



THE FIFTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Fifth Framework Programme focuses on Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 1998 to 2002.

GUIDE FOR PROPOSERS

INFORMATION SOCIETY TECHNOLOGIES IST PROGRAMME (USER-FRIENDLY INFORMATION SOCIETY)

CALL OF 19th MARCH 1999

PART 2 “Fixed deadline proposals”

**Proposals for
RTD actions (*including INCO Bursaries*)
Call part identifier IST-99-1-1A
and
Take Up Actions
Call part identifier IST-99-1-1B**



Final Edition, 12 March, 1999

Reference No. B_PG2A_EN_199901.pdf

Foreword – PART 2

This **PART 2 of the IST Guide for Proposers** for the call of 19th March, 1999, contains the **information specific to the part of the call with a fixed deadline of 16th June, 1999** (*Call part identifiers: IST-99-1-1A and IST-99-1-1B*).

PART 2

Contains **section V** of the proposers guide and the necessary appendices you need to make your proposal.

This PART 2 must be read in connection with PART I, which contains information on the Fifth Framework Programme, the IST programme, the rules for participation and general instructions on how to make a proposal.

The additional documents you will need to prepare a proposal are:

The Work Programme for the Specific Programme you are applying for. The Work Programme provides the description of the content of the action lines which are open for proposals, and an indicative timetable for programme implementation (“roadmap”).

The Call for Proposals as published in the Official Journal of the European Communities. This will tell you which action lines are open for proposals and what the deadline for the proposal submission is.

The Evaluation Manual (as well as programme specific guidelines in this Guide). These documents will provide the details on which criteria will be used in the evaluation of proposals, which weight is attributed to each of the criteria and where appropriate the threshold to be attained in order to be retained. You can use the evaluation manual and the guidelines as a checklist for the completeness of your proposal.

This Guide also contains references to other documents, reports, forms and software tools which are of assistance in the preparation of proposals.

This Guide for Proposers does not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Fifth Framework Programme, the various Specific Programmes nor the Calls for Proposals in these Programmes.

Contents – PART 2 – “Fixed deadline proposals”

FOREWORD – PART 2.....	3
V. SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR IST PROGRAMME CALL PUBLISHED 19TH MARCH 1999; FIXED DEADLINE PROPOSALS (16TH JUNE, 1999).....	7
V.1. INTRODUCTION.....	7
V.2. IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES.....	7
V.3. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.....	9
V.4. ADDRESSES FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.....	11
V.5. DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS.....	11
V.6. SUPPORT FOR PROPOSERS	12
V.7. REFERENCES	14
APPENDIX 1 - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS.....	15
APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR SHARED-COST RTD PROJECTS	16
APPENDIX 1B - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR INCO BURSARIES FOR YOUNG RESEARCHERS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	23
APPENDIX 1C - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES - (TAKE-UP ACTIONS)	24
APPENDIX 2 - NOTIFICATION OF INTENTION TO PROPOSE (PRE-REGISTRATION)	33
APPENDIX 3 – PRE-PROPOSAL SCREENING FORMS.....	35
APPENDIX 4 – ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM	39
APPENDIX 5 – NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS.....	41
APPENDIX 6 – DRAFT EVALUATION GUIDELINES, 1ST CALL IST PROGRAMME.....	51

PART 2

V. Specific information for IST Programme Call Published 19th March 1999; Fixed Deadline Proposals (16th June, 1999)

V.1. Introduction

This section details the submission procedure that is required for proposals for the “fixed deadline” activities in the IST Call of 19 March 1999.

Another version of PART 2 of this Guide for proposers (differing by this Call-specific Section V) has been prepared and is available from the European Commission for the “continuous submission” scheme which is also included in this Call.

In addition to the actions included here, the IST Programme also welcomes applications for Marie Curie Industry Host Fellowships and measures established for SME participation.

Dedicated Guides to Proposers for these actions are available from the European Commission.

V.2. Implementation measures

The 1st Call of the IST Programme, issued on 19th March 1999, requests proposals by a fixed deadline for certain specific work within each of the IST Programmes four key actions (KA), in future and emerging technologies (FET)¹, for a number of cross programme activities (CPA), for certain Take-up actions, and for International cooperation measures². The goals of this work are described in summary form in the Call for Proposals published in the Official Journal of the European Communities, and in fuller detail in the IST Workprogramme.

The implementation means which may be employed to achieve these goals are **Research projects**, **Demonstrations projects** and **Combined research and demonstration projects** (all three of which use the same shared cost RTD proposal form), and **Take-up Actions** (which use the Accompanying Measures proposal form).

V.2.1. RTD Actions

Research projects aim at obtaining new knowledge or are intended to develop or improve products, processes or services and at the same time support the implementation of Community policies. Proposals for research projects should therefore focus more on the innovation aspects and on how they will bring forward the state of the art in their specific research or application areas.

Demonstration projects are designed to prove the viability of new technologies offering potential economic advantage but which cannot be commercialised directly. The description of proposals for demonstration projects should therefore focus more on the aspects of validation, involvement of users and the possibilities to create market opportunities and on the exploitation plans.

¹ FET has specifically developed detailed information concerning its part of the IST Programme, which may be consulted at <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/fethome> before preparing a proposal.

² Proposers can if they wish reflect cross-programme actions in their projects submitted in response to calls under specific Key Actions - for example, projects can incorporate elements of CPA 4, New Indicators and Statistical Methods (see IST Workprogramme).

Combined research and demonstration projects combine the two above elements in a single project. The description of proposals for combined projects must therefore focus on the most important part of the proposal, and clearly state the research and demonstration objectives, and describe how each of them will be obtained.

