- The main part of this Guide (Sections 1-5) is common to all such calls. 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.

- Information specific to this call is found in the annexes. Annex 3 “Instructions for completing Part A of the proposal” has been modified to include the details of the lump sum funding method for ICPC participants.

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 website. The Guide does not in itself have legal value, and thus does not supersede those documents.
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1. History

- V1.0, 30-08-2012: Initial version of this document.
- V1.1, 05-11-2012: Clarification about the meaning of “proposal anonymity” (Section 10.2, Page 31).
- V1.2, 19-11-2012: Correction/clarification of possible actions once a proposal is submitted (Section 4.3.1.6, Page 15).

2. Getting started

Funding decisions in the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) are made on the basis of proposals. Proposals describe planned activities, information on who will carry them out, and how much they will cost. The Commission evaluates all eligible proposals in order to identify those whose quality is sufficiently high for possible funding. This evaluation is a peer-review carried out by independent experts.

The Commission then negotiates with some or all of those whose proposals have successfully passed the evaluation stage, depending on the budget available. If negotiations are successfully concluded, grant agreements providing for an EU financial contribution are established with the participants.

This Guide for Applicants contains the essential information to guide you through the mechanics of preparing and submitting a proposal. It is important that you have the correct Guide. Not only are there different Guides for different calls, there are different Guides for other funding schemes within the same call. You must also refer to the current ICT work programme. This provides a detailed description of the objectives and topics which are open for proposals, and will describe the wider context of research activities in this area. Work programmes are revised regularly, so make sure you refer to the latest version before preparing your proposal.

Please check that this is the right guide for you by consulting the work programme, the call text, (both documents posted on the Participant Portal website) and the description of the funding scheme in the next section.

This Guide and the work programme are essential reading. However, you may also wish to consult other reference and background documents, particular those relating to negotiation and the grant agreements, which will be made available on the Commission’s CORDIS web site (see Annex 1, Page 29 of this guide) and on the Participant Portal, whose URI is http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal.

All research activities supported by the Seventh Framework Programme should respect fundamental ethical principles.

3. About the funding scheme: Collaborative projects (STREP)

3.1. General

A number of funding schemes are available to implement projects in FP7, but only certain ones may be available for the topics covered by this call. These are indicated in the call text.

This Guide covers the collaborative projects “Small and medium-scale focused research projects” (STREP), and a description is given in this section.

Please note that special conditions may apply on a call-by-call basis. These will always be set out in the work programme which includes the call text.

Note: Your proposal will be evaluated according to the funding scheme which you select. The Commission services will not re-examine or re-assign it on your behalf.
3.2. **Collaborative projects STREP**

### 3.2.1. Purpose

Small and medium-scale focused research projects (STREP) are objective-driven research projects, which aim at generating new knowledge, including new technology, or common resources for research in order to improve European competitiveness, or to address major societal needs. They have clearly defined scientific and technological objectives directed at obtaining specific results, which could be applicable in terms of development or improvement of products, processes, services or policy.

STREP target a specific research objective in a sharply focused approach. They have a fixed overall work plan where the principal deliverables are not expected to change during the lifetime of the project.

### 3.2.2. SICAs

STREP may also be used to support a special form of international co-operation projects, the so-called Specific International Cooperation Actions (SICA) with ICPC countries in areas of mutual interest and dedicated to cooperation on topics selected on the basis of their scientific and technological competences and needs. SICA have specific consortium requirements noted in the following section.

### 3.2.3. Size and resources

There must be at least three ‘legal entities’ established in different EU Member States or Associated countries (the countries concerned are listed in Section 4.1.3, Page 8 of this Guide). The entities must be independent of each other.

For the SICA projects there must be at least four independent legal entities of which at least two must be established in different Member States or Associated countries and at least two must be established in different ICPC countries in the target regions defined in the objective for the proposed project\(^1\).

A higher number of participants may be specified on a call-by-call basis: check the call text.

The size, scope and internal organisation of collaborative projects can vary from research theme to research theme and from topic to topic. Typically the number of participants in STREP for the ICT FET-Open scheme varied from 4 to 7 participants and the EC contribution varied between 1 and 2 M€, with an average around 1.8 M€\(^2\).

### 3.2.4. Indicative average duration

STREP are expected to last typically two to three years. However, there is no formal minimum or maximum duration.

### 3.2.5. Activities

The activities to be carried out in the context of a STREP can include:

- Research and technological development activities, reflecting the core activities of the project, aimed at a significant advance beyond the established state-of-the-art, including scientific coordination and/or
- Demonstration activities, designed to prove the viability of new technologies that offer a potential economic advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product-like prototypes) and
- Management activities, over and above the technical management of individual work packages, linking together all the project components and maintaining communications with the Commission.

---

\(^1\) Exceptionally in the case of Brazil, China and Russia, the two overseas partners may be in different regions of these large countries.

\(^2\) Does not apply to project proposals submitted to Objective ICT-2011.9.4.
3.2.6. Financial Regime

Reimbursement will be based on eligible costs (based on maximum rates of reimbursement specified in the grant agreement for different types of activities within the project). In some cases the reimbursement of indirect costs is based on a flat rate.

The work programmes shall specify if other forms of reimbursement are to be used in the actions concerned. Participants in International Cooperation Partner Countries (see Annex 1 to the work programme) may opt for a lump sum.

If so provided in the call text, it is possible to claim subsistence and accommodation costs (related to travel as part of the implementation of a project) on the basis of flat rates. These rates, which do not cover travel costs, are in the form of a daily allowance for every country. The use of these rates is optional, but you may wish to use them when calculating your proposal budget. The rates themselves, and the detailed rules for their use, are given at this URI: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html, in Article II.15.1.b of the “Guide to Financial Issues relating to FP7 Indirect Actions”.

3.2.7. Specific Characteristics

- The description of work (Annex 1 to the grant agreement) is normally fixed for the duration of the project.
- The composition of the consortium is normally fixed for the duration of the project.

4. How to apply

4.1. Turning your idea into an effective proposal

4.1.1. The coordinator

For a given proposal, the coordinator acts as the single point of contact between the participants and the Commission. The co-ordinator is generally responsible for the overall planning of the proposal and for building up the consortium that will do the work.

4.1.2. Focusing your planned work

The work you set out in your proposal must correspond to one or more of the topics, and associated funding scheme(s), indicated in this call for proposals. Proposals that fail to do so will be regarded as ineligible.

Multidisciplinary proposals addressing several topics may be submitted, provided that the ‘centre of gravity’ lies in a topic or topics open in the call in question.

Refer to the Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide, and the work programme, to check the eligibility criteria and any other additional conditions that apply.

Refer also in those documents to the evaluation criteria against which your proposal will be assessed. Keep these in mind as you develop your proposal.

4.1.3. Who can participate?

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

A legal entity can be a so-called “natural person” (e.g. Mme Dupont) or a “legal person” (e.g. National Institute for Research).

However, there are certain minimum conditions that have to be met relating to participation from the EU and Associated countries. These conditions vary between funding schemes (See Section 3, Page 6), and may also vary from call to call. See the call text 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.

The Associated Countries are:
Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Faroe Islands, FYR Macedonia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Moldova, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland and Turkey

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

The following may receive EU funding in an FP7 project:

- 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, Page 25),
- 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 to the work programme.
- Any other legal entity, under the conditions indicated below:
  In the case of a participating international organisation other than an international European interest organisation, or a legal entity established in a non-EU country other than an associated country or ICPC, a Community financial contribution may be granted provided that at least one of the following conditions is satisfied:
  a) Provision is made to that effect in the specific programmes or in the relevant work programme,
  b) It is essential for carrying out the indirect action,
  c) Such funding is provided for in a bilateral scientific and technological agreement or any other arrangement between the Community and the country in which the legal entity is established.

Before the signature of a grant agreement, the Commission has to verify the existence and legal status of all participants. This verification is made only once for each organisation at the time of its first participation in FP7. The details of all validated organisations are stored in a Unique Registration Facility (URF). These organisations are allocated a unique code, the so-called Participant Identification Code (PIC). In any further participation in other proposals, the organisations already validated use the PIC for their identification with the Commission.

For the confirmation and maintenance of the data stored in the URF, the Commission asks each organisation to nominate one privileged contact person, the so-called Legal Entity Appointed Representative (LEAR). The LEAR is usually a person working in the central administration of the organisation and she/he must be appointed by the top management of the entity. The LEAR can view their organisations’ legal and financial data online and ask for corrections and changes to the data of their legal entity via the Web interface of the Unique Registration Facility.

4.1.4. Cooperation with other countries

The Commission attaches great importance to international cooperation in research, and FP7 has been designed to ensure that such activities can be integrated across the programme. In addition to the opportunities mentioned above, which are generally applicable, calls may include:

- Topics of mutual interest defined in the work programmes where international cooperation is particularly encouraged.
- Specific international cooperation actions (SICA), also on topics of mutual interest. Here special minimum conditions apply.
Please check the work programme, including the call text, to see if these possibilities apply to this call.


4.1.5. National Contact Points

A network of National Contact Points (NCP) has been established to provide advice and support to organisations which are preparing proposals. You are highly recommended to get in touch with your NCP at an early stage (See Annex 1, Page 29, to this Guide).

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

4.1.6. Other sources of help

Annex 1, Page 29, 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.
- The ICT Information Desk.
- A dedicated help desk has been set up to deal with questions related to research ethics issues.
- A dedicated help desk has been set up to deal with technical questions related to the **Participant Portal Submission Service**.
- A further help desk providing assistance on intellectual property matters.
- Other services, including partner search facilities.

4.1.7. 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 proposal would be of assistance to the experts. An English translation of the abstract may be included in Part B of the proposal.

4.1.8. Presenting your proposal

A proposal has two parts.

