



GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

RESEARCH FOR THE BENEFIT OF SPECIFIC GROUPS – CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATIONS (BSG-CSO)

Annexes, specific to call:

Call identifier FP7-SSH-2011-3

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

Annex 1

Timetable and specific information for this call

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

Publication of call	20 July 2010
Deadline for submission of proposals	2 February 2011 at 17:00:00 Brussels local time
Evaluation of proposals	10-27 May 2011
Evaluation Summary Reports sent to proposal coordinators ("initial information letter")	Fourth week of June 2011
Invitation letter to successful coordinators to launch grant agreement negotiations with Commission services	Second week of August
Letter to unsuccessful applicants	From mid-September
Signature of first grant agreements	From November 2011

- **Indicative budget** : EUR 6.3 million from budget 2011

Further information and help

The CORDIS 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.

Call information

CORDIS call page and work programme: <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm>

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

General sources of help:

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

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

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

Specialised and technical assistance:

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

EPSS help desk support@epss-fp7.org

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

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

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

FP7 Legal basis documents generally applicable

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

Legal documents for implementation

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

Guidance documents

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

Other supporting information

- Brochure “The FP7 in Brief”
- European Charter for researchers and the Code of Conduct for their recruitment
- International cooperation
- Risk Sharing Financing Facility and the European Investment Bank

Ethics Review

- Ethics check list
- Supporting documents

Annex 2

Evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied for this call

1. General

The evaluation of proposals is carried out by the Commission with the assistance of 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 confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration before beginning their work. Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

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

2. Before the evaluation

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

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

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

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

¹ Rules on Proposal Submission, Evaluation, Selection and Award Procedures (posted on CORDIS).

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 competences.

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

- An appropriate balance between academic expertise, civil society involvement 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 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.

3. Evaluation of proposals

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

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

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

<i>Evaluation criteria applicable to Research for the benefit of specific groups</i>		
S/T QUALITY “Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics/activities addressed by the call)”	IMPLEMENTATION “Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”	IMPACT “Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sound concept, and quality of objectives • Innovative character in relation to the state-of-the art • Contribution to advancement of knowledge / technological progress • Quality and effectiveness of S/T methodology and associated work plan • Appropriate comparative perspective and the largest possible European coverage in relation to the subject of research (though not necessarily simply by reason of a geographically diverse consortium). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance) • Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment ...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution, at the European [and/or international level], to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity • Appropriateness of measures envisaged for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

Where topics have been specifically highlighted in the Work Programme as being research areas which are particularly well suited for international cooperation, the inclusion of a relevant third country partner or partners could add to the scientific and/or technological excellence of the project and/or lead to an increased impact of the research to be undertaken.

These aspects will be considered specifically during the evaluation of all topics concerned by International Cooperation. For further information see the topics concerned.

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

The relevance of a proposal will be considered in relation to the activity 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 activity of the call, or if only part of the proposal addresses the activity, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected on eligibility grounds.

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

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

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

No weightings will be applied, i.e. each evaluation criterion has an equal weight.

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

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

Conflicts of interest: Under the terms of the appointment letter, experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform a 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.

4. Individual evaluation

This part of the evaluation will be carried out on the premises of the experts concerned ("remotely").

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Consensus meeting

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

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

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

The moderator for the group may designate an expert to be responsible for drafting the consensus report ("rapporteur"). The experts attempt to agree on a consensus score for each of the criteria that have been evaluated and suitable comments to justify the scores. Comments should be

suitable for feedback to the proposal coordinator. Scores and comments are set out in a consensus report. They also come to a common view on the questions of scope.

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.

Ethics issues: If one or more experts have noted that there are ethics issues touched on by the proposal, the relevant box on the consensus report (CR) should be ticked and an Ethics Issues Report (EIR) should be completed stating the nature and type of ethics issues involved. Exceptionally for this issue, no consensus is required.

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

Outcome of consensus

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

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

The signing of the consensus report completes the consensus step.

Evaluation of a resubmitted proposal

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

6. Panel review

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

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

The panel comprises experts involved at the consensus step.

Several panels will cover the different topics of this call. In this call, there will be panels held at the topic level.

For the ranking panel, all the experts for a particular topic will examine all the proposals submitted for this topic. They will subsequently produce a final ranked list of proposals to be funded by the Commission.

The tasks of the ranking panel will also include:

- reviewing cases where a minority view was recorded in the consensus report;

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

The panel is chaired by the Commission. The Commission 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.