V.2.2. Bursaries for young researchers from developing countries

Proposers for Research, demonstration and combined research and demonstration projects may include applications for **Bursaries for young researchers from developing countries** (INCO Bursaries) in conjunction with their RTD proposals, using the special application form supplied.

V.2.3. Accompanying Measures - Take Up Actions

Take up Actions in general include Trials, Best Practice Actions, First User Actions, Assessment Measures, Access Actions and Take-up Support Nodes. In this call, only certain **Assessment Measures** and **Access Actions** are requested.

Proposals for Take-up actions are submitted on the Accompanying Measures proposal submission form. In the keyword section of Part A (Form A1) of the Accompanying Measure form, proposers should insert either "**ASSESS**" (for Assessment) or "**ACCESS**", to indicate the type of Accompanying Measure involved.

V.2.4. Assessment measure

The "assessment" take-up measure called for in the IST Work Programme under action line IV.8.3, and under action lines IV.7.2 and IV.7.3 is globally referred to as Semiconductor Equipment Assessment (SEA). The co-ordination of "assessment" actions is called for under action line VIII.2.1 and/or VIII.3.1. Detailed information concerning SEA can be consulted at <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/melhome>.

Actions carried out within SEA will be coordinated to gain optimal benefit in particular through the provision of the necessary elements to carry out the Assessments and Tests and through the dissemination of results. Within each action, close and effective user-supplier co-operation will have to take place. Furthermore, one or more industrial users have to be involved in each Assessment action, depending on the maturity of the equipment or material to be assessed or tested.

The assessment actions planned under SEA cover two aspects:

i) Assessment Projects under close-to-production conditions

Focus is primarily on the following themes: Equipment and materials for lithography, multi-layer metalisation, novel front-end process architectures, chip assembly, and specialised equipment for low-cost production. Equipment and materials supporting these themes (e.g. metrology, analytical, handling, cleaning, and masks) are included. Their contribution to the main themes needs to be highlighted by the proposer.

ii) Proof of Concept Equipment Tests

Equipment Tests are reduced assessments at an early development stage (alpha type) which may take place at equipment suppliers' premises (300 mm wafer equipment). Equipment Tests are also designed to extend the process capabilities of existing state of the art equipment to new applications (all wafer diameters).

The allowable costs for the Community contribution to the assessment measures are as follows: Up to 100 % of eligible costs for cost categories Personnel, Subcontracting, Travel and Subsistence, Consumables and Other specific Costs (for prototypes in close to production conditions). No contribution will be made to cost categories Durable equipment, Computing, IPR

costs and Overheads. Proposers for assessment measures should only fill in the cost categories that are allowable in the A4 form.

V.2.5. Access Actions

Access Actions are designed to provide coordinated access to advanced, emerging technologies and services, knowledge and competence and are included in the different action lines IV.7.2; IV.7.3; IV.8.1 and IV.8.4 of the Workprogramme. The coordination of "access" actions is called under action lines VIII.2.1. and/or VIII.3.1. Detailed information concerning these activities of the IST Programme can be consulted at <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/melhome> or <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/mst&subsyshome>.

Access Actions have to offer access to advanced services for specific user communities in order to support take-up of advanced technologies and services, in particular where the access or offer is not readily available and shortage is identified or when it is necessary to overcome major factors hindering take-up.

In Access Actions the consortium must demonstrate proven capability to provide access to required technologies and services, and the ability to stimulate relevant use of advanced emerging technologies and services. It must demonstrate the added value to a specific clearly identified user community and how take-up will be monitored. The proposed action will also need to demonstrate the potential to be self-supporting at long term.

The projects will be coordinated to maximise the complementarity of the offers, to broaden the user communities and to stimulate exchange of knowledge and expertise.

The allowable costs for the Community contribution to the access actions are as follows: Up to 100 % of eligible costs for cost categories Personnel, Subcontracting, Travel and Subsistence, Consumables, Computing Costs and Other Specific Costs. No contribution will be made to cost categories Durable equipment, IPR costs and Overheads. Proposers for access actions should only fill in the cost categories that are allowable in the A4 form.

Proposals for **Take-up actions** are submitted on the **Accompanying measures proposal submission form**.

In the **keyword section of Part A** (Form A1) of the Accompanying measure form, proposers should insert either "**ASSESS**" (for Assessment) or "**ACCESS**" (for Access), to indicate the type of Accompanying measures involved.

V.3. Proposal requirements

Proposals must conform to the descriptive and qualifying conditions given in this guide. Proposers are urged to use the ProTool supplied by the Commission in order correctly to structure the administrative part of their proposal, however use of the tool is not compulsory provided the format and forms below are used.

V.3.1. Notification of intention to propose

For the purposes of planning evaluation sessions and inviting the appropriate external experts, the IST programme **strongly encourages** the proposal co-ordinators to **pre-register their intention to submit a proposal**.

To do this, the proposal co-ordinators should prepare a request for a proposal number using the pre-registration form (Appendix 2), to be sent to the Commission services via fax letter or electronic mail **no later than three weeks before the deadline for receipt**. In return, they will receive, normally within a few working days, but not earlier than 4 weeks before the call deadline, a proposal number from the Commission services to be quoted in the full proposal submitted. The pre-registration of a proposal does not commit the proposers to submitting a full proposal or an identical proposal

While failure to request a proposal number will not exclude a proposal from evaluation, this procedure provides the Commission with a list of potential proposers to the Call (so that they may be notified of any further information or issues arising during the Call) and it also assists the Commission services in preparing for the evaluation.