**Part A** will contain the administrative information about the proposal and the participants. The information requested includes a brief description of the work, contact details and characteristics of the participants, and information related to the funding requested (see Annex 3, Page 39, to this Guide). This information will be encoded in a structured database for further computer processing to produce, for example, statistics and evaluation reports. This information will also support the experts and Commission staff during the evaluation process.

The information in Part A is entered through a set of on-line forms using the **Participant Portal Submission Service** described in Section 4.2.2, Page 12.

**Part B** is a “template”, or list of headings, rather than an administrative form (see Annex 4, Page 50, to this Guide). You should follow this structure when presenting the scientific and technical content of your proposal. The template is designed to highlight those aspects that will be assessed against the **evaluation criteria**. It covers, among other things, the nature of the proposed work, the participants and their roles in the proposed project, and the impacts that might be expected to arise from the proposed work.

Only black and white copies are used for evaluation and you are strongly recommended, therefore, not to use colour in your document. Do not insert hypertext links, only the text of your Part B will be read, not any documents linked to it.
Part B of the proposal is uploaded by the applicant into the Participant Portal Submission Service.

For the specific call FP7-ICT-2013-X, Part B (see Annex 4, Page 50, to this Guide) is made up of 3 parts, B1, B2 and B3. The part B1 includes a single cover page and 8 more pages dealing with the first evaluation criteria “Scientific and/or Technical quality”. B1 must be strictly anonymous and have no more than 9 pages (including the single cover page). The part B2 deals with the second and third evaluations criteria, “Implementation” and “Impact”. The length of B2 must not exceed 2 pages, one page per criteria. The part B3 relates to the Ethical Issues aspects of the project proposal. There is no length constraint on Part B3.

FP7-ICT-2013-X operates a continuous submission procedure. Project proposals may be submitted at any time from the opening of the call until January 29th, 2013 and, if eligible, are evaluated as they come in. As a consequence, a project proposal should be submitted to the FP7-ICT-2013-X call only once it is fully ready.

The evaluation is accomplished in 2 steps. The first step, where only B1 is considered, cares about the first criteria only. If a proposal is successful at the first step (i.e. The score related to the scientific criteria is equal or above the corresponding threshold), its evaluation continues at the second step taking into account further the “Implementation” and “Impact” criteria from Part B2. If a proposal is not successful at the first step, it does not go through the second step of the evaluation.

4.1.9. Ethical principles

Please remember that research activities in FP7 should respect fundamental ethical principles, including those reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union. Ethical 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 research shall not be financed under this Framework Programme:

- 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.

As regards human embryonic stem cell research, the Commission will maintain the practice of the Sixth Framework Programme, which excludes from Community financial support research activities destroying human embryos, including for the procurement of stem cells. The exclusion of funding of this step of research will not prevent Community funding of subsequent steps involving human embryonic stem cells.

4.1.10. Risk-Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF)

The Risk-sharing Finance Facility (RSFF) provides project financial support in addition to the FP7 grant. This innovative debt-based facility, designed by the European Commission and the European Investment Bank (EIB) creates an additional capacity of up to €10 billion for financing higher risk research, technological development, demonstration and innovation activities.

The EIB will implement RSFF in close collaboration with all major EU national and regional banks within Member States and Associated Countries to FP7, which are providing support to the development of European companies.

Financing through the RSFF can be sought either in addition to, or instead of FP7 grants.

---

1 See Section 10.2 on Page 31 for the eligibility criteria.
3 Research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads can be financed.
4.2. Introduction to proposal submission

4.2.1. One continuous stage submission, two steps evaluation

FP7-ICT-2013-X operates a continuous submission procedure. Project proposals may be submitted at any time from the opening of the call until January 29th, 2013 and, if eligible, are evaluated as they come in. As a consequence, a project proposal should be submitted to the FP7-ICT-2013-X call only once it is fully ready. Section 10.2 on Page 31 provides a list of eligibility criteria to be considered for STREP proposals addressing the FP7-ICT-2013-X call.

When eligible, the evaluation process is accomplished in 2 steps. The first step, where only B1 is considered, cares about the first criteria only and implements a strictly anonymous evaluation process with the help of remote evaluators. If a proposal is successful at the first step (i.e. The score related to the scientific criteria is equal or above the corresponding threshold), its evaluation continues at the second step taking into account further the “Implementation” and “Impact” criteria from Part B2.

If a proposal is not successful at the first step, it does not go through the second step of the evaluation.

The second step of the evaluation is not anonymous and is carried out through a combination of remote evaluation and panels of experts that convene in Brussels.

Further detail of the evaluation procedures applied is given in Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide.

4.2.2. About the Electronic Submission Services of the Commission

Proposals must be submitted electronically, using the Commission’s Electronic Submission Services which are to be found on the Participant Portal. Proposals arriving at the Commission or Agency by any other means are regarded as “not submitted”, and will not be evaluated.

All the data that you upload is securely stored on a server to which the proposal coordinator and the other participants in the proposal have access until the proposal is submitted or until the call deadline.

The Electronic Submission Services can be accessed from the relevant call page on the Participant Portal.

As this is a web application, an Internet connection is required. An Internet browser and version 9 (or above) of the Adobe reader are needed. To check the requirements, click on https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/submission/manage/diagnostics.

Full instructions are found in the “10 Minute guide to the Electronic Submission”, available from the submission service website (click on “Electronic proposal submission user manual” to download the user guide).

---

1 In exceptional cases, when a proposal coordinator has absolutely no means of accessing the Participant Portal Submission Service, 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, Page 29), indicating in the subject line “Paper submission request”. You may telephone the enquiry service if web access is not possible: 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 from Europe; or 32 2 299 96 96 from anywhere in the world. A postal or e-mail address will then be given to you. Such a request, which must clearly explain the circumstances of the case, must be received by the Commission no later than one month before the call deadline. The Commission will reply within five working days of receipt. Only if a derogation is granted, a proposal on paper may be submitted by mail, courier or hand delivery. The delivery address will be given in the derogation letter.

2 Accessible at the URI https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/ShowDoc/Participant+Portal/portal_content/docs/submission/10_minutes_guide_to_the_submission.pdf
4.2.3. Obtaining a mandatory Participant Identification Code (PIC)

Before starting the process of submitting the proposal, each participant in your proposal must be identified with a Participant Identification Code (PIC). Failure to do so will block the submission of your proposal. The Participant Identification Code (PIC) is a unique 9 digit number that helps the Commission or Agency identify a participant organisation. It is used in all grant-related interactions between the organisation and the Commission/Agency. The use of PICs will lead to more efficient processing of your proposal.

If your organisation has already participated in a 7th Framework Programme proposal, it is likely that you already have a PIC number. You can check this on the Participant Portal at the URI http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/myorganisations or in the search provided in the proposal submission system. If your organisation already has a PIC, it is likely that it has also appointed a Legal Entity Authorised Representative (LEAR). The names of LEAR are however not available online. You have to enquire within the administration of your own organisation.

If a PIC is not yet available for an organisation, it can be obtained by registering the organisation in the Participant Portal under the “Register” sub-tab of the “My Organisations” tab at the URI http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/myorganisations. After filling in the data for the entity, a PIC number is given, which can then be used in the Electronic Submission Services. You are encouraged to proceed well before the call deadline to avoid potential last minute troubles.

All participants already possessing a PIC should use it to identify themselves in the Electronic Submission Service. After entering the PIC, sections of their administrative A forms are filled in automatically.

If, after entering your PIC, the data which appears for your organisation is incorrect, you should contact the LEAR of your organisation to correct it through the Participant Portal. You can also change yourself the data pre-filled from the PIC in your administrative A forms, but these changes will remain local to the Electronic Submission Services for this proposal only. The original data, which is stored in the Commission's database, will always re-appear whenever the PIC is used, until the new data is validated.

4.3. Get started

As a first step, the coordinator starts creating the proposal by accessing the system from the call page. Access to the Electronic Submission Service is granted after logging in to the Participant Portal from the relevant call page.

4.3.1. Proposal coordinator’s actions

4.3.1.1. Step one: getting a European Commission Authentication Service user ID.

Getting a personal user ID with the European Commission Authentication Service (ECAS) is mandatory in order to login to the Participant Portal and to be able to use the different functions of the Portal, including the proposal submission. This will allow editing the proposal data in the electronic proposal submission system, completing the information requested or, for coordinators, submitting the proposal. The system will request a login from every partner. The same user ID will be used for all later interactions with the Commission or Agency in the field of Research. Further details on the ID are available under the URI https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/cas/eim/external/help.cgi.

4.3.1.2. Step two: choosing a funding scheme

For each call, a list of available funding schemes or objectives as activity codes will be presented by the Electronic Submission Services. The proposal coordinator must choose the appropriate one for the proposal. Refer to the call text and work programme for the various conditions applicable to each funding scheme.

1 See Section 4.1.3, Page 8
4.3.1.3. Step three: creating a draft proposal

Once the coordinating organisation is identified with its PIC number, the coordinator fills in the pre-registration data for the proposal: acronym, short summary, activity code, and at the next step, the list of participants. These details can be used by the Commission or Agency services in order to plan the evaluation. In general, the following details are requested:

- The **proposal acronym** is the name of the proposal and it will be used throughout the lifetime of the project, if funded. No more than 20 characters are allowed (standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters, except underscore, space, hyphen or dot).
- The **proposal short summary** describes briefly the purpose of the proposal with a maximum of 2,000 characters. Entering at least keywords will help the services in preparing the evaluations (e.g. choosing the experts for the evaluations). Coordinators may choose to enter “xxx” at this stage should they prefer not disclosing any data.
- The **Activity code** is the objective addressed by the proposal.