A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget as shown in the call fiche. The panel can deal with one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above.

Priority order for proposals with the same score

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 fiche. The following approach will be applied successively for every group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

- (i) Proposals that address topics not otherwise covered by more highly-rated proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.
- (ii) These proposals will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion *scientific and/or technological excellence*. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion *impact*. 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 (e.g. presence of SMEs, international co-operation, public engagement).
- (iii) The method described in (ii) will then be applied to the remaining *ex aequos* in the group.

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 ethics issues raised and any security considerations;
- 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 during the evaluation by experts;
- A summary of any deliberations of the panel.

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

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

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

- At least one proposal per topic will be selected provided it passes all evaluation thresholds.

7. Ethics 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.

Annex 3

Instructions for completing "part A" of the proposal

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

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

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

Please note:

- Only information provided in part A of the proposal will be used to determine whether the proposal is eligible with respect to budget thresholds and/or minimum number of eligible participants.
- The coordinator fills in the section A1 and section A3.
- The participants already identified at the time of proposal submission (including the coordinator) each fill in their respective section A2.
- Subcontractors shall not fill in section A2 and should not be listed separately in section A3.
- The estimated budget planned for any future participants (not yet identified at the time of the proposal) is not shown separately in form A3 but should be added to the coordinator's budget. Their role, profile and tasks are described in Part B of the proposal.

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

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

Note:

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

Research for the benefit of specific groups – Civil Society Organisations (BSG-CSO)

Section A1: Content	
Proposal Acronym	<p>The short title or acronym will be used to identify your proposal efficiently in this call. It should be of <u>no more than 20 characters</u> (use standard alphabet and numbers only; no symbols or special characters please).</p> <p>The same acronym should appear on each page of Part B of your proposal.</p>
Proposal Title	<p>The title should be <u>no longer than 200 characters</u> and should be understandable to the non-specialist in your field.</p>
Duration in months	<p>Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months.</p>
Call (part) identifier	<p>[pre-filled]</p> <p>The call identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you are addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union, and on the CORDIS call page. A call identifier looks like this: <i>FP7-ENV-2009-1</i> or <i>FP7-SSH- 2009-1</i></p>
Topic/Activity code(s) most relevant to your proposal	<p>Please refer to the topic codes/objectives listed in the Work Programme call fiche</p> <p>All activities and topics of FP7 have been assigned unique codes, which are used in the processing of data on proposals and subsequent contracts. The codes are organised hierarchically.</p> <p>The choice of the first activity code will be limited in the drop-down menu to one of the topics open in this call. Select the code corresponding to the topic most relevant to your proposal.</p> <p>The choice for the second code is also limited to topics open in the call in question. Enter a second code if your proposal also addresses another of these. Select 'none' if this is not the case.</p> <p>Select a third code if your proposal is also relevant to another theme. This time, the available codes will simply correspond to broad themes. Select 'none' if this is not the case.</p>
Free Keywords	<p>Please enter keywords that you consider sufficient to characterise the scope of your proposal (at least three from generic to specific).</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 100 characters</u>.</p>
Abstract	<p>The abstract should, at a glance, provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the Work Programme. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process and in communications to the programme management committees and other interested parties. It must therefore be short and precise and should not contain confidential information. Please use plain typed text, avoiding formulae and other special characters. If the proposal is written in a language other than English, please include an English version of the proposal abstract in Part B.</p> <p>There is <u>a limit of 2000 characters</u>.</p>
Similar proposals or signed contracts	<p>A 'similar' proposal or contract is one that differs from the current one in minor ways, and in which some of the present consortium members are involved.</p>