V.3.2. Proposal structure

The forms for the preparation of a proposal are appended to this document. Research, Demonstration and Combined projects use the same "shared cost RTD" form. Other forms are used for Accompanying Measures and for Bursaries for young researchers from developing countries.

The shared cost RTD proposal form is divided into three separate parts:

Part A, which contains legal and administrative information concerning the proposers, and a summary of the funding requested;

Part B, which described the work to be carried out;

Part C, which describes the European added value, the contributions to the social policies, the consortium, the management of the project and the exploitation and/or dissemination plans.

For **Research** or for **Demonstration** projects the proposers should make a proposal description consisting of Parts A, B and C.

However, for **Combined research and demonstration** projects the general rule is that the proposal should treat the two elements separately. That is:

A single Part A is prepared, with however two A4 cost forms, one summarising the costs of the research element and one summarising the costs of the demonstration element of the work.

Two Part Bs (separating the research and demonstration elements)

Two Part Cs (separating the research and demonstration elements)

Only in the case where it is **impossible** to separate clearly the research and demonstration parts of the proposal may the consortium make one proposal description (i.e. one Part A, one Part B and one Part C), but the consortium must then in the A4 cost sheet use a percentage for funding (between 35-50%), that accurately reflects the relative weight of the two phases in the project.

Proposers are reminded that for a proposal to be eligible, it must be complete in all its parts.

V.3.3. Proposal anonymity

For proposals for **shared-cost RTD** in this Call the standard rule of anonymity is applied. Part B of the proposal, which contains the description of the content of the proposed project, must contain no reference to the names of the organisations involved in the consortium or any other information by

which they may be identified. Participants must be referred to by the codes and numbers assigned in Part A, sheet A3.

There is **no anonymity requirement for Accompanying Measure proposals, or bursary applications.**

V.3.4. Optional pre-proposal checks

A **pre-proposal check service** is offered in this Call **uniquely for FET P1, FET P2 and FET P3 proposals**. Use the form in Appendix 3 to request a pre-proposal check. The completed form should be faxed to +32 2 296 8390 or sent by email to istfet@cec.be

The **deadline for submission** of pre-proposals for checking is **17h00 (Brussels), 23rd April 1999**.

V.4. Addresses for submission of proposals

Proposals must be submitted before the deadline by one of the following methods:

- Electronically using the Proposal Preparation Tool (ProTool). ProTool contains the necessary information for electronic submission to the Commission.
- Post, preferably registered, as confirmed by the postmark, to:

*European Commission
The Research Proposal Office (ORBN 8)
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium*

- Courier³ or hand-delivery, as confirmed by acknowledgement of receipt, to:

*European Commission
The Research Proposal Office
Square Frère Orban/Frère Orbanplein 8
B-1040 Brussels, Belgium*

V.5. Deadline for submission of proposals

The deadline for submission of proposals for the 1st IST Call is:

16th June 1999

Proposals sent by express courier service or delivered by hand must arrive by 17h00 Brussels time on this date.

Proposals sent by mail must be clearly postmarked on or before this date, and then must arrive no more than 10 working days after it.

In the case of electronic submission, the validation file, which identifies the proposal file uniquely, must be sent (electronically or by fax) on or before this date. The proposal file must then be received electronically no more than 48 hours after the deadline.

³ For courier services that require a telephone number for the recipient, please use +32-2-2960245.

V.6. Support for Proposers

V.6.1. Programme Information desk

The address of the IST Programme Infodesk is:

*European Commission
The IST Information Desk
Directorate General XIII, Unit G7
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200, BU 29 4/19
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium*

*Email: ist@cec.be
Fax: +32-2-296.8388
Web: www.cordis.lu/ist*

The desk is manned 09h00 - 17h00 (Brussels), Monday to Friday.

For specific information relating to the Marie Curie Industry Host Fellowship scheme, proposers should use the following addresses:

*European Commission
Marie Curie Fellowships (Unit XII-F2)
Directorate General XII
Rue de la Loi/Wetstraat 200
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium*

*Email: Improving@dg12.cec.be
Fax: +32-2-2969926
Web: <http://www.cordis.lu/improving>*

Proposers should periodically check the IST Call Website: <http://www.cordis.lu/ist>) for the latest information.

V.6.2. Partner search facilities

The Commission's CORDIS server in Luxembourg (<http://www.cordis.lu/ist/eoi>) offers a number of services and information sources which may be useful in partner search for participation in this programme, as well as a list of organisations which have already expressed an interest in participating in this programme.

V.6.3. National contact points

National Contact Points for the IST Programme (see Appendix 5) can be helpful to organisations from their country in finding partners from other countries, and should be contacted for further information for the country concerned.

V.6.4. IDEALIST: Support for potential proposers

The IDEALIST service helps potential proposers and newcomers to the IST Programme to find the right partners across international boundaries. IDEALIST offers:

- a partner brokerage service, targeted on particular calls and action lines, that pools the local knowledge of partners from 19 countries
- international partner brokerage events
- general support for potential proposers
- special workshops and seminars.

The IDEALIST partners, many of whom are also official National Contact Points for the IST Programme, represent Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. To find out more, contact ideal-ist@dlr-de or access <http://www.ideal-ist.net/>

V.6.5. IDEALIST-EAST: promoting CEEC/NIS involvement

The objective of the IDEALIST-EAST network is to foster cooperation in the IST Programme between organisations from Central and Eastern European Countries (CEEC) and the Newly Independent States (NIS) of the former Soviet Union on the one hand, and the EU Member and Associated States on the other. Specific aims are to:

- increase the awareness in the ICT community in the West of the opportunities for collaboration with organisations in the East
- increase the competence of the Eastern partners who give advice to industry and researchers on participation in the IST Programme
- enhance partner search for IST collaborators between East and West.