4.3.1.4. Step four: adding other participants to the proposal

At this step the proposal coordinator sets up the consortium. The proposal coordinator can:

- Add other participants to the proposal.
  - The coordinator adds the partners using the nine-digit identifier, the PIC number. A search function is provided to help the coordinator finding the PIC number of the partners.
  - Once the coordinator has added the entities of the consortium, the coordinator has to insert the contact persons’ details for each participant. The main identifier is the e-mail address of a person.
  - Once the coordinator saves this page, an automatic invitation is sent to all contacts’ e-mail address. The invited persons can access the proposal after logging in to the Participant Portal, with the ECAS account linked to the given e-mail address, under the “My Proposals” tab.
- Delete a participant.
- Reorder the participants. The order of the participants in the administrative forms will be adjusted.

The proposal coordinator however cannot be deleted, and is always the first participant.

4.3.1.5. Step five: forms, files and submission

This step is the core of the process, as, from this step, the proposal coordinator can:

- Fill in the administrative forms, Part A of the proposal (see Annex 3, Page 39, of this Guide).
- Complete all the forms, including the budget table and the administrative details of the coordinator and of all participants. Proposal partners can only complete their own administrative details (Form A2). Forms are completed using a PDF reader (e.g. Adobe Acrobat Reader or Okular).
- Download the template of Part B of the proposal and other information files (see Annex 4, Page 50 of this Guide).
- Upload the files that will be Part B of the proposal.
- Submit the proposal package.

> Only the coordinator can upload the part B of the proposal and submit the proposal. Therefore, only the coordinator should be logged into the Electronic Submission Service when the submission attempt is made.

For the proposal Part B you must use exclusively Portable Document Format (PDF) files, compatible with Adobe Acrobat Reader version 3 or higher, with embedded fonts. Other file formats will not be accepted by the system. Irrespective of any page limits specified in Annex 4, Page 50, to this Guide, there is an overall limit of 10 Mbytes to the size of proposal files for Part B. It is advised to limit the size of the proposal to 2 Mbytes.
There are also restrictions to the name given to the part B files. Use alphanumeric characters. Special characters and spaces must be avoided.

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

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

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

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

Completing Part A forms in the Electronic Submission Services and uploading Part B files does not yet mean that the proposal is submitted. Once there is a consolidated version of the proposal, the “SUBMIT” button must be clicked. **Only the coordinator is authorised to submit the proposal.**

At this point the service performs a limited automatic validation of the proposal. A list of discovered problems, such as missing data, is given on the last page of the proposal submission forms. In some cases users are allowed to submit incomplete administrative information but for significant omissions, proposal submission will be blocked until the problems are corrected. Therefore you are strongly advised, when preparing your proposal, to regularly click on “validate” at the bottom of any page of the part A to obtain updated validation messages and to review them on the last page of the proposal submission forms.

When errors or omissions are corrected, the coordinator must then repeat the above step to finally achieve the proposal submission.

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

When the proposal has been successfully submitted, the service will proceed to Step 6 where the coordinator sees a message that indicates that the proposal has been received.

This automatic message is not the official acknowledgement of receipt. See Section 6, Page 19.

**4.3.1.6. Step six: proposal status page**

Reaching this step means that the proposal is submitted, i.e. sent to the Commission or Agency services for evaluation. It does not mean that the proposal is valid, complete, eligible in all respects or that it will be funded.

In Step 6 you can:

- **Download the proposal.** It is advised to download the proposal once submitted to check that it has been correctly sent. The downloaded proposal will be digitally signed and time stamped.

Please note that, specific to the FET FP7-ICT-2013-X call, once a project proposal is submitted its evaluation process will start. As a consequence **it is not possible to re-edit it after its submission.**

**Withdrawing** a project proposal in the FET FP7-ICT-2013-X call may only be possible by contacting the Call Coordinator. This mainly depends on the proposal’s evaluation progress.
4.3.2. Use of the system by other participants

In order to access the proposals, all contacts need to have an ECAS ID that is necessary for the login of the Participant Portal.

Those contacts, who have been invited by the coordinator, can access the proposal via the “My Proposals” tab after the login.

In the proposal submission system, participants can:

- Complete their own entity’s administrative details and budget forms (A2 and A3.1),
- 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.

4.4. About the deadline

4.4.1. Continuous call

Proposals must be submitted on or before the deadline specified in the Call text and for this specific call FP7-ICT-2013-X, only once the proposal is fully ready. It is your responsibility to ensure the timely submission of your proposal.

The Electronic Submission Services of the Commission will be closed for this call at the call deadline. Please note that the deadline established in the call refers to the sharp time, no extra seconds allowed (for example, call deadline at 17:00 means at 17:00:00). After this moment, the proposal can no longer be modified. It is however visible in a read-only version.

Call deadlines are absolutely firm and are strictly enforced. Do not wait until the last moment before submitting your proposal.

Please, note that you should however submit your project proposal only once it is fully ready for evaluation.

Do not wait until the last moment to start the submission of the proposal. Internet access issues and proposal verification issues must be detected well before the submission deadline if help is to be requested from the service desk. Such issues are never accepted as extenuating circumstances for failure to submit in time.

Submission is deemed to occur at the moment when the proposal coordinator completes the submission sequence described above. It is not the point at which you start the upload of the Part B files. 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 submitted your proposal in error to another call which closes after this call, the Commission or Agency 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 Electronic Submission Services, a detailed knowledge of the contents of the proposal and the authority to make last-minute decisions on behalf of the consortium if problems arise. You are advised not to delegate the job of submitting your proposal.

In the unlikely event of a failure of the Electronic Submission Services 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 pages on the Participant Portal.

Such a failure is a rare and exceptional event, therefore do not assume that there will be an extension to this
call. If you have difficulty in submitting your proposal, you should not assume that it is because of a problem
with the Commission server, as this is rarely the case. Contact the Electronic Submission Services help desk
if in doubt (see the address given in Annex 1, Page 29, to this Guide).

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

4.4.2. Correcting or revising your proposal

Once your project proposal is submitted its evaluation process will automatically start. It is therefore
not possible any more to correct or revise the submitted version.

4.5. Ancillary material

The Part B of your proposal is made up of 3 files, each in PDF format:

- **Part B1**: This part must be strictly anonymous\(^1\). It is made up of one single cover page providing the
  acronym, title, abstract of the proposal, followed by a maximum of 8 pages containing a text related
to the first criteria of the evaluation about “Scientific and Technological quality” of the proposal.

- **Part B2**: This part contains no more than two pages. The first one is meant to address the “imple-
  mentation” criteria of the evaluation. The second page provides information dealing with the “Imple-
  mentation” criteria of the evaluation.

- **Part B3**: This third part is not limited in size and must be used exclusively to provide information
  about possible ethical issues identified in the proposed work.

Any hyper-links to other documents, embedded material, and any other documents (company brochures, sup-
porting documentation, reports, audio, video, multimedia etc.) sent electronically or by post, will be disreg-
arded.

4.6. Withdrawing a proposal

If you wish to withdraw a project proposal please contact the Call Coordinator.

A withdrawn proposal will not be subsequently considered by the Commission.

4.7. Registration of legal entities in the Commission’s Early Warning System and
Central Exclusion Database

To protect the EU’s financial interests, the Commission or Agency uses an internal information tool, the
Early Warning System (EWS) to flag identified risks related to beneficiaries of centrally managed contracts
and grants. Through systematic registration of financial and other risks the EWS enables the Commission
services to take the necessary precautionary measures to ensure a sound financial management\(^2\).

EWS registrations are not publicly disclosed. However, registrations will be transferred to the Central Exclu-
sion Database (CED) if they relate to entities that have been excluded from EU funding because they are in-
solvent or have been convicted of a serious professional misconduct or criminal offence detrimental to EU
financial interests. The data in CED are available to **all public authorities implementing EU funds**, i.e.

---

1 See Section 10.2 on Page 31 for the eligibility criteria.
2 The EWS covers situations such as significantly overdue recovery orders, judicial proceedings pending for serious administrative
errors/fraud, findings of serious administrative errors/fraud, legal situations which exclude the beneficiary from funding.
European institutions, national agencies or authorities in Member States, and, subject to conditions for personal data protection, to third countries and international organisations.

The work programme informs you that the details of your organisation (or those of a person who has powers of representation, decision-making or control over it) may be registered in the EWS and the CED and be shared with public authorities as described in the relevant legal texts1.

More information on the EWS and CED can be found at the following URI:
http://ec.europa.eu/budget/explained/management/protection/protect_en.cfm

4.8. Data protection

Proposals are archived under secure conditions at all times. The data contained in the proposal are treated in accordance with Regulation 45/2001 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data2. After completion of the evaluation and at any subsequent negotiation, all copies are destroyed other than those required for archiving and/or auditing purposes.

5. Check list

5.1. Preparing your proposal

- **Does your planned work fit with the call for proposals?** Check that your proposed work does indeed address the topics open in this call. (See the current version of the work programme).
- **Are you applying for the right call and funding scheme?** Check that you have applied for the right call and one of the funding schemes open for your chosen topics (see the work programme)3.
- **Is your proposal eligible?** The eligibility criteria are given in the work programme. See also Annex 2, Page 31, to this Guide. 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? Check that you comply with any budgetary limits that may have been fixed on the requested EU contribution. Any proposal not meeting the eligibility requirements will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- **Is your proposal complete?** Proposals must comprise a Part A, containing the administrative information including participant and project cost details on standard forms; and a Part B containing the scientific and technical description of your proposal as described in this Guide. A proposal that does not contain both parts will be considered ineligible and will not be evaluated.
- **Does your proposal follow the required structure?** Proposals should be precise and concise, and must follow exactly the proposal structure described in this document (see Annex 4, Page 50, to this Guide), which is designed to correspond to the evaluation criteria which will be applied. Omitting requested information will almost certainly lead to lower scores and possible rejection.
- **Does your proposed work raise ethical issues?** Clearly indicate in Part B3 any potential ethical, safety or regulatory aspects of the proposed research and the way these will be dealt with prior and during the implementation of the proposed project. A preliminary ethical control will take place during the evaluation and, if needed, an ethical screening and/or review will take place for those proposals raising ethical issues. Proposals may be rejected on ethical grounds if such issues are not dealt with satisfactorily.
- **Have you maximised your chances?** There will be strong competition. Therefore, edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator;

---

3 If you have in error registered for the wrong call or funding scheme, discard that registration (usernames and passwords) and register again before the call deadline. If, after the close of the call, you discover that you have submitted your proposal to the wrong call, notify the Participant Portal Submission Service Helpdesk.
refer to the evaluation criteria given in Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.