Section A2/ Participants	
Participant number	The number allocated by the consortium to the participant for this proposal. The co-ordinator of a proposal is always number one .
Participant Identify Code	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 http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal . Organisations not yet having a PIC are strongly encouraged to self-register (at http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal) before submitting the proposal and insert in section A2 the temporary PIC received at the end of the self-registration.
Organisation legal name	<p>For Public Law Body, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Entity, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body;</p> <p>For Private Law Body, it is the name under which your organisation is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register.</p> <p>For a natural person, it is for e.g. Mr Adam JOHNSON, Mrs Anna KUZARA, and Ms Alicia DUPONT.</p>
Type of participant	<p>CSO: Civil Society Organisation which participates as specific group</p> <p>RTD: RTD performer</p> <p>OTH : Other than CSO and RTD performer</p> <p>as specified in the Work Programme</p>
Legal address	<p>For Public and Private Law Bodies, it is the address of the entity's Head Office.</p> <p>For natural persons it is the Official Address.</p> <p>If your address is specified by an indicator of location other than a street name and number, please insert this instead under the "street name" field and "N/A" under the "number" field.</p>
Country	Insert the name of your country as commonly used.
Public body	Public body means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations.
Non-profit organisation	Non-profit organisation is a legal entity qualified as such when it is recognised by national or, international law.
Research organisation	Research organisation means any legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives
NACE code	<p>NACE means "<u>N</u>omenclature des <u>A</u>ctivités économiques dans la <u>C</u>ommunauté <u>E</u>uropéenne".</p> <p>Please select one activity from the list that best describes your professional and economic ventures. If you are involved in more than one economic activity, please select the one activity that is most relevant in the context of your contribution to the proposed project. For more information on the methodology, structure and full content of NACE (rev. 1.1) classification please consult EUROSTAT at:</p> <p>http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/ramon/nomenclatures/index.cfm?TargetUrl=LST_CLS_DLD&StrNom=NACE_1_1&StrLanguageCode=EN&StrLayoutCode=HIERARCHIC</p>
Economic Activity	Trade activity irrespective of a profit or non profit purpose.

Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)	<p>SMEs are micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003.</p> <p>The full definition and a guidance booklet can be found at http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/enterprise_policy/sme_definition/index_en.htm</p> <p>To find out if your organisation corresponds to the definition of an SME you can use the on-mine tool at http://ec.europa.eu/research/sme-techweb/index_en.cfm</p>
Dependencies with (an) other participant(s)	<p>Two participants (legal entities) are dependent on each other where there is a controlling relationship between them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A legal entity is under the same direct or indirect control as another legal entity (SG); or – A legal entity directly or indirectly controls another legal entity (CLS); or – A legal entity is directly or indirectly controlled by another legal entity (CLB). <p><u>Control:</u> Legal entity A controls legal entity B if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A, directly or indirectly, holds more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of B, or – A, directly or indirectly, holds in fact or in law the decision-making powers in B. <p>The following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:</p> <p>(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;</p> <p>(b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.</p>
Organisation Short Name	<p>Choose an abbreviation of your Organisation Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and in all relating documents.</p> <p>This short name should not be more than 20 characters exclusive of special characters (./;...), for e.g. CNRS and not C.N.R.S. It should be preferably the one as commonly used, for e.g. IBM and not Int.Bus.Mac.</p>
Character of dependence	<p>According to the explanation above mentioned, please insert the appropriate abbreviation according to the list below to characterise the relation between your organisation and the other participant(s) you are related with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SG: Same group: if your organisation and the other participant are controlled by the same third party; • CLS: Controls: if your organisation controls the other participant; • CLB: Controlled by: if your organisation is controlled by the other participant.
Contact point	<p>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).</p>
Title	<p>Please choose one of the following: Prof., Dr., Mr., Mrs, Ms.</p>
Sex	<p>This information is required for statistical and mailing purposes. Indicate F or M as appropriate.</p>
Phone and fax numbers	<p>Please insert the full numbers including country and city/area code. Example +32-2-2991111.</p>
Section A3/Budget	

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	<p>Summary description (as displayed on EPSS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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). <p>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.</p> <p>Further guidance</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the system must allow the participant to identify and remove its direct ineligible costs (VAT, etc.); - it must at least allow for the allocation of the overheads at the level of the legal entity to the individual projects by using a fair "driver" (e.g. total productive hours); - the system applied and the costs declared according to it should follow the normal accounting principles and practices of the participant. Therefore, if the system used by a participant is more "refined" than the "minimum" requirements mentioned here, it is that system which should be used when declaring costs. <p><i>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...)</i></p> <p>The simplified method does not require previous registration or certification by the Commission.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 :</p> <p>(i) Status of the organisation</p> <p>The flat rate is reserved to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - non-profit public bodies - secondary and higher education establishments - research organisations - SMEs

	<p>(ii) Accounting system of the organisation</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>Example:</i> <i>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:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. <p>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.</p> <p>An organisation which can identify the real indirect costs but does not have a system to allocate these indirect costs can opt for this 60% flat rate. The choice of this specific flat rate lies within the responsibility of the participant. If a subsequent audit shows that the above-mentioned cumulative conditions are not fulfilled, all projects where this participant is involved might be reviewed.</p> <p>(iii) Type of funding scheme</p> <p>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).</p>