The IDEALIST-EAST partners, many of whom are also official National Contact-Points for the IST Programme, represent Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine, and the United Kingdom. To find out more, contact ideal-ist-east@dlr.de or access <http://www.ideal-ist-east.net/>

V.6.6. Programme Information Days

The IST Programme is organising a number of Information Days, where those interested in proposing may attend, for a presentation of the programme and of the general Framework Programme, to obtain documentation and proposal preparation software (ProTool), to ask questions etc. and to meet potential consortium partners.

The latest information on planned Information Days is obtainable from the programme Infodesk and at the website given in the references below.

V.6.7. Other helpfacilities

The Intellectual Property Right-Helpdesk

The IPR-Helpdesk has been set up to support participants in RTD programmes seeking information on Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and related contractual issues. The activity will also aid participants in locating the assistance necessary to register, protect, and exploit their inventions. The IPR-Helpdesk offers information on these issues and guides users to the services available from national patent offices, patent agents, and lawyers in their country.

IPR-Helpdesk
 64–66 avenue Victor Hugo
 L-1750 Luxembourg
 Tel. +352–47-11-11-1
 Fax +352–47-11-11-60
e-mail: info@ipr-helpdesk.org
URL: <http://www.cordis.lu/ipr-helpdesk>

Timetable:

Proposers for this call will be notified of the result of the evaluation and selection of their proposals in the end of July or beginning of August. Successful proposers will then be asked to prepare their draft Technical Annex/Project Programme in August for negotiation with the Commission services in beginning of September with the aim to finalise the negotiations in the first half of October. Please bear in mind this timetable so that you already at the proposal stage have prepared the IPR and consortium agreements and so that your consortium is prepared to work over the summer.

V.7. References

Potential proposers could consult the following documents:

Decision on the Fifth Framework Programme		http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/decisions.htm
Decision on the IST Programme		http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/decisions.htm
IST Call text, 19.03.99		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/calls
IST Workprogramme 1999		http://www.cordis.lu/ist
Evaluation Manual		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm
Notification of intention to propose	Appendix 2	http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm
Screening of Pre-proposals	Appendix 3	http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm
Proposal Submission Forms (Part A)		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm
Proposal Submission Forms (Part B and C)	Attached	http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm
FET Information		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/fethome
Semiconductor Equipment Assessment (SEA)		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/melhome
Access actions in this Call		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/melhome http://www.cordis.lu/ist/mst&subsyshome
National contact points	Appendix 5	http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/npcs.htm
Information Days calendar		http://www.cordis.lu/ist
Organisations expressing interest in Call		http://www.cordis.lu/ist/eoi
Innovation Relay Centres		http://www.cordis.lu/innovation-smes/src/suppnet.htm
Information and forms on Marie-Curie fellowships		http://cordis.lu/improving
SME-specific measures		http://www.cordis.lu/sme
INCO-web site (Bursaries, international co-operation)		http://www.cordis.lu/inco
Other programme web sites accessible via		http://www.cordis.lu/fp5
IPR helpdesk		http://www.cordis.lu/ipr-helpdesk
Proposal Preparation Tool (ProTool)		http://www.cordis.lu/fp5
IDEALIST		http://www.ideal-ist.net/
IDEALIST EAST		http://www.ideal-ist-east.net/

Last-minute information (IST)		http://www.cordis.lu/ist
--------------------------------------	--	--

Appendix 1 - Proposal Submission Forms

The proposal Submission forms are in general in three parts:

- **Part A**, which contains legal and administrative information concerning the proposers, and a summary of the funding requested;
- **Part B**, which describes the work to be carried out;
- **Part C**, which describes the European added value, the contribution to social policies, the consortium, the management of the projects, the exploitation and dissemination plan and ethical and safety issues.

PART 2 of this Guide for Proposers contains only the programme specific forms for Part B and Part C. Printed versions of the Part A forms, including machine readable forms (A0-A4), Guidelines and Annexes, are a separate part of the Information Package. They may also be downloaded from the web or obtained through the National Contact Points or the Programme Helpdesk.

If your Information Package does not contain the Part A form for the type of action you want to submit a proposal for, please download them from the programme web site or contact the National Contact Points or the programme helpdesk. If you plan to submit a proposal for an SME Specific Measure (Exploratory Award, CRAFT) or Marie Curie Fellowships, you must request the Guide for Proposers (including forms) that are specific to these actions.

In Appendix 1A to 1C you find the following B and C forms:

APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR SHARED-COST RTD PROJECTS

APPENDIX 1B - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR INCO BURSARIES

APPENDIX 1 C - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES – TAKE UP MEASURES

Appendix 1A - Proposal Submission Forms for shared-cost RTD projects

Shared-cost RTD projects cover:

- Research and development (R&D) projects,
- Demonstration projects,
- Combined R&D and demonstration projects.

Proposal structure and description.

The description of the content of a proposal has two parts:

- **Part B** is anonymous. It presents the objectives and summarises the scientific background to the project. It describes the progress to be expected with regard to the state of the art, as well as the different tasks to be carried out. There must in this part be no reference to the names of the organisations involved in the consortium. The participants must only be referred to by the codes and numbers assigned to the participants in the administrative form, (sheet A3). It is, however, possible to indicate background references supporting the work and presented later in a list annexed to part C. (e.g.: *in the past years, partner H has established that this phenomenon was caused by conditions X and Y [publication 04], the partnership has a strong experience in this specific field [publications 06 to 10], and the industrial partner G owns three major patents in the area [patents 12 to 14]*). Proposals in which the identity of any of the applicants is indicated will be rejected. Independently of this, it must be clear that the evaluation of the scientific & technical merits of the proposal will be performed exclusively on the basis of this part B and might result in the rejection of the proposal without any further evaluation of the other parts.
- **Part C**, which is not anonymous, describes the European added value of the project, the contribution(s) to the social policies, ethical and legal considerations, the consortium, the management of the project and the exploitation and/or dissemination plans.