- **Do you need further advice and support?** You are strongly advised to inform your National Contact Point of your intention to submit a proposal (see address in Annex 1, Page 29 to this Guide). Remember the Enquiry service listed in Annex 1, Page 29 to this Guide.

### 5.2. Final checks before submission

- Do you have the agreement of all the members of the consortium to submit this proposal on their behalf?
- Are the three files making your Part B in Portable Document Format (PDF)?
- Is your Part B file name made up of the letters A to Z, and numbers 0 to 9 without special characters or spaces?
- Have you printed out your Part B, to check that it really is the file you intend to submit, and that it is complete, printable and readable? **Once submitted it will not be possible to replace your Part B files of your project proposal.**
- Have you respected the font size (11 point) and the page limitations for the different sections?
- Is your Part B files within the size limit of 10 Mbytes?
- Have you virus-checked your computer? The Participant Portal Submission Service will automatically block the submission of any file containing a virus.

### 5.3. Importance of the deadline

- Have you made yourself familiar with the Participant Portal Submission Service in good time?
- You should only submit your project proposal once it is fully ready for evaluation. However you should make this submission well in advance of the deadline in order to have sufficient time to address potential problems related to the submission procedures.
- Have you completed the Participant Portal Submission process?

### 5.4. Following submission

- Proposal submitted to the Participant Portal can still be viewed by the applicant.
- It is highly recommended that after uploading and submitting your project proposal, you then review what you have uploaded.

### 6. What happens next

Shortly after the effective submission of your proposal the Commission will send an **acknowledgement of receipt** to the e-mail address of the proposal coordinator given in the submitted proposal. This is assumed to be the individual named as “person in charge” on the A2 form of participant number 1.

Please note that the message received on reaching Step 6 within the Participant Portal Submission Service after 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 submission of your proposal or after the call deadline, you should contact the FP7 Enquiry Service (see Annex 1, Page 29, of this Guide). However, first please check that you are the person named in the proposal as contact person for partner number 1, check the email address which you gave for yourself, and check the junk mail box of your email system for a few days following the submission or the deadline for any mail originating from FP7Aor@ess-fp7.org.*

The Commission will check that your proposal meets the **eligibility criteria** that apply to this call and funding scheme (see the work programme and Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide).
All eligible proposals will be evaluated by independent experts. The evaluation criteria and procedure are described in Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide.

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

If you have not received your ESR by the date referred to in Annex 1, Page 29, to this Guide, please contact the Commission via the FP7 enquiry service.

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

The Commission also informs the relevant programme committee, consisting of delegates representing the governments of the Member States and Associated Countries.

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

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

Negotiations between the applicants and the Commission aim to conclude a grant agreement which provides for EU funding of the proposed work. They cover both the scientific/technological, and the administrative and financial aspects of the project. The officials conducting these negotiations on behalf of the Commission will be working within a predetermined budget envelope. They will refer to any recommendations which the experts may have made concerning modifications to the work presented in the proposal, as well as any recommendations arising from an ethical review of the proposal if one was carried out. The negotiations will also deal with gender equality actions, and, if applicable to the proposed project, with gender aspects in the conduct of the planned work, as well as the relevant principles contained in the European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment. Where relevant, security aspects shall also be considered.

A description of the negotiation process is provided in the “FP7 Negotiation guidance notes” (available on CORDIS). Members of the proposal consortium may be invited to Brussels or Luxembourg to facilitate the negotiation.

For participants in negotiated proposals not yet having a Participant Identification Code (PIC), i.e. not yet being registered and validated in the Commission’s Unique Registration Facility (URF), their existence as legal entities and their legal status will have to be validated before any grant agreement can be signed.

Applicants are reminded that the Commission’s Research DGs have adopted a new and reinforced audit strategy aimed at detecting and correcting errors in cost claims submitted in projects on the basis of professional auditing standards. As a result the number of audits and participants audited will increase significantly and the Commission’s services will assure appropriate mutual exchange of information within its relevant internal departments in order to fully coordinate any corrective actions to be taken in a consistent way. More information can be found here: http://cordis.europa.eu/audit-certification/home_en.html.

7. Summary of the evaluation and selection process

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

---

Proposal

Eligibility

Evaluation by experts

Ethical Review (if needed)

Commission ranking

Consultation of programme committee (if required)

Commission funding and/or rejection decision

Commission rejection decision

Applicants informed of results of expert evaluation*

Applicants informed of Commission decision
8. 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 by email shortly after its submission or after the deadline of the call that a proposal has been successfully submitted (but not that it is necessarily eligible). Contact the FP7 Enquiry service urgently if you do not receive such an acknowledgement within a few days of the submission or close of the call.

Applicant

The term used generally in this guide for a person or entity applying to a call for proposals. The term ‘participant’ is used in the more limited sense of a member of a proposal or project consortium (see below).

Associated countries

Non-EU countries which are party to an international agreement with the Community, under the terms or on the basis of which it makes a financial contribution to all or part of the Seventh 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, in Section 4.1.3, Page 8.

C

Call text

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 Participant Portal web page devoted to a particular call.

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 Participant Portal web-site.

Consensus discussion

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

Consortium

Most funding schemes require proposals from a number of participants (usually at least three) who agree to work together in a consortium.

Continuous submission

Some calls are open for an extended period, during which proposals may be submitted at any moment. The evaluation of these proposals start as soon as they have been submitted.

Coordinator

The coordinator leads and represents the applicants. She or he acts as the point of contact with the Commission.
**CORDIS service**

A web service providing access to all the documentation related to FP7. See also Participant Portal.

---

**Deadline**

For a particular call, the moment after which proposals cannot be submitted to the Commission, and when the Participant Portal Submission Service closes for that call. Deadlines are strictly enforced.

**Deliverable**

A deliverable represents a verifiable output of a 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.

**Direct costs**

Direct costs are all eligible costs which can be attributed directly to the project and are identified by the participant as such, in accordance with its accounting principles and its usual internal rules.

---

**Early Warning System (EWS)**

An internal information tool of the Commission to flag identified financial risks related to beneficiaries.

**Eligibility Committee**

An internal committee which examines in detail cases of proposals whose eligibility for inclusion in an evaluation is in question.

**Eligibility criteria**

The minimum conditions which a proposal must fulfil if it is to be retained for evaluation. The eligibility criteria are generally the same for all proposals throughout FP7, and relate to submission before the cut-off date or deadline of the call, minimum participation, completeness and scope. However, additional eligibility criteria may apply to certain calls, and applicants should check the work programme, and Annex 2, Page 31, of this Guide.

**Ethical issues table**

Research activities supported by the Framework Programme should respect fundamental ethical principles. The main issues which might arise in a project are summarised in tabular form in a checklist included in the proposal (Part B3 of a proposal submitted to this FP7-ICT-2013-X call).

**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, additional evaluation criteria may apply to certain calls, and applicants should check the work programme, and Annex 2, Page 31, to this Guide.

**Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)**

The assessment of a particular proposal following the evaluation by independent experts is provided in an Evaluation Summary Report. It normally contains both comments and scores for each evaluation criterion.
FP7 enquiry service

A general information service on all aspects of FP7. Contact details are given in Annex 1, Page 29, to this Guide.

Funding scheme

The mechanisms for the Community funding of research projects. The funding schemes have different objectives, and are implemented through grant agreements.

Grant Agreement (GA)

The legal instrument that provides for Commission funding projects.

Hearing

Applicants whose proposals have been evaluated are sometimes invited to provide explanations and clarifications to any specific questions raised by the experts. These questions are transmitted to the applicants in advance.

Indirect costs

Indirect costs, (sometimes called overheads), 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.

Individual evaluation

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.

Initial information letter

The letter sent by the Commission to applicants shortly after the evaluation by experts, which includes the report from the experts on the proposal in question (the Evaluation Summary Report).

International Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC)

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

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

Joint Research Centre (JRC)

The Commission’s own research institutes.

LEAR (Legal Entity Authorised Representative)

The LEAR is a person nominated in each legal entity participating in FP7. This person is the contact for the Commission related to all questions on legal status. She/he has access to the online database of legal entities with a possibility to view the data stored on her/his entity and to initiate updates and corrections to these data. The LEAR receives a Participant Identification Code (PIC) from the Commission (see below), and distributes this number within her/his organisation.

Lump sum

Lump sums do not require the submission of financial justifications (statements), as they are “fixed”. ICPC participants when participating in an FP7 grant agreement have the choice between being reimbursed on the basis of eligible costs or on the basis of lump-sums. This choice can be made up to the moment of the signature of the grant agreement (whatever the final option chosen, the maximum EU contribution for the project remains unchanged). Once made, it will apply during the whole duration of the agreement without the possibility of changing it. ICPC participants may opt for a lump sum in a given project and for reimbursement of costs in another.

Milestones

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

National Contact Points (NCP)

Official representatives 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.