	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <div style="background-color: #000080; color: white; text-align: center; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;">Indirect Costs - Decision Tree</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> 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 </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;"> <div style="text-align: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">YES</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">Real indirect costs or costs calculated using a simplified method</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">or</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">20% of total direct eligible costs (1)</div> </div> <div style="text-align: center;"> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">No</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">or</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-bottom: 5px;">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 </div> </div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px; text-align: center;"> Coordination and support actions : In any case Maximum 7% of the direct eligible costs (1) </div> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 10px;">(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</p> </div>
International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC)	International Cooperation Partner Country means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income, lower-middle income or upper-middle-income country and which is identified as such in Annex I to the Work Programmes.
Lump sum funding method	<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <p>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.</p> <p>More information on ICPC lump sums can be found in the section II.18 of the "Guide to financial issues" http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html</p>
Type of Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (and/or environmental, social, health) advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product like prototypes). Other activities means any specific activities not covered by the above mentioned types of activity, such as training, coordination, networking and dissemination (including publications). These activities should be specified in the proposal Part B.

	<p>Management activities are part of the other activities. They include the maintenance of the consortium agreement, if it is obligatory, the overall legal, ethical, financial and administrative management including for each of the participants obtaining the certificates on the financial statements or on the methodology, the implementation of competitive calls by the consortium for the participation of new participants and, any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities.</p>
Personnel costs	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 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. <p>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.</p>
Sub-contracting	<p>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.</p> <p>Where it is necessary for the participants to subcontract certain elements of the work to be carried out, the following conditions must be fulfilled:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - subcontracts may only cover the execution of a limited part of the project; - recourse to the award of subcontracts must be duly justified in Part B of the proposal having regard to the nature of the project and what is necessary for its implementation; - recourse to the award of subcontract by a participant may not affect the rights and obligations of the participants regarding background and foreground; - Part B of the proposal must indicate the task to be subcontracted and an estimation of the costs. <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>
Other direct costs	<p>Means direct costs not covered by the above mentioned categories of costs.</p>
Total Budget	<p><u>Note:</u> The "total budget" is not the requested EU contribution.</p> <p>A sum of all the eligible costs, under the respective types of activity.</p>
Requested EU contribution	<p>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.</p> <p>Maximum reimbursement rates of eligible costs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research and technological development = 50% or 75%*

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstration activities = 50% • Other activities (including management) = 100% <p>(*) For participants that are non profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs.</p>
Total Receipts	<p><u>Note:</u> <i>The term "receipts" is not the requested EU contribution.</i></p> <p>Receipts of the project may arise from:</p> <p>a) Financial transfers or contributions in kind free of charge to the participant from third parties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <u>not</u> be considered a receipt of the project if their use is at the management discretion of the participant. <p>b) Income generated by the project:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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 <u>not</u> be considered a receipt for the participant when generated from the use of foreground resulting from the project. <p>The EU 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.</p>

Annex 4

Instructions for drafting Part B of the proposal

Research for the benefit of CSOs – BSG-CSO

A description of the general characteristics of the funding scheme "Research for the benefit of specific groups" is given in section 2 of this Guide for Applicants. Please examine this carefully before preparing your proposal.

This annex concerns more specifically the use of the scheme for civil society organisations and provides a template to help you structure your proposal. A particular attention is given in this scheme to:

- Objectives which combine CSOs concerns and scientific issues
- Well established partnership between research organisations and CSOs
- Appropriate training for the participants
- Well developed dissemination and exploitation of project results in the public interest

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). Each of the sections 1, 2 and 3 corresponds to an evaluation criterion. The sub-sections (1.1, 1.2 etc.) correspond to the sub-criteria.

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

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

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

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

As an indication, such a layout should lead to a maximum of between 5000 and 6000 possible characters per page (including spaces).