Please remember to indicate the proposal's short name (acronym) and proposal number and the date at the top of every page of parts B and C, and on all annexes.

For **Research** or for **Demonstration** projects the proposers should make a proposal description consisting of Parts A, B and C.

However, for **Combined research and demonstration** projects the general rule is that the proposal should treat the two elements separately. That is:

A single Part A is prepared, with however two A4 cost forms, one summarising the costs of the research element and one summarising the costs of the demonstration element of the work.

Two Part Bs (separating the research and demonstration elements)

Two Part Cs (separating the research and demonstration elements)

Only in the case where it is **impossible** to separate clearly the research and demonstration parts of the proposal may the consortium make one proposal description (i.e. one Part A, one Part B and one Part C), but the consortium must then in the A4 cost sheet use a percentage for funding (between 35-50%), that accurately reflects the relative weight of the two phases in the project.

This section contains only the Parts B and C of the Proposal submission forms for RTD Proposals. Part A (administrative forms) may be downloaded from the programme web site, or may be obtained via your National Contact Point or the programme helpdesk.

Proposers should note that proposals that would not contain all three parts of the proposal, the administrative part (form A) and the proposal description in part B and C, will not be eligible.

Part B – RTD Proposals: Description of scientific/technological objectives and workplan

NB! PART B MUST BE ANONYMOUS

Part B should not reveal the names of the proposers nor otherwise reveal their identity e. g. through inclusion of corporate logos, references to existing products, etc.

B1. Title page

Proposal full title
Proposal acronym
(Date of preparation)
Proposal number (if applicable)

B2. Content list (Part B only)

B3. Objectives.

This section, which should not exceed two pages, describes the **scientific/technological objectives** of the proposal in a measurable and verifiable form. The progress of the project work will be measured against these objectives in later reviews and assessments.

B4. Contribution to programme/key action objectives

This section, which should not exceed more than one page, describes how the proposed project will contribute to the objectives of the programme and/or key action.

B5. Innovation

This section, not exceeding two pages, describes innovative aspects of the proposed project, and how the proposed project will advance the state of the art in the research area.

B6. Project workplan:

This section concisely describes the work planned to achieve the objectives of the proposed project. The recommended length, excluding the forms specified below, is 10 pages. An introduction should explain the structure of the workplan and how the workplan will lead the participants to achieve the objectives of the proposal. The workplan must be broken down into workpackages (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of a project's life cycle. Essential elements of the workplan are:

- a) Introduction – explaining the structure of the workplan and the overall methodology used to achieve the objectives;
- b) Project planning and time table; (Gantt chart)
- c) Graphical presentation of the project's components; (Pert diagram)
- d) Detailed project description broken down into workpackages:
 - Workpackage list (use form B1 below);
 - Deliverables list (use form B2 below);
 - One page description of each workpackage (use form B3 below):

Note: The number of workpackages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work and the overall value of the proposed project. Each workpackage should be a major sub-division of the proposed project and should also have a verifiable end-point (normally a deliverable or an important milestone in the overall workplan).

B1.	Workpackage list
------------	-------------------------

Work-package No ⁴	Workpackage title	Lead contractor No ⁵	Person-months ⁶	Start month ⁷	End month ⁸	Phase ⁹	Deliverable No ¹⁰
	TOTAL						

⁴ Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

⁵ Number of the contractor leading the work in this workpackage.

⁶ The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

⁷ Relative start date for the work in the specific workpackages, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

⁸ Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

⁹ Only for combined research and demonstration projects: Please indicate R for research and D for demonstration.

¹⁰ Deliverable number: Number for the deliverable(s)/result(s) mentioned in the workpackage: D1 - Dn.

B2.**Deliverables list**

Deliverable No¹¹	Deliverable title	Delivery date¹²	Nature¹³	Dissemination level¹⁴

¹¹ Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

¹² Month in which the deliverables will be available. Month 0 marking the start of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

¹³ Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

¹⁴ 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).
-

B3.**Workpackage description**

Workpackage number :
Start date or starting event:
Participant number:
Person-months per participant:

Objectives**Description of work****Deliverables****Milestones and expected result**

Part C – RTD Proposals: Description of contribution to EC policies, economic development, management and participants.

NB! PART C IS NOT ANONYMOUS

Part C describes the contribution of the proposed work to EC policies and social objectives, and to economic development, the project management plan, the consortium structure, the participating organisations in the consortium, the key personnel and individual and collective plans for dissemination and/or exploitation of the results.

C1. Title page

Proposal full title
Proposal acronym
(Date of preparation)
Proposal number (if applicable)

C2. Content list (part C only)

C3. Community added value and contribution to EC policies.

This section, which should not exceed two pages, should identify which issue at European level the proposal is addressing and how the proposed project will contribute to the implementation or evolution of one or more of the EC's policies, if appropriate. It should also describe why the proposed project should be carried out at European level instead of at national level, for example if there is a need to create a critical mass in human or financial terms, will the project bring together complementary expertise existing in different organisations, or the proposed project addresses problems connected with standardisation and regulation

C4. Contribution to Community social objectives.