Non-profit

A legal entity is qualified as “non-profit” when considered as such by national or international law.
**Part A**

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

**Part B**

The part of a proposal explaining the work to be carried out, and the roles and aptitudes of the participants in the consortium. This part is uploaded to the Participant Portal as three different PDF files. Part B1 contains a single cover page and the description related to the “Scientific and Technological quality” criteria. Part B2 describes the “Implementation” and “Impact” aspects of the proposed work. Part B3 addresses possible Ethical issues.

**Part B template**

A set of 3 documents in PDF format supplied by the Participant Portal Submission Service, consisting of a template of all chapter headings, forms and tables required to prepare a proposal Part B. The templates format are given in Annex 4, Page 50, to this Guide.

**Participants**

The members of a consortium in a proposal or project. These are legal entities, and have rights and obligations with regard to the Community.

**Participant Identification Code (PIC)**

Organisations participating in FP7 will progressively be assigned Participant Identification Codes (PIC). Possession of a PIC will enable organisations to take advantage of the Unique Registration Facility (see Page 28), and to identify themselves in all transactions related to FP7 proposals and grants.

**Participant Portal**

The single entry point for interaction with the research Directorates-General of the European Commission. It hosts a full range of services that facilitate the monitoring and the management of proposals and projects throughout their life cycle, including calls for proposals, and access to the Participant Portal Submission Service.

**Participant Portal Submission Service**

A web based service, which must be used to submit proposals to the Commission. Access is given through the Participant Portal.

**Participant Portal Submission Service Helpdesk**

A telephone and email service to assist applicants who have difficulty in submitting their proposal via the Participant Portal Submission Service.

- Email: DIGIT-EFP7-SEP-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu.
- Tel: +32 2-299-22-22.

**Programme committee**

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

**Proposal**

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

Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.

---

**Redress procedure**

The initial information letter will indicate an address if an applicant wishes to submit a request for redress, if she or he believes that there have been shortcomings in the handling of the proposal in question, and that these shortcomings would jeopardise the outcome of the evaluation process. An internal evaluation review committee (“redress committee”) will examine all such complaints. This committee does not itself evaluate the proposal. It is possible that the committee will recommend a re-evaluation of all or part of the proposal.

---

**Research organisation**

A legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.

---

**Reserve list**

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

---

**Risk-Sharing Finance Facility (RSFF)**

A new mechanism to foster private sector investment in research, by increasing the capacity of the EIB and its financial partners to provide loans for European RTD projects.

---

**RTD**

Research and Technological Development.

---

**SME**

SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises. SMEs are defined in Recommendation 2003/361/EC of 6 May 2003.

---

**Specific flat rate (60%)**

A 60% flat rate of the total direct costs applicable under certain conditions to non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SME. This rate is now available for the entire duration of FP7.

---

**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.
Thresholds

For a proposal to be considered for funding, the evaluation scores for individual criteria must exceed certain thresholds.

Two-stage submission

Some calls require proposals to be submitted in two stages. In this case, applicants initially present their idea in a brief outline proposal. This is evaluated against evaluation criteria, or sub-criteria for this stage set out in the call. Applicants successful in the first stage will be invited to submit a full proposal at the second stage, which will be evaluated against criteria for this second stage set out in the call. The first stage criteria, as set out in the work programme, are usually a limited set of those applying at the second stage.

Two-step evaluation

An evaluation procedure in which a proposal is evaluated first on a limited number of evaluation criteria (usually, just one), and only those proposals which achieve the threshold on this are subject to a full evaluation on the remaining criteria.

Unique Registration Facility (URF)

A system that will allow organisations who intend to submit on several occasions to register their details once and for all, obviating the need to provide the same information with each submission. The Web interface of the URF is found at the URI http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/urf. On this website you will also find a search tool to check if your organisation is already registered or not.

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, Page 31, to this Guide.

Work Package

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

Work Programme

A formal document of the Commission for the implementation of a specific programme, 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.
9. Annex 1: Timetable and specific information for this call

9.1. Timetable

The ICT 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 page. You must consult this document.

- Indicative timetable for Call FP7-ICT-2011-C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication of call</td>
<td>12th Septembre 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for submission of proposals</td>
<td>29th January 2013 at 17:00 Brussels time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators</td>
<td>June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>Starting on 12th September 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature of first grant agreements</td>
<td>September 2013 – October 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2. Further information and help

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

9.2.1. Call information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Portal</td>
<td><a href="http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/">http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/</a> (select the tab “FP7 calls”)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.2.2. General sources of help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP7 Research enquiries service</td>
<td><a href="http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries">http://ec.europa.eu/research/enquiries</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Portal Submission Service</td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:DIGIT-EFP7-SEP-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu">DIGIT-EFP7-SEP-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu</a> Tel: +32 2-299-22-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Help Desk</td>
<td><a href="http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/get-support_en.html">http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/get-support_en.html</a> (information under “Ethics Help Desk for all FP7 projects”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Sharing Financing Facility (European Investment Bank)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.eib.org/rsff">http://www.eib.org/rsff</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2.3. FP7/ICT Support projects

| Idealist partner search project | http://www.ideal-ist.eu |
| IPR Help Desk | http://www.ipr-helpdesk.eu |

9.2.4. Legal documents generally applicable

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

These documents are available via http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html.

9.2.5. Contractual information

- Consortium agreement checklist
- Negotiation Guidance notes
- Financial guidelines
- Model Grant agreement

These documents are available via http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html.

9.3. Pre-proposal check

The Commission offers a facility to allow an applicant to check on the appropriateness of their proposed action and the eligibility of the proposal consortium. Simply contact the coordinator of the FET-Open scheme (see http://cordis.europa.eu/ict/fet-open/home_en.html).

The advice given by the Commission is strictly informal and non-binding. Only one pre-proposal check will be carried out per proposal. The advice provided through the pre-proposal check does not in any way engage the Commission with respect to acceptance or rejection of the proposal when it is formally submitted at a later stage. The evaluators who later evaluate your proposal will not be informed of the results of the pre-proposal check, nor even that a pre-proposal check was carried out. The pre-proposal service is not intended to assist with the identification of possible partners for your consortium.

This pre-proposal assessment service is entirely optional. Any proposal can always be submitted directly to the call without a pre-proposal check.
10. Annex 2: Evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied to STREP proposals for this call

10.1. General

All eligible proposals are evaluated by independent experts.

Commission staff ensures that the process is fair, and in line with the principles contained in the Commission’s rules¹.

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, one or more independent experts 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 observers 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.

10.2. 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 via the Participant Portal Submission Service before the deadline given in the call text.
- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call text
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)
- The content of the proposal relates to the topics and funding schemes, including any special conditions, set out in the relevant parts of the work programme
- Part B1 must be strictly anonymous, which means that it may not include the name of any organisation or its staff involved in the consortium or any other information which could identify an applicant. Furthermore, on the title page and in Section 1 strictly no bibliographic references or links to additional information are permitted.
- Part B1 must include one single cover page followed by a maximum of 8 pages describing the “Scientific and Technological quality” of the proposal.
- Part B2 must not be longer than two pages and should include:
  - One page maximum describing the “Implementation” criteria.
  - One page maximum describing the “Impact” criteria.

Proposal in which the Part B PDF files have been password protected or for which printing has been disabled will be considered as failing the eligibility conditions under the third bullet point.

The Commission 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;

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

10.3. Evaluation of proposals

10.3.1. Overview

At the beginning of the evaluation, experts will be briefed on 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.

The evaluation process for the specific FP7-ICT-2013-X call is made in 2 steps.

In a first step, a project proposal is evaluated only according to the “Scientific and Technological quality” criteria described in Part B1. This step involves individual evaluations carried out remotely so that top-level expertise can be accessed in the very broad scientific and technical areas covered by FET-Open.

If the result of the evaluation of the first criteria is below the corresponding threshold, the proposal will not be further considered.

Otherwise, if the result of the evaluation of the first criteria is equal to or above the corresponding threshold, the evaluation of the proposal continues to the second step. This second step is not anonymous and is carried through a combination of remote evaluation and panels of experts in Brussels. It will assess further the “Implementation” and “Impact” criteria. Then the evaluators in Brussels will discuss further the syntheses and scores and compare the proposals participating to the second step evaluation in a series of panel meetings.

In both cases, a synthesis of the individual evaluations will be drafted.

The proposal will be evaluated against the following pre-determined evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria applicable to</th>
<th>Collaborative project proposals (STREP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/T QUALITY</td>
<td>IMPLEMENTATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“scientific and/or technological excellence” (relevent to the topics addressed by the call)</td>
<td>“Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clarity of targeted breakthrough and its relevance towards a long-term vision.</td>
<td>• Quality of management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quality of the participants and of the consortium as a whole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation criteria applicable to Collaborative project proposals (STREP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/T QUALITY</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“scientific and/or technological excellence” (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</td>
<td>“Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”</td>
<td>“Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Novelty and foundational character. • Specific contribution to progress in science and technology. • Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and workplan.</td>
<td>• Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources (person-months, equipment, budget).</td>
<td>science, technology and/or society. • Appropriateness of measures envisaged for the dissemination and/or use of project results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Threshold: 4/5 | Threshold: 3/5 | Threshold: 3.5/5 |
| Weight: 80% | Weight: 10% | Weight: 10% |

NO OVERALL THRESHOLD

Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the three criteria, not for the sub-criteria (bullet points). These 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.

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 topics of the call, or if only part of the proposal addresses the topics, 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0:</td>
<td>The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:</td>
<td>Very good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 general 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.

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.

10.3.2. First step evaluation: Scientific excellence

Individual Evaluation: The “Scientific and Technological quality” criteria of each proposal will first be assessed remotely, anonymously and independently by three or more experts, chosen by the Commission from a pool of experts taking part in this evaluation. At this first step the experts are acting individually; they do not discuss the proposal with each other, nor with any third party. The experts record their individual opinions in an Individual Evaluation Report (IER), giving scores and also comments against the first evaluation criteria.