SUMMARY OF MANDATORY PAGE LIMITS *(conforming to font and margin sizes mentioned above)*

Section	Maximum pages
1. Scientific and/or technological excellence, relevant to the topics/activities addressed by the call	20 pages for whole section*
1.1 Sound concept and quality of objectives	No specific limit
1.2 Innovative character in relation to the state-of-the-art	No specific limit
1.3 Contribution to advancement of knowledge/technological progress	No specific limit

1.4	Quality and effectiveness of S/T methodology and associated work plan	1 page for section 1.4 (i) ("Overall strategy") [OPTION: 2 pages for each work package description in section 1.4 (d)]
2.1	Description of project management structure and procedures	5 pages
2.2	Individual participants	1 page per participant
2.3	Description of the consortium	No specific limit
2.4	Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed	2 pages
3.	Impact	10 pages for whole section
4.	Ethics Issues	No specific limit
5.	Consideration of gender aspects	1 page

* This limit does not include the Gantt chart under 1.4 ii), the tables 1.4a- e, and the Pert diagram under 1.4 iv).

Cover Page

Proposal full title:

Proposal acronym:

Type of funding scheme: Research for CSOs

Work Programme topics addressed (Indicate activity codes and free keywords)
(if more than one, indicate their order of importance to the project)

Name of the coordinating person:

List of participants:

Participant no. *	Participant organisation name	Country	Type of participant (CSO,RTD Performers or other)
1 (Coordinator)			
2			
3			

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

Table of Contents

Proposal

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence, relevant to the topics/activities addressed by the call

1.1 Sound concept and quality of objectives

Explain the concept of the project. Research for CSOs aims to develop scientific knowledge related to CSOs activities in order to contribute to public debate. Describe the extent to which the proposed project addresses a specific scientific and/or technological need / activity of the CSO participants which requires outsourcing research activities to RTD performers.

Describe this CSO need / activity and how the project will enable the CSO participation to develop their knowledge in relation to the expressed need / activity. The strategy to disseminate and use the project results should be considered as a specific objective in the project.

Show the soundness of the concept. Describe in detail the proposed project's S&T objectives and the way it will contribute to public debate. The objectives should be realistic and their achievement verifiable within the project, as the progress of the project work will be measured against these goals.

1.2 Innovative character in relation to the state-of-the-art

Describe the national, European and/or international state-of-the-art on the main issues at stake in terms of policy and public debate on which the project's approach is based, by means of a documentary study including, for example, literature, publications, patents, standards and data-base searches. Briefly describe the current limitations and gaps which the project intends to address.

1.3 Contribution to advancement of knowledge / technological progress

Describe the current knowledge situation for the CSO participants and the relevant scientific knowledge already available and explain the novelties that the project will bring about and how it will enhance significantly the knowledge of CSO participants and RTD performers in the area and topics concerned

1.4 Quality and effectiveness of S/T methodology and associated work plan

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages² (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of the implementation of the project, and include consortium management and assessment of progress and results. (Please note that your overall approach to management will be described later, in section 2).

Please present your plans as follows:

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

- i) Describe the **overall strategy** of the work plan and in particular:
 - Describe how the **partnership between CSO participants and RTD performers** (and possible other participants though not in a dominant role) will be developed at the different stages of the project. In particular, describe how the project design integrates the need to set aside time and resources in order to explore the differences and commonalities between CSO participants and RTD performers, and develop a common language and working methods.
 - **Research**, technological development, demonstration³ and innovation activities: Explain how the research/innovation effort of the project is comprised of a number of different components (major elements or blocks of work). Describe each of these components; identify who will carry out each. Show the relevance and contribution of each to the project as a whole.
 - Explain which **training** activities for the CSO participants are planned directly related to the project. This could also involve training that the CSO participants provide for the RTD performers in order to familiarise them with the CSOs work.
 - Describe the **strategy to disseminate and exploit the results of the project in the public interest**; Dissemination and dialogue with a broader public may include citizens panels, focus groups, consensus buildings, world cafés, workshops or web-based initiatives.
 - Explain how the **knowledge management** and possible IPR protection will support the participating CSOs in using the research results to their best advantage.
- ii) Show the timing of the different WPs and their components (Gantt chart or similar).
- iii) Provide a **detailed work description** broken down into work packages:
 - Work package list (please use table 1.4a);
 - Deliverables list (please use table 1.4b);
 - List of milestones (please use table 1.4c);
 - Description of each work package, and summary (please use table 1.4d)
 - Summary effort table (please use table 1.4e)

For each Work package explain which participant will be involved, giving a particular attention to the partnership between CSOs and RTD performers which should be develop all through the project. Include contingency plans for unexpected outcomes of the research work.

- iv) Provide a graphical presentation of the components showing their interdependencies (Pert diagram or similar)
- v) Describe any significant risks, and associated contingency plans

Note:

- The number of work packages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work and the overall value of the proposed project. The planning should be sufficiently detailed to justify the proposed effort and allow progress monitoring by the Commission.