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the proposed project will contribute to meeting the social objectives of the Community such as: improving the quality of life and health and safety (including working conditions) and/or how it will contribute to improving employment, and/or to preserving or enhancing the environment and natural resources. Where applicable, the description should also cover the proposed project's compliance with ethical requirements.

C5. Project management

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the proposed project will be managed, the decision making structures to be applied, the communication flow within the consortium and the quality assurance measures which will be implemented, and how legal and ethical obligations will be met.

C6. Description of the consortium

Short description of one page of the consortium stating who the participants are, what their roles and functions in the consortium are, and how they complement each other.

C7. Description of the participants

Short description of the participating organisations including (no more than two pages per organisation):

The expertise and experience of the organisation,

Short CVs of the key persons to be involved indicating relevant experience, expertise and involvement in other EC projects. *(Each CV no more than 10 lines)*

C8. Economic development and scientific and technological prospects

This section, which should not exceed three pages, should describe plans for the dissemination and/or exploitation of the results for the consortium as a whole and for the individual participants in concrete terms, for example by describing the dissemination and/or exploitation strategies, the user groups to be involved and how they will be involved, the tools and/or means to be used to disseminate the results and the strategic impact of the proposed project in terms of improvement of competitiveness or creation of market opportunities for the participants.

Appendix 1B - Proposal Submission Forms for INCO bursaries for young researchers from developing countries

The proposal forms for INCO bursaries for young researchers from developing countries - Part A (administrative forms) including instructions for how to describe the application (part B) - may be downloaded from the programme web site, or may be obtained via your National Contact Point or the programme helpdesk. The application does not contain a Part C.

INCO bursaries: Consortia preparing a research, demonstration or a combined research and demonstration proposal or a concerted action proposal for any of the specific programmes may include an application for bursaries for young researchers from developing countries. If successful, the bursary will be funded from the budget of the specific programme “Confirming the International Role of Community Research”. The following procedures apply all such bursaries under all specific programmes of the EC fifth framework programme.

More details on INCO bursaries may be found in Box 1 of PART 1 of this guide for proposers. The evaluation and selection process is described in Appendix 4 of Part 2 of this guide for proposers.

Bursary procedure

Following a positive evaluation of both the bursary application and the main project proposal, the co-ordinator of the proposal will be notified. Once the negotiation of the main project contract has been successfully completed, a complementary contract for the bursary will be prepared for signature by the host institute. (No negotiations are foreseen for this complementary contract, since the costs are fixed). The bursary contract may start at any time within 12 months of the signature of the main project contract.

Once the bursary contract is signed, 80% of the funding will be transferred to the host institute one month before the arrival of the bursary recipient. The host institute will then forward a pre-paid return travel ticket to the bursary recipient and transmit the remainder of the funding to the bursary recipient as soon as he/she arrives in the host institute. The final 20% will be transferred upon acceptance of the final report of the bursary recipient.

Appendix 1C - Proposal Submission Forms for Accompanying Measures - (Take-up actions)

In the keywords section of Part A in form A1, proposers should insert either “**ASSESS**” (for Assessment) or “**ACCESS**”, to indicate the type of Take up Accompanying Measure involved.

This section contains only the Parts B and C of the Proposal submission forms for Accompanying Measures – Take Up Measures. Part A (administrative forms) may be downloaded from the programme web site, or may be obtained via your National Contact Point or the programme helpdesk.

Proposal structure and description.

The description of the content of a proposal has two parts:

- **Part B** presents the overall objectives of the project. It describes underlying problem addressed with this project and the progress to be expected with regard to the state of the art, as well as the different tasks to be carried out. It should be pointed out that the evaluation of the merits of the proposal will be performed exclusively on the basis of this part B and might result in the rejection of the proposal without any further evaluation of the other parts.
- **Part C** describes the European added value of the project, the contribution(s) to the social policies, ethical and legal considerations, the consortium, the management of the project and the exploitation and/or dissemination plans.

Please remember to indicate the proposal’s short name (acronym) and proposal number and the date at the top of every page of parts B and C, and on all annexes.

Proposers should note that proposals that would not contain all three parts of the proposal, the administrative part (form A) and the proposal description in part B and C, will not be eligible.

Part B – Take Up Actions: Description of scientific/technological objectives and workplan

NB! THERE IS NO ANONYMITY REQUIREMENT FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES / TAKE UP ACTIONS

B1. Title page

Proposal full title
Proposal acronym
(Date of preparation)
Proposal number (if applicable)

B2. Content list (Part B only)

B3. Objectives.

This section, which should not exceed two pages, describes the **scientific/technological objectives** of the proposal in a measurable and verifiable form. The progress of the accompanying measure will be measured against these objectives in later reviews and assessments.

B4. Contribution to programme/key action objectives

This section, which should not exceed more than one page, describes how the proposed accompanying measure will contribute to the objectives of the programme and/or key action.

B5. Relations to programme

This section, not exceeding two pages, describes how the accompanying measure will relate to projects/actions etc. which the measure accompanies, or to the programme as a whole, what cooperation will be required and how it will be achieved.

B6. Project workplan:

*This section concisely describes the work planned to achieve the objectives of the proposed accompanying measure. The recommended length, excluding the forms specified below, is 10 pages. An introduction should explain the structure of the workplan and how the workplan will lead the participants to achieve the objectives of the proposal. The workplan must be broken down into workpackages (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of accompanying measure's life cycle. For assessment projects (SEA) it should include a description of the *initial status* of the equipment or material based on which a factory acceptance test would be carried out (WP 1). The degree of innovation of the equipment or material to be assessed should be described. The users should also indicate target specifications for a site acceptance test (WP 2) as well as final target specifications. Specifications would normally comprise process, handling/cleanliness, reliability and cost parameters. In that context a competitive and market analysis should also be given.*

For “access” actions technologies and services to be offered have to be clearly described and the targeted user communities have to be clearly identified.