When scoring proposals, experts must only apply the above evaluation criteria (See Page 32).

Experts will assess and mark the first criteria of 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. The opinion expressed should be factual and justify the assessment. The score should be in line with the comment. Recommendations for improvements to be discussed as part of a possible negotiation phase will be given, if needed.

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

Consensus phase: 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 an electronic forum 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 first evaluation criteria “Scientific and Technological quality”.

The moderator or a specific rapporteur will prepare a draft Consensus Report (CR). The experts attempt to agree on a consensus score for the first criteria and on 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 Commission may ask up to three additional experts to examine the proposal.

Once the CR is agreed, the moderator or a specific rapporteur will provide the Consensus Meeting Minutes (CMM) that documents how the consensus has been reached.

---

1 In the sense of Appendix 5 of the ICT work programme.
Outcome of consensus: The outcome of the consensus step is the Consensus Report, together with its related CMM. 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 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 phase of the first step of the evaluation.

Conclusion of the first step evaluation: If the result of the first step evaluation is below the corresponding threshold, the FET-Open Objective coordinator will prepare an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), based on the final CR agreed by the evaluators. This ESR will only show the comments and associated score related to the first criteria “Scientific and Technological quality”. If the result of the first step evaluation is equal or above the corresponding threshold, the evaluation of the project proposal will continue to the second step dealing with the second, “Implementation” and third “Impact” criteria.

Evaluation of a resubmitted proposal: In the case of proposals that have been submitted previously to the Commission in FP7, the moderator may give the experts the previous evaluation summary report following 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.

10.3.3. Second step evaluation: Implementation and Impact

Individual Evaluation: The two remaining criteria1, “Implementation” and “Impact” of each proposal, whose evaluation during the first step was successful, will first be assessed, remotely or on site in Brussels, and independently by three or more experts, chosen by the Commission from a pool of experts taking part in this evaluation. At this second 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 second and third evaluation criteria.

When scoring proposals, experts must only apply the above evaluation criteria (See Page 32).

Experts will assess and mark the second and third criteria of 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. The opinion expressed should be factual and justify the assessment. The score should be in line with the comment. Recommendations for improvements to be discussed as part of a possible negotiation phase will be given, if needed.

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

Consensus phase: Once all the experts to whom a proposal has been assigned have completed their IER in the second step, the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment, representing their common views. This entails a consensus meeting or an electronic forum to discuss the scores awarded and to prepare comments.

A dedicated rapporteur will prepare a draft Consensus Report (CR) taking into consideration the IER prepared at the second step. The experts attempt to agree on a consensus score for the second and third criteria and on 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 ethics if necessary.

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

---

1 In the sense of Appendix 5 of the ICT work programme.
particular proposals or the organisations involved, and to ensure a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the second “Implementation” and third “Impact” evaluation criteria.

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.

Once the CR is agreed, the moderator or a specific rapporteur will provide the CMM that documents how a consensus has been reached.

**Outcome of consensus:** The outcome of the consensus step is the Consensus Report, together with its CMM. 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 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 draft consensus phase of the second step of the evaluation.

**Ethical issues:** In parallel to the assessment of the second and third criteria, possible Ethical issues will be assessed taking into consideration Part B3 of the proposal and a draft EIR possibly produced during the first step of the evaluation. If one or more experts have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal and the proposal is considered to be on or above threshold, the relevant box on the final consensus report will be ticked and an Ethical Issues Report (EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues.

**Evaluation of a resubmitted proposal:** In the case of proposals that have been submitted previously to the Commission in FP7, the moderator may give the experts the previous evaluation summary report following 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.

**Conclusion of the second step evaluation:** The result of the second step of the evaluation is a set of finalised, complete (i.e. addressing all three criteria) and signed CR for the project proposals that successfully passed the first step evaluation, including a possible EIR. Each of these final CR is translated into a corresponding draft Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) that will be processed further.

**10.3.4. Panel meetings: Production of final ESR**

This allows the evaluators to formulate their recommendations to the Commission having had an overview of the results of the consensus step. The panel comprises experts involved at the consensus step with experts who reviewed the other proposals in the area.

According to the number and topic of proposals received, the continuation of the evaluation session can be organised in parallel thematic panels each of which is composed of the proposal rapporteurs. A panel rapporteur is assigned whose main tasks are to report at the consolidation panel meeting and to provide input to the panel report.

Before panel meetings evaluators familiarise themselves with all proposals to be discussed. For this they are provided with the abstracts (form A1) of all the proposals. They may also access the proposals themselves as well as the individual evaluator reports (IER forms).

All the draft ESR, coming from the finalised CR, from the proposals that reached Step 2 are discussed and reviewed collectively in panel meetings. The conclusion for each proposal is based on a collective wisdom and consistency of the scoring is therefore assured. In doing so, the panel meetings also ensure that the marks have been used consistently, on all criteria, including on the “Scientific and Technological quality” criteria that was evaluated in Step 1. Their outcome is recorded as the final ESR for that proposal.

---

1 Exceptionally for Ethical issues, no consensus is required.
The panel discussion includes:

- Resolving cases where a minority view was recorded in the consensus report,
- Reviewing any suggestion for reduction in effort provided in the Consensus Report for the proposals that have passed all thresholds. Such recommendations are set out in the final ESR,
- Making recommendations on possible clustering or combination of proposals and
- Recommending a priority order for proposals with the same score

The moderator or rapporteur in charge of a proposal will document the process related to the proposal in the corresponding minutes.

The panel is chaired by the Commission who will ensure fair and equal treatment of the proposals in the panel discussions. A panel rapporteur will be appointed to draft the panel’s advice. All proposals passing all thresholds will then be ordered according to scores.

10.3.5. Priority order for proposals with the same score

This is the final step involving the independent experts. A panel review will recommend one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above. A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget shown in the call text.

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. Whether or not such a prioritisation is carried out will depend on the available budget or other conditions set out in the call text. The following approach will be applied successively for every group of ex-æquo proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

1. Proposals will be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion “Scientific and/or Technological excellence”.
2. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion “Impact”.
3. If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on other appropriate characteristics, to be decided by the panel, related to the contribution of the proposal to the European Research Area and/or general objectives mentioned in the work programme.

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

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

If the panel has considered proposals submitted to various parts of a call (e.g. different funding schemes, or different topics that have been allocated distinct indicative budgets in the work programme), the report may accordingly contain multiple priority lists.

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

A copy of the Evaluation Summary Report will be sent to each proposal coordinator.

10.3.6. Ethical Review of project proposals

An ethics review of above-threshold proposals may be organised by the Commission. The Ethics Review is carried out by independent experts with a special expertise on ethics. Reviewing research projects on ethical grounds at the EU level is a legal requirement under FP7. The Review evaluates aspects of the design and methodology of the proposed research such as intervention on humans, use of animals, data protection issues, terms of participation of children and vulnerable populations groups.
The Panel drafts an Ethics Review Report that summarises its opinion on the ethical soundness of the project proposal under consideration. The requirements put forward by the Panel are taken into account in any subsequent negotiations on the grant agreement, and may lead to obligatory provisions in the conduct of the research.

11. Annex 3: Instructions for completing Part A of the proposal

Proposals in this call must be submitted electronically, using the Participant Portal Submission Service. The procedure is summarised in Section 4, Page 8 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. Section A1 gives a snapshot of your proposal, Section A2 concerns the participants in the consortium, while Section A3 deals with the money matters. Details of the work you intend to carry out will be described in Part B (See Annex 4, Page 50, of this guide).

Please note:

- The coordinator fills in the 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, if any, do not fill in Section A2 and are not listed separately in Section A3. They are described in Part B.

When you complete Section A3, please make sure that:

- Numbers are always rounded to the nearest whole number.
- You have inserted zeros ("0") where there are no costs, or funding figures. Leaving cells empty will block the submission of your proposal.
- All costs are given in Euros, not thousands of Euros.
- Costs do not include Value Added Tax.

| STREPs in the ICT Theme do not include a cost category “Other”. |
| Dissemination activities may be classified under “Management”. |
| Activities such as IPR protection or the preparation of an exploitation plan may be classified under “Management”. |
| Activities such as training, coordination activities with other research projects or the commercial exploitation of results cannot be included in a STREP project. |

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

### Collaborative Projects

For each type of Collaborative Projects, please refer to the work programme.

### 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.

### Call (part) identifier

The call identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you are addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union, and on the Participant Portal call page. In this specific case, the call identifier should be: FP7-ICT-2013-X. The call identifier is pre-filled in the forms from the Participant Portal Submission Service. If you do not have the identifier FP7-ICT-2013-X on your forms in the context of a Xtrack FET-Open proposal submission, you have registered for a wrong call. Discard the registration and register again.