(Maximum length for the whole of Section 1: – twenty pages. This limit does not include the Gantt chart under 1.4 ii), the tables 1.4a- e, and the Pert diagram under 1.4 iv).

³ Which offers environmental, social, health and/or economic advantages.

Table 1.4 a: Work package list

Work package No ¹	Work package title	Type of activity ²	Lead participant No ³	Lead participant short name	Person-months ⁴	Start month ⁵	End month
		TOTAL					

¹ Work package number: WP 1 – WP n.

² Please indicate one activity per work package:

RTD = Research and technological development; DEM = Demonstration; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable in this call including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and coordination activities according to the description of the funding scheme given previously.

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

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

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

Table 1.4 b: Deliverables List

Del. no. ¹	Deliverable Title	WP no.	Nature ²	Dissemination level ³	Delivery date ⁴

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

² Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

R = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

³ Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

PU = Public

PP = Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services).

RE = Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services).

CO = Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services).

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

Table 1.4 c: List of milestones

Milestones are control points where decisions are needed with regard to the next stage of the project. For example, a milestone may occur when a major result has been achieved, if its successful attainment is required for the next phase of work. Another example would be a point when the consortium must decide which of several technologies to adopt for further development.

Milestone number	Milestone name	Work package(s) involved	Expected date ¹	Means of verification²

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

² Show how you will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype completed and running flawlessly; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated.

Table 1.4 d: Work package description

For each work package:

Work package number		Start date or starting event:					
Work package title							
Activity Type ¹							
Participant number							
Participant short name							
Person-months per participant:							

Objectives

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks), and role of participants
--

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery)

¹ Please indicate one activity per work package:
RTD = Research and technological development; DEM = Demonstration; MGT = Management of the consortium;
OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable (including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and coordination activities).

Table 1.4 e: Summary of staff effort

A summary of the staff effort is useful for the evaluators. Please indicate in the table the number of person months over the whole duration of the planned work, for each work package, for each participant. Identify the work-package leader for each WP by showing the relevant person-month figure in bold.

Participant no./short name	WP1	WP2	WP3	...	Total person months
Part.1 short name					
...					
...					
...					
Subtotal CSO Participants					
Subtotal RTD					
Subtotal OTHER					
Total					

2. Implementation

2.1 Quality of the Consortium as a whole

2.1 Description of project management structure and procedures *(max 5 pages)*

Describe the organisational structure and decision-making mechanisms of the project. Show how they are directly related to the complexity of the project and to the degree of integration required.

Show they take into account the partnership to develop between CSO participants and RTD performers all through the different stages of the project. The organisation structure should reveal an adequate representation of the CSOs and demonstrate their role in the leadership of the project. The establishment of steering committees and advisory boards is worth considering, but should be appropriate and not render the project management overly complex. Handling of IPR matters should be reflected in the decision making process. Distinct responsibilities should be defined for both strategic and daily activities.

Demonstrate that the **CSO coordinator** is experienced and qualified for a demanding and complex management task. Provide a clear justification if the CSO participants entrust the **coordination to one the RTD performer participant**. In the BSG funding scheme other participants may make a particular contribution relevant to the project though not in a dominant role.

Particular attention should be paid to conflict resolution mechanisms and contingency planning. The decision making approach has to ensure that no decision in the consortium will adversely effect the collective interest of the CSO participants.

2.2 Individual participants

Present a profile of each participant: organisation name, type, size, and full range of activities, contractual role, their role and main tasks in the project, degree of involvement and qualifications for these role/tasks.

For CSO explain how they respond to the criteria set for the funding scheme (cf chapter 2.2 of the guide: non governmental, non-profit, not representing commercial interests and pursuing a common purpose in the public interest) and possible other criteria set in the Work Programme. For the Environment Work Programme, professional associations and consultancy organisations are not considered as specific groups under this scheme.

For the RTD performers, explain why they were selected to carry out the work including their competence in the appropriate field and identify the principal research personnel who will be involved.

If other participants are included in the consortium describe their relevance to the project and how their participation is in the interest of the CSO participants.

(Maximum length for Section 2.2: one page per participant. However, where two or more departments within an organisation have quite distinct roles within the proposal, one page per department is acceptable.

The maximum length applying to a legal entity composed of several members, each of which is a separate legal entity, is one page per member, provided that the members have quite distinct roles within the proposal.)

