

Proposals and projects in FP7

Short presentation

Place: Date

Seventh Framework programme

Procedures generally similar to FP6

1. Streamlining and simplification in:

- Minimum consortium composition
- Cost models
- Proposer documentation
- Evaluation criteria
- Project management (*still being developed*)

2. Increased funding levels

Funding schemes

- 3 funding schemes – 5 “instruments”

Collaborative Projects (CP)

Small or medium scale focused research actions (“STREP”)

Large Scale Integrating Projects (“IP”)

Networks of Excellence (NoE)

Coordination and Support Actions (CSA)

Coordinating or networking actions (“CA”)

Support Actions (“SA”)

- ICT Workprogramme shows budget pre-allocation to instruments

Minimum consortia

- Three independent legal entities from three different Member States or Associated countries (CR, TU; CH, IC, IS, LI, NO)
- EEIGs composed of members that meet the criteria above
- Participation of international (intergovernmental) organisations
- Participants from third countries if in addition to minima
- Support actions; no restrictions

Reimbursement of eligible costs

Cost reporting models eliminated; all participants report **direct** and **indirect** (overhead) eligible costs

Eligible costs

- Actual
- Incurred during the project
- Determined according to usual accounting and management principles/practices
- Used solely to achieve project objectives
- Consistent with principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness
- Recorded in the accounts (or the accounts of third parties)

Direct costs IP, STREP, NoE

- **Research and technological development activities:**
 - **50%** funding of eligible costs except for:
 - Public bodies (non-profit): – 75%
 - Secondary and higher education establishments: – 75%
 - Research organisations (non-profit): – 75%
 - Small and Medium sized Enterprises - SMEs: – 75%
- **Demonstration activities-** All: – **50%** of eligible costs
- **Other activities-** All: – **100%** including e.g. consortium management

Direct costs CA, SA

- **Coordination and support actions – 100%**

Indirect costs IP, STREP, NoE

Any participant

- **Actual** indirect costs (participants may use a simplified method of calculation)
- or
- **Flat-rate** of 20% of direct costs excluding subcontracts

Non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs unable to identify real indirect costs

- Flat-rate of 60% of direct costs excluding subcontracts (until end 2009)
- Flat rate of minimum 40%, to be established by the Commission (for subsequent calls)

Indirect costs CA, SA

Flat rate based on direct eligible costs: 7%

Guarantee mechanism

Commission will establish and operate a
Participant guarantee fund

Contribution to guarantee fund of max.
5% of the EC contribution by each
participant, to be returned at the end of
the project

Guarantee fund replaces all other forms of
financial guarantees

Evaluation criteria

1. Scientific and technical quality

Threshold 3/5

2. Implementation 3/5

Threshold 3/5

3. Impact 3/5

Threshold 3/5

Overall score

Threshold 10/15

Information for proposers

- Workprogramme 2007-2008
- Guide for Applicants
now including the *Guidance notes for evaluators*
and the *Background note* on the funding
scheme
- Evaluation forms with notes
- EPSS manual
- Model grant agreement



Electronic Submission

EPSS - Electronic Proposal Submission System

- Online preparation only
- Improved validation checks before submission is accepted
- FP6 Submission failure rate = $\pm 1\%$

Main reason; waiting till the last minute

- Technical problems
- Panic-induced errors
- Too late starting upload, run out of time

Submit early, submit often!
If in trouble, call the helpdesk !

Ethical issues

New annex “ICT-Ethics” in the Guide for Applicants.

Post-evaluation review for any selected proposals which have ethical issues,
based on the contents of the original proposal

Does your proposal show...?

- that you fully understand the ethical issues involved in your planned action
- that you have adequate plans to deal with them
- that there are clear lines of responsibility
- that you will review and report on these issues on a regular basis

When writing your proposal....

Divide your effort over the evaluation criteria

Many proposers concentrate on the scientific element, but lose marks on project planning or impact description

Think of the finishing touches which signal quality work to a busy evaluator:

- clear language
- well-organised contents, following the Part B structure
- useful and understandable diagrams
- no typos, no inconsistencies and obvious paste-ins, no numbers which don't add up, no missing pages ..

When writing your proposal....

Make it *easy* for the evaluators to give you high marks. Don't make it hard for them!

- Make sure you submit the latest, complete version of your proposal
- Don't write too little; cover what is requested
- Don't write too much
- Don't leave them to figure out why it's good, tell them why it's good
- Leave nothing to the imagination

Timetable of ICT Call 1

- Deadline for submission of proposals:
17h00 8th May 2007
- Evaluation of proposals: *Commencing early June*
- Invitation letter to Hearings: *Weeks commencing 11th or 18th June*
- Hearings: *Week commencing 25th June*
- Evaluation Summary Reports: *Mid-July*
- Invitation to negotiations : *Early August*
- Signature of first grant agreements : *October-November*

Getting help with your proposal

The ICT theme supports

- Information days and briefings in Brussels and elsewhere
- Partner search facilities (<http://www.ideal-ist.net/>)
- A supporting website of advice, information and documentation (<http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/>)
- A Helpdesk for proposers' questions, reachable by email or phone (and a Helpdesk for electronic proposal submission)
- A list of contact persons for the objectives in each call

And a network of National Contact Points in Europe and beyond:

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ncp_en.html