### Topic code(s) most relevant to your proposal

Please refer to the topic codes /objectives listed in the work programme call text. 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 ver-
### Section A1: Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Similar proposals or signed contracts</strong></th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

There is a **limit of 2000 characters**. Exceeding this limit may block the submission of your proposal.
## Section A2/ Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant number</th>
<th>The number allocated by the consortium to the participant for this proposal. The <strong>co-ordinator</strong> of a proposal is always <strong>number one</strong>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identify Code</td>
<td>The Participant Identification Code (PIC) enables organisations to take advantage of the Participant Portal. Organisations who have received a PIC from the Commission 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 <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/searchorganisations">http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/searchorganisations</a>. Organisations not yet having a PIC are strongly encouraged to register before submitting the proposal and insert in Section A2 the temporary PIC received at the end of the registration process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal name</td>
<td><strong>For Public Law Body</strong>, 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; <strong>For Private Law Body</strong>, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register. <strong>For a natural person</strong>, it is for e.g. Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Short Name</td>
<td>Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents. This short name should <strong>not be more than 20 characters</strong> exclusive of special characters (.;/…), e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal address</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit organisation</td>
<td>Non-profit organisation is a legal entity qualified as such when it is recognised by national or, international law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public body</td>
<td>Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research organisation</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACE code</td>
<td><strong>NACE</strong> means “Nomenclature des Activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne”. Please select <strong>one</strong> activity from the list that <strong>best</strong> describes your professional and economic ventures. If you are involved in more than one economic activity, please select the <strong>one</strong> activity that is <strong>most</strong> 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: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&amp;StrNom=NACE_1_1&amp;StrLanguage=Code=EN&amp;StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC">http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&amp;StrNom=NACE_1_1&amp;StrLanguage=Code=EN&amp;StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## 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](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](http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm).

## Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)

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**).

**Control:** 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.

## Character of dependence

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.

## 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.
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Indirect Costs

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.

Method of calculating indirect costs

Summary description

• 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.
• 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.

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 (or choose the 20% flat rate option under 2. below). This method is the same as the “full cost” model used in previous Framework Programmes.

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
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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
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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.

**Method of calculating indirect costs**

- **YES**
  - Real indirect costs or costs calculated using a simplified method

- **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

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
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner Country (ICPC)</th>
<th>which is identified as such in Annex I of the work programmes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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 EU contribution is calculated by applying the normal upper funding limits shown under “requested EU contribution”. This amount is all inclusive, covering support towards both the direct and the indirect costs.


**Type of Activity**

- RTD activities means activities directly aimed at creating new knowledge, new technology, and products including scientific coordination.
- Demonstration activities means activities designed to prove the viability of new technologies that offer a potential economic advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product like prototypes).
- Management activities 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, dissemination and any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities.

**Personnel costs**

Personnel costs are only the costs of the actual hours worked by the persons directly carrying out work under the project and shall reflect the total remuneration: salaries plus social security charges (holiday pay, pension contribution, health insurance, etc.) and other statutory costs included in the remuneration. Such persons must:

- be directly hired by the participant in accordance with its national legislation,
- be working under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter, and
- be remunerated in accordance with the normal practices of the participant.

Participants may opt to declare average personnel costs if certified in accordance with a methodology approved by the Commission and consistent with the management principles and usual accounting practices of the participant. Average personnel costs charged by a participant having provided a certification on the methodology are deemed not to significantly differ from actual personnel costs.

**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
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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.

### Total Budget

*Note: The term “Total Budget” does not mean your requested EU contribution.*

A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.

### Requested EU contribution

The requested EU contribution shall be determined by applying the upper funding limits indicated below, per activity and per participant to the costs accepted by the Commission, or to the flat rates or lump sums.

**Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs**

- **Research and technological development** = 50% or 75%*
- **Demonstration activities** = 50%
- **Other activities (including management)** = 100%

(*) For participants that are non profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs.

### Total Receipts

*Note: The term “Receipts” does not mean your requested EU contribution.*

Receipts of the project may arise from:

a) Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties:
   - shall be considered a receipt of the project if they have been contributed by the third party specifically to be used on the project.
   - shall *not* be considered a receipt of the project if their use is at the management discretion of the participant.

b) Income generated by the project:
   - 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;
   - shall *not* be considered a receipt for the participant when generated from the use of foreground resulting from the project.

The Community financial contribution may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for the participants. For this reason, the total requested EU funding plus receipts cannot exceed the total eligible costs.
12. Annex 4: Instructions for drafting Part B of the proposal (FET Open Xtrack proposal)

**Small or medium-scale focused research projects (STREPs)**

A description of this funding scheme is given in Section 2, Page 6, of this Guide for Applicants. Please examine this carefully before preparing your proposal.

This annex provides a template to help you structure your proposal. An electronic version of this template can be obtained via the Participant Portal Submission Service. 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, Page 31, of this Guide). Sections 1, 2 and 3 each correspond to an evaluation criterion. The sub-sections (1.1, 1.2 etc.) correspond to the sub-criteria. Section 4 corresponds to the Ethical Issues aspects of the proposal.

Please keep to maximum page lengths where these are specified. Project proposals exceeding one or more of these limits will be declared ineligible. The format of a page is the ISO 216 standard A4. The minimum font size allowed is 11 points. All margins (top, bottom, left and right) should be at least 15mm (not including any footers or headers).

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

- The Part B of a project proposal is made up of 3 files called B1, B2 and B3 in the following. These three files must be provided in PDF format.
- Part B1 may not exceed the limit of 9 pages, must be strictly anonymous and may not provide any background reference. It includes one single cover page, Bc, that provides general information about the proposal (See below) and a maximum of 8 pages describing the first criteria, “Scientific and Technological quality”.
- Part B2 may not exceed the limit of 2 pages. It includes one page maximum describing the criteria number 2 “Implementation” and one page maximum addressing the criteria number 3 “Impact”.
- Part B3 is not restricted in number of pages but must contain at least the table providing the overview of the Ethical Issues related to the project proposal. The skeleton of this table is available on Page 55, of this guide.
- Part B of the proposal will be evaluated according to the criteria specified for STREP proposals (See Page 32).

---

1 See Section 10.2 on Page 31 for the eligibility criteria.
Part B1

Maximum length – 9 pages.

Cover Page

Maximum length – 1 page.

- Proposal full title
- Proposal acronym
- Type of funding scheme: In this case – Small or medium-scale focused research project (STREP)
- Work programme topics addressed; if more than one, indicate their order of importance to the project
- Proposal abstract; copied from Part A, if not in English include an English translation.

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

Maximum length – 8 pages.

“FET-Open is a special scheme designed to be open and continuously responsive to novel and fragile ideas that challenge current thinking, whenever they arise and wherever they come from. It aims at foundational breakthroughs that can open radically new directions for information and communication technologies in the future.”

1.1 Targeted breakthrough and long-term vision

Describe the breakthrough(s) that you are targeting to achieve. What is the long-term vision (scientific, technological, societal, other) that motivates this breakthrough? Explain how this breakthrough is an essential step towards the achievement of your long-term vision, in particular in terms of new forms and uses of information and information technologies. Describe the concrete objectives that you consider to constitute the proof-of-concept of such a breakthrough. The objectives should be those that you consider achievable within the project, in spite of the inherent risks. For each objective indicate clear intermediate and final targeted results that should be stated in a verifiable form. Clear quantitative targets are preferable when possible.

1.2 Novelty and foundational character

Describe the state-of-the-art in the area(s) concerned, and the advance that the proposed project would bring about. Clearly describe the novelty of your proposal. In what way do you challenge current thinking or assumptions? Novelty should come from new ideas, not from the incremental refinement of existing approaches. It can also come from new and unexpected combinations of insights from various disciplines. What is the scientific foundation that you aim to develop and what are the specific contributions to science and technology that your project will make (including in case of failure)?

1.3 Specific contribution to progress in science and technology

Describe what will the contribution of your proposed work to the progress in science and technology.

1.4 S/T methodology¹ and workplan

This section should demonstrate a credible approach to achieve the objectives and the targeted intermediate and final results indicated in Section 1.1. Provide a detailed description of the scientific and technological approach or methodology by which you will attempt to reach your objectives and tar-

¹ Note that, whereas the scientific and technological methodology is evaluated under the criteria ‘S/T quality’, the quality of the actual workplan is evaluated under FET-Open under the criteria ‘Implementation’.
geted results. Provide a brief description of the necessary research activities and of the related effort. Demonstrate that you are aware of the level and nature of the risks of failure, and that you have a good idea on how to address these risks. Where relevant, show how your approach takes into account the difficulties inherent to the multi-disciplinary nature of the idea or approach that you are proposing.
Part B2

Maximum length: 2 pages.

Section 2: Implementation

Maximum length: 1 page.

2.1 Quality of management

Describe the management approach necessary to match the nature, complexity and scale of the project and how you will ensure fruitful research collaboration across domains and disciplines.

2.2 Individual participants and consortium as a whole

For each participant in the proposed project, provide a brief description of the main tasks they have been attributed, and the previous experience relevant to those tasks. Provide also a short profile of the main individual(s) who will be undertaking the work. Describe how the participants collectively constitute a consortium capable of achieving the project objectives.

Sub-contracting: Indicate and briefly justify any part of the work that is planned to be sub-contracted by the participant responsible.

Other countries: If one or more of the participants requesting EU funding is based outside of the EU Member states, Associated countries and the list of International Cooperation Partner Countries, explain in terms of the project’s objectives why such funding would be essential.

2.3 Resources to be committed

In addition to the costs indicated on form A3 of the proposal, and the effort shown in Section 1.4 above, please identify any other major costs (e.g. equipment).

Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised, including any resources that will complement the EU contribution and show how the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

Section 3: Impact

Maximum length: 1 page.

3.1 Transformational impact on science, technology and/or society

What would be the measures proposed to maximise the transformative impact of your project? What difference will they make, especially in terms of long-lasting changes on science, technology, society or theories? Explain how account is taken of other national or international related activities.

3.2 Dissemination and/or use of project results

Describe the measures you propose for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and how these will increase the impact of the project. In designing these measures, you should take into account a variety of communication means and target groups as appropriate (e.g. policy-makers, interest groups, media and the public at large).

For more information on communication guidance, see the URI http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/science-communication/index_en.htm

1 See CORDIS web-site, the Participant Portal and Annex 1 of the work programme.
Part B3

Section 4: Ethical Issues

No maximum length for Section 4: depends on the number and complexity of the ethical issues involved

Describe any ethical issues that may arise in the project. In particular, you should explain the benefit and burden of the experiments and the effects it may have on the research subject. Identify all countries where research will be undertaken and which ethical committees and regulatory organisations will need to be approached during the life of the project.