2.3 Description of the consortium *(No specific limit)*

Describe how the participants collectively constitute a consortium capable of achieving the project objectives, and how they are suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them.

Show the complementarity between participants. Explain how the composition of the consortium is well-balanced in relation to the objectives of the project.

2.4 Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed *(max 2 pages)*

Describe the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment) and how the proposal allocates appropriate resources in terms of budget, personnel, equipment and materials in line with the work plan and for the successful conduct of the project.

The cost breakdown must be well structured and it has to correspond to activities to be implemented by each partner in each work package. *(Add corresponding table).*

If appropriate, the following issues should also be addressed within this section:

i) Sub-contracting: If any part of the work is to be sub-contracted by the participant responsible for it, describe the work involved and explain why a sub-contract approach has been chosen for it.

ii) Other countries: If one or more of the participants requesting EU funding is based in a country that is outside the EU, and is not an Associated country, and is not on the list of International Cooperation Partner Countries¹, explain in terms of the project's objectives why such funding would be essential.

iii) Additional partners: If there are as-yet-unidentified participants in the project, the expected competences, the role of the potential participants and their integration into the running project should be described. **However, these as-yet-unidentified participants will not be counted in the minimum number of participants condition regarding the eligibility of the proposal.**

3. Impact. The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

(Maximum length for the whole of Section 3 – ten pages)

3.1 Contribution, at the European and/or international level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant activity

Projects under 'Research for the Benefit of Specific Groups – Civil Society Organisations' aim at developing capacity of the involved CSO so that they can contribute to the development of specific research agendas together with the associated research performers. Thus it is expected that CSO involved could better contribute to public debate.

¹ See CORDIS web-site, and annex 1 of the work programme.

Explain how the results of the project will contribute to this aim and to the specific impacts as defined in the call for proposals. Describe the extent to which the proposed project will lead to new knowledge useful for CSOs activities and for a wider public debate.

3.2 Appropriateness of measures envisaged for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

3.2.1 Project results and IPR

Describe your plans for the management of knowledge (intellectual property) acquired in the course of the project.

Provide a clear and adequate description of how the participants intend to organise the ownership of the project results and user rights to the best advantage of the participating CSOs and ensure a wide public access.

By default, the CSO participants retain the full ownership of all project results ("foreground"). When the owners of the foreground are not the CSOs, the owners shall ensure that the CSOs are provided with all the rights to that foreground that are required for the purposes of using and disseminating it.

If the consortium decides to follow the default approach it has to explain that the RTD performers ensure that CSO participants receive full ownership and exploitation rights of all the results generated by the project.

If the consortium agrees that the RTD performers (and possible other participants) keep part of the ownership or the entire foreground the consortium has to describe clearly:

- How it is ensured that the CSO participants are provided with all the rights that are required for its intended use and public dissemination;
- How the RTD performers (or the other participants) are going to exploit the IPR/ownership.

In both cases, please present a breakdown on how to share between participants the different elements of the planned results/foreground in relation with their work in the project. For the selected projects, participating CSO and RTD performers and the possible other participants shall specify in a consortium agreement their arrangements concerning inter alia the ownership, the use and the dissemination of the foreground. The consortium agreement is signed between them (the Commission has no part). They shall provide the consortium agreement at the latest 2 months after the start of the project.

3.2.2 Dissemination and Use

A particular attention should be given to dissemination and use the project results in the public interest and to advance the public debate on the related topics.

Elaborate a comprehensive dissemination plan. Describe the measures you propose 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 http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/science-communication/index_en.htm

Describe the planned strategy, including scope and time scale, methodology and tools which will be mobilised for an effective dialogue/debate on the project and its results with the participating CSOs and their members and beyond with a wider public. This may include focus groups, stakeholders juries, citizens panels, consensus building, interactive websites, world cafés, etc.

4. Ethical Issues

Describe any ethics issues that may arise in the project. In particular, you should explain the benefit and burden of their experiments and the effects it may have on the research subject. . All countries where research will be undertaken should be identified. You should be aware of the legal framework that is applicable and the possible specific conditions that are relevant in each country (EU and non-EU countries alike).

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.

Clinical Trials: Approvals from national competent authorities are required

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 identify 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. Describe what happens to the animals after the research experiments. The use of animals requires permits and/or authorizations from the national competent authorities.