Essential elements of the workplan are:

- a) Introduction – explaining the structure of the workplan and the overall methodology used to achieve the objectives;
- b) Project planning and time table; (Gantt chart)
- c) Graphical presentation of the project's components; (Pert diagram)
- d) Detailed project description broken down into workpackages:
 - Workpackage list (use form B1 below);
 - Deliverables list (use form B2 below);
 - One page description of each workpackage (use form B3 below):

Note: The number of workpackages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work and the overall value of the proposed project. Each workpackage should be a major sub-division of the proposed project and should also have a verifiable end-point (normally a deliverable or an important milestone in the overall workplan).

B1.	Workpackage list
------------	-------------------------

Work- package No ¹⁵	Workpackage title	Lead contractor No ¹⁶	Person- months ¹⁷	Start month ¹⁸	End month ¹⁹	Phase ²⁰	Deliv- erable No ²¹
	TOTAL						

¹⁵ Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

¹⁶ Number of the contractor leading the work in this workpackage.

¹⁷ The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

¹⁸ Relative start date for the work in the specific workpackages, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

¹⁹ Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

²⁰ Only for combined research and demonstration projects: Please indicate R for research and D for demonstration.

²¹ Deliverable number: Number for the deliverable(s)/result(s) mentioned in the workpackage: D1 - Dn.

B2.**Deliverables list**

Deliverable No²²	Deliverable title	Delivery date²³	Nature²⁴	Dissemination level²⁵

²² Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

²³ Month in which the deliverables will be available. Month 0 marking the start of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

²⁴ Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

²⁵ 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).

B3.**Workpackage description**

Workpackage number :
Start date or starting event:
Participant number:
Person-months per participant:

Objectives**Description of work****Deliverables****Milestones and expected result**

Part C – Take Up Actions: Description of contribution to EC policies, economic development, management and participants.

There is no anonymity requirement for part C.

Part C describes the contribution of the proposed work to EC policies and social objectives, and to economic development, the project management plan, the consortium structure, the participating organisations in the consortium, the key personnel and individual and collective plans for dissemination and/or exploitation of the results.

Part C is not anonymous.

C1. Title page

Proposal full title

Proposal acronym

(Date of preparation)

Proposal number (if applicable)

C2. Content list (part C only)

C3. Community added value and contribution to EC policies.

This section, which should not exceed two pages, should identify which issue at European level the proposal is addressing and how the accompanying measure will contribute to the implementation or evolution of one or more of the EC's policies, if appropriate. It should also describe why the proposed accompanying measure should be carried out at European level instead of at national level, for example if there is a need to create a critical mass in human or financial terms, will the accompanying measure bring together complementary expertise existing in different organisations, or address problems connected with standardisation and regulation. Partners of assessment projects (SEA) should be ready to cluster projects to ensure other than directly involved users can benefit from the assessment results. For "access" actions the added value of the proposed actions to the targeted user communities has to be clearly demonstrated. Furthermore partners in "access" actions should be ready to coordinate their activities to maximise the complementarity of the offers, to broaden the user communities and to stimulate exchange of knowledge and expertise.

C4. Contribution to Community social objectives.

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the proposed measure will contribute to meeting the social objectives of the Community such as: improving the quality of life and health and safety (including working conditions) and/or how it will contribute to improving employment, and/or to preserving or enhancing the environment and natural resources. Where applicable, the description should also cover the measure's compliance with ethical requirements.

C5. Management

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the accompanying measure will be managed, the decision making structures to be applied, the communication flow within the consortium and the quality assurance measures which will be implemented, and how legal and ethical obligations will be met. The clustering of assessment projects under SEA - see C3 - will allow effective co-ordination, early agreement –between users and suppliers - on globally accepted assessment metrics and on competitive specifications, the timely delivery of relevant and measurable results of assessments and their dissemination to SEA participants and to potential users worldwide. For “access” actions proposers should demonstrate their ability to stimulate and monitor relevant use of technologies they offer. In addition they should indicate how their offers could be co-ordinated with others.

C6. Description of the consortium

Short description of one page of the consortium stating who the participants are, what their roles and functions in the consortium are, and how they complement each other. In the case of SEA projects at least one industrial user has to be involved in tests of alpha type equipment and at least two in assessments of more mature prototypes..

C7. Description of the participants

Short description of the participating organisations including (no more than two pages per organisation):

The expertise and experience of the organisation,

Short CVs of the key persons to be involved indicating relevant experience, expertise and involvement in other EC projects. (*Each CV no more than 10 lines*)

C8. Economic development and scientific and technological prospects

This section, which should not exceed three pages, should describe plans for the dissemination and/or exploitation of the results for the consortium as a whole and for the individual participants in concrete terms, for example by describing the dissemination and/or exploitation strategies, the user groups to be involved and how they will be involved, the tools and/or means to be used to disseminate the results and the strategic impact of the proposed accompanying measure in terms of improvement of competitiveness or creation of market opportunities for the participants. In the case of SEA projects it is intended to carry out dissemination actions at project level, but also at the level of clustered projects and beyond – see also C3 and C5. In the case of “access” actions proposers should demonstrate the potential for the proposed actions to be self-supporting at long term.