The following special issues should be taken into account.

Informed consent

When describing issues relating to informed consent, it will be necessary to illustrate an appropriate level of ethical sensitivity, and consider issues of insurance, incidental findings and the consequences of leaving the study.

Data protection issues

Avoid the unnecessary collection and use of personal data. Identify the source of the data, describing whether it is collected as part of the research or is previously collected data being used. Consider issues of informed consent for any data being used. Describe how personal identity of the data is protected.

Use of animals

Where animals are used in research the application of the 3Rs (Replace, Reduce, Refine) must be convincingly addressed. Numbers of animals should be specified. State what happens to the animals after the research experiments.

Human embryonic stem cells

Research proposals that will involve human embryonic stem cells (hESC) will have to address 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 have taken into account the legislation, regulations, ethical rules and/or codes of conduct in place in the country(ies) where the research using hESC is to take place, including the procedures for obtaining informed consent;
- the source of the hESC;
- the measures taken to protect personal data, including genetic data, and privacy;
- the nature of financial inducements, if any.

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. If you are sure that none of the issues apply to your proposal, simply tick the YES box in the last row.

Notes:

1. For further information on ethical issues relevant to ICT, see Annex 5, Page 56, of this Guide
2. 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.
3. A dedicated website that aims to provide clear, helpful information on ethical issues is now available at the URI http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ethics_en.html. The site includes guidance documents on privacy and data protection, developing countries, informed consent procedures, etc.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Informed Consent</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve children?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve patients?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve persons not able to give consent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve adult healthy volunteers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Biological research</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human Genetic Material?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human biological samples?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human biological data collection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human Embryos?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human Foetal Tissue or Cells?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve Human Embryonic Stem Cells?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Privacy</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve tracking the location or observation of people without their knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research on Animals</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve research on animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are those animals transgenic farm animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are those animals cloned farm animals?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are those animals non-human primates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Research Involving Developing Countries</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Is any part of the research carried out in countries outside of the European Union and FP7 Associated states?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Dual Use</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the research have direct military application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the research have the potential for terrorist abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ICT Implants</strong></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Does the proposal involve clinical trials of ICT implants?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(If none) I confirm that none of the above issues apply to my proposal.
13. Annex 5: Ethical Guidelines for undertaking ICT research in FP7

13.1. Introduction

In recent years there has been an increase in the importance of ethical issues related to ICT research and technological developments.

The decision of the European Parliament and the Council concerning FP7\(^1\) states that research activities supported by the Framework Programme should respect fundamental ethical principles, including those reflected in the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union\(^2\) and take into account opinions of the European Group on Ethics in Science and New Technologies (EGE)\(^3\).

Article 15 of the FP7 draft rules of participation\(^4\) states that any proposal which contravenes fundamental ethical principles or which does not fulfil the conditions set out in the specific programme, the workprogramme or in the call for proposals shall not be selected and may be excluded from the evaluation, selection and award procedures at any time.

Applications for EU-funded research activities may, if appropriate, include specific tasks or a specific work package that explicitly addresses ethical concerns (in terms of the research, its conduct and outcomes) and outlines how ethical issues raised by the proposed research will be handled.

The purpose of this guidance is to assist proposers in identifying potential ethical issues arising from the proposed ICT research.

13.2. Conduct of ICT Research

All research areas within ICT of FP7 may raise ethical issues of varying seriousness. Some proposals will be more sensitive than others. It is likely that new, sensitive applications will come to the fore during the term of FP7.

13.2.1. A responsible approach

It is likely that most of the principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union\(^5\) will be relevant to the approach adopted by ICT researchers. These principles cover dignity, freedom, equality, solidarity, citizens’ rights and justice. Proposals must comply with Article 8 of the European Human Rights Convention\(^6\). In particular, given the pervasive and ubiquitous nature of ICT and the many opportunities it offers, researchers should consider the sensitive implications of their proposals for privacy and autonomy\(^7\).

However, researchers should recognise that new dangers associated with the process of ICT research can exist. They should carry out a prior assessment of risk and identification of precautionary actions proportional to the potential risk/harm\(^8\).

Researchers have a duty to alert public authorities to the ethical and practical implications of the ICT research outcomes, as and when particular issues become apparent within the research process\(^9\).

---

\(^1\) Decision 1982/2006/EC: Official Journal L412 of 18/12/06
\(^2\) http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/default_en.htm
\(^3\) The EGE is an independent, multidisciplinary body, appointed by the Commission to examine ethical questions arising from science and new technologies and on this basis to issue Opinions – http://ec.europa.eu/european_group_ethics/index_en.htm
\(^4\) Official Journal L391 of 30/12/06
\(^6\) http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/005.htm
\(^7\) Opinion 10 of EGE - The Ethical Aspects of the 5th Framework Programme, http://ec.europa.eu/european_group_ethics/docs/opinion10_en.pdf
Researchers should comply with national legislation, European Union legislation, respect international conventions and declarations and take into account the Opinions of the European Group on Ethics. However, consideration of ethical issues goes beyond simple compliance with current regulations and laws.

13.2.2. Privacy and informed consent

The right to privacy and data protection is a fundamental right and therefore applicable to ICT research.

Researchers must be aware that volunteers have the right to remain anonymous. Researchers must comply with Data Protection legislation in the Member State where the research will be carried out regarding ICT research data that relates to volunteers.

Informed consent is required whenever ICT research involves volunteers in interviews, behavioural observation, invasive and non-invasive experimentation, and accessing personal data records. The purpose of informed consent is to empower the individual to make a voluntary informed decision about whether or not to participate in the research based on knowledge of the purpose, procedures and outcomes of the research.

Before consent is sought, information must be given specifying the alternatives, risks, and benefits for those involved in a way they understand. When such information has been given, free and informed consent must be obtained. Depending on the nature of the research, different consent procedures may be used. Special consideration must be given when volunteers have reduced autonomy or are vulnerable.

The majority of European citizens view personal privacy as an important issue. Research, for example, on RFID and ICT for healthcare, is likely to raise privacy issues. Therefore, researchers must ensure that the manner in which research outcomes are reported does not contravene the right to privacy and data protection. Furthermore, researchers must carefully evaluate and report the personal privacy implications of the intended use or potential use of the research outcomes. Wherever possible, they must ensure that research outcomes do not contravene these fundamental rights.

13.2.3. Use of animals in ICT research

In accordance with the Amsterdam protocol on animal protection and welfare, animal experiments must be replaced with alternatives wherever possible. Suffering by animals must be avoided or kept to a minimum. This particularly applies to animal experiments involving species which are closest to human beings. Thus ICT research involving animals should conform to the ethical principles of replacement, reduction, refinement and minimisation of suffering.

Proposers must carefully justify animal experiments in cross-science proposals for non-medical objectives. Furthermore, they should identify the scientific areas which would benefit from knowledge gained through animal experiments. Proposers must be aware that Member States may have differing and possibly conflicting interpretations of animal welfare in research, and the research must meet regulations in the country in which it will be carried out.

---

2 “Volunteers” is used to describe all those who are the subjects of research observations, experiments, tests etc.
13.3. Specific guidance in some currently sensitive areas

13.3.1. ICT implants\(^1\) and wearable computing

- ICT implants should only be developed if the objective cannot be achieved by less-invasive methods such as wearable computing devices and RFID tags.
- To the extent that an individual, via an ICT implant or wearable computing device, becomes part of an ICT network, the operation of this whole network will need to respect privacy and data protection requirements.
- ICT implants in healthcare are, in general, acceptable when the objective is saving lives, restoring health, or improving the quality of life. They should be treated in the same way as drugs and medical devices.\(^2\)
- ICT implants to enhance human capabilities should only be developed: to bring individuals into the “normal” range for the population, if they so wish and give their informed consent; or to improve health prospects such as enhancing the immune system. Their use should be based on need, rather than economic resources or social position.
- ICT implants or wearable computing devices must not: allow individuals to be located on a permanent and/or occasional basis, without the individual’s prior knowledge and consent; allow information to be changed remotely without the individual’s prior knowledge and consent; be used to support any kind of discrimination; be used to manipulate mental functions or change personal identity, memory, self-perception, perception of others; be used to enhance capabilities in order to dominate others, or enable remote control over the will of other people.
- ICT implants should not be developed to influence future generations, either biologically or culturally.
- ICT implants should be developed to be removed easily.

13.3.2. eHealth\(^3\) and genetics

Personal health data must be treated as “sensitive personal data”\(^4\). ICT researchers using it have a duty of confidentiality equivalent to the professional duty of medical secrecy. Therefore:

- The use of personal health data in ICT research for the purposes from which society as a whole be- nefits must be justified in the context of the personal rights.
- The security of ICT in healthcare is an ethical imperative to ensure the respect for human rights and freedoms of the individual, in particular the confidentiality of data and the reliability of ICT systems used in medical care.
- Proposers should be particularly aware when ICT is linked to sensitive medical areas such as the use of genetic material\(^1\).
- Proposers should access established general medical and genetics ethical guidance when formulating their proposals.

13.3.3. ICT and Bio/Nano-electronics

ICT-bio/nano-electronics has a strong potential for misuse. Consequently, proposers should pay particular attention to the guidelines in Section 2 in this area\(^5\).

---


Researchers involved in ICT-bio/nano-electronics research proposals should be aware that certain applications, e.g. miniaturised sensors, may have specific implications for the protection of privacy and personal data.

ICT-bio/nano-electronics research may overlap with other scientific disciplines such as biology. In these situations proposers should draw upon the ethical guidance of that discipline.