Human embryonic stem cells: Research proposals that will involve human embryonic stem cells (hESC) will have to address all the following specific points:

- the applicants should demonstrate that the project serves important research aims to advance scientific knowledge in basic research or to increase medical knowledge for the development of diagnostic, preventive or therapeutic methods to be applied to humans;
- the necessity to use hESC in order to achieve the scientific objectives set forth in the proposal. In particular, applicants must document that appropriate validated alternatives (in particular, stem cells from other sources or origins) are not suitable and/or available to achieve the expected goals of the proposal. This latter provision does not apply to research comparing hESC with other human stem cells;
- the applicants should take into account the legislation, regulations, ethics 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 applicants should ensure that for all hESC lines to be used in the project were derived from embryo's

- of which the donor(s)' express, written and informed consent was provided freely, in accordance with national legislation prior to the procurement of the cells;
- that result from medically-assisted *in vitro* fertilisation designed to induce pregnancy, and were no longer to be used for that purpose;
- of which the measures to protect personal data and privacy of donor(s), including genetic data, are in place during the procurement and for any use thereafter. Researchers must accordingly present all data in such a way as to ensure donor anonymity;
- of which the conditions of donation are adequate, and namely that no pressure was put on the donor(s) at any stage, that no financial inducement was offered to donation for research at any stage and that the infertility treatment and research activities were kept appropriately separate.

Identify the countries where research will be undertaken and which ethical committees and regulatory organisations will need to be approached during the life of the project.

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

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

Note:

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

To ensure compliance with ethical principles, the Commission Services will undertake ethics audit(s) of selected projects at its discretion.
 A dedicated website that aims to provide clear, helpful information on ethics issues is now available at: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ethics_en.html
 The site includes guidance documents on privacy and data protection, developing countries, informed consent procedures etc.

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

ETHICS ISSUES TABLE

(Note: Research involving activities marked with an asterisk * in the left column in the table below will be referred automatically to Ethics Review)

	Research on Human Embryo/ Foetus	YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryos?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Foetal Tissues/ Cells?		
*	Does the proposed research involve human Embryonic Stem Cells (hESCs)?		
*	Does the proposed research on human Embryonic Stem Cells involve cells in culture?		
*	Does the proposed research on Human Embryonic Stem Cells involve the derivation of cells from Embryos?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

	Research on Humans	YES	Page
*	Does the proposed research involve children?		
*	Does the proposed research involve patients?		
*	Does the proposed research involve persons not able to give consent?		
*	Does the proposed research involve adult healthy volunteers?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human genetic material?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human biological samples?		
	Does the proposed research involve Human data collection?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

	Privacy	YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve processing of genetic information or personal data (e.g. health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction)?		
	Does the proposed research involve tracking the location or observation of people?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

	Research on Animals¹	YES	Page
	Does the proposed research involve research on animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic small laboratory animals?		
	Are those animals transgenic farm animals?		
*	Are those animals non-human primates?		
	Are those animals cloned farm animals?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

¹ The type of animals involved in the research that fall under the scope of the Commission's Ethical Scrutiny procedures are defined in the Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes Official Journal L 358 , 18/12/1986 p. 0001 - 0028

	Research Involving ICP Countries¹	YES	Page
	Is the proposed research (or parts of it) going to take place in one or more of the ICP Countries?		
	Is any material used in the research (e.g. personal data, animal and/or human tissue samples, genetic material, live animals, etc):		
	a) Collected in any of the ICP countries?		
	b) Exported to any other country (including ICPC and EU Member States)?		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

	Dual Use	YES	Page
	Research having direct military use		
	Research having the potential for terrorist abuse		
	I CONFIRM THAT NONE OF THE ABOVE ISSUES APPLY TO MY PROPOSAL		

5. Consideration of gender aspects

You may give an indication of the sort of actions that would be undertaken during the course of the project to promote gender equality in your project, or in your field of research. (These will not be evaluated, but will be discussed during negotiations should your proposal be successful).

These could include actions related to the project consortium (e.g. improving the gender balance in the project consortium, measures to help reconcile work and private life, awareness raising within the consortium) or, where appropriate, actions aimed at a wider public (e.g. events organised in schools or universities).

(Maximum length for section 5 – one page)

¹ In accordance with Article 12(1) of the Rules for Participation in FP7, 'International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC) means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income (L), lower-middle-income (LM) or upper-middle-income (UM) country. The list of countries is given in annex 1 of the work programme. Countries associated to the Seventh EU Framework Programme do not qualify as ICP Countries and therefore do not appear in this list.