Appendix 2 - Notification of Intention to Propose (Pre-registration)

Request for Proposal Number for the 1st call of the IST programme
Fax to: +32 2 296.8388

Title _____	First Name _____	Surname _____
Function _____		
Organisation _____		
Internal Address _____		
Street and Number _____		
Postal Code _____	City _____	Country _____
Fax _____	Fax (alternative) _____	
Tel. _____	Tel.(alternative) _____	
E-mail _____	E-mail (alternative) _____	

List of Participants (company name and country, proposal co-ordinator first)

Name of organisation:	Country Code

Information on proposal:

Proposal full name	
Proposal acronym	
Proposal abstract (3 lines)	

Our intended Proposal is related to the following thematic priorities/research area(s):

**Please use the reference(s) for thematic priorities given in the Part A of the relevant proposal submission form (Annex 1)*

Proposal language (if not English) _____

Name of Requester: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

(For Commission use only:)

Your proposal has been registered with the following number:

(Signed for the IST programme)

--

Appendix 3 – Pre-proposal Screening Forms

Pre-proposal consultation - Confidential information

1. Coordinator:

Name (first name, family name)	
Female /Male	
Organisation	
Department	
Address (street, building no, P. O. Box, CEDEX, Postcode, Country)	
Telephone:	
Fax:	
E-mail	

**Please answer all the following questions (in approximately 1200 words for questions 9 to 11).
The Commission Services reserve the right to return without comment any incomplete pre-proposals.**

2. Proposal title

3. Proposal acronym

4. Project duration (approx.).....

5. Funding

Amount requested in EURO.....

Percentage of costs to be funded

6. Main Programme

6.1. Research Area(s)

7. Other Programme(s)

7.1. Research Area(s)

8. Participants

Organisation name	Postcode + city/town	Country

Pre-proposal consultation - Confidential information

Give a short description of the work:

9. Objectives:

10. Description of the work:

11. Milestones and expected result:

Appendix 4 – Acknowledgement of receipt form



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General XIII

Information Society: Telecommunications, Markets, Technologies - Innovation and Exploitation of Research

Information Society Technologies: Technological Developments of a Generic Nature and Horizontal Actions

Operational aspects of the programme

Brussels,

Please write the name and full postal address to which this acknowledgement of receipt should be sent in the box ➡

Dear Madam/Sir

We are pleased to acknowledge receipt of your proposal:

To be completed by Coordinating Partner			
Programme(s):			
Research Area(s):			
Proposal Title:			
Proposal Acronym:			

This proposal has been given the following reference number (To be completed by the Commission):

Date of reception:

Proposal registration number:

You are kindly requested to quote this reference number in all future correspondence relating to this proposal. Please ensure that all your partners are also made aware of this reference number.

After a check for eligibility, your proposal will be evaluated. It is expected that the final result of the evaluation will be communicated to you three to four months after the deadline for submission of proposals.

On behalf of the Commission we thank you for your proposal and your interest in the research programmes.

Yours faithfully,

5FP Evaluation Coordinator

Appendix 5 – National contact points

EU MEMBER STATES:**Austria**

Mr Christian Frey
 BIT - Bureau for International Reserach
 and Development Co-Operation
 Wiedner Hauptstrasse 76
 1040 Wien

Tel.: (+43-1)581.1616-141
 Fax: (+43-1)581.1616-18
 E-mail: frey@bit.ac.at

Fuldmægtig Jan Corner-Walker
 FIRST
 Randersgade 60
 DK-2100 København Ø

Tel: (+45)3544.62 00
 Fax: (+45)3544.6201
 E-mail: jcw@forskraad.dk

Belgium

Mme Claudine Belleflamme
 SSTC / DWTC
 Rue de la science 8
 B-1000 Bruxelles

Tel.: (+32-2)238.3569
 Fax: (+32-2)230.5912
 E-mail: bell@belspo.be

Finland

Mr Mikko Uusitalo
 TEKES (Technology Development
 Centre)
 PO Box 69
 FIN-00101 Helsinki

Tel. (+358-10)521.5812
 Fax: (+358-10)521.5906
 e-mail: mikko.uusitalo@tekes.fi

De heer Karel Goossens
 IWT
 Bischoffsheimlaan 25
 B-1000 Brussel

Tel: (+32-2)209.0900
 Fax: (+32-2)223.1181
 E-mail: krg@iwt.be

France

Ms Christine Montagut
 CFCE (Centre Français du Commerce
 Extérieur)
 10, avenue d'Iéna
 F-75783 PARIS CEDEX 16

Tel (+33)(0)1-4073.3673
 Fax (+33)(0)1-4073.3060
 E-mail: cmontagut@cfce.fr

M. D. Jacobs
 DGTRE
 Avenue Prince de Liège 7
 B-5100 Jambes

Tel: (+32-81)321.634
 Fax: (+32-81)306.600

Germany

Mr. Klaus Schütz
 DLR (Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und
 Raumfahrt e.V.)
 Linder Höhe
 D-51147 Köln

Tel. (+49-2203)601.3400 (IST infoline)
 Fax (+49-2203)601.3055
 e-mail: eu-ncp@dlr.de

Denmark

EU- konsulent Søren Jensen
 EuroCenter/Erhvervsfremmestyrelsen
 Rådhuspladsen 14
 DK-1550 København V

Tel: (+45)3332.7278
 Fax: (+45)3332.7478
 E-mail: sje@schultz.dk

Greece

Mrs Paraskevi Sachini
NDC / NHRF (National Documentation
Center of the National Hellenic
Research Foundation)
Vassileos Konstantinou Ave. 48
GR-116 35 Athens

Tel: (+30-1)727.3906
Fax: (+30-1)724.6824
E-mail: esachin@ekt.org.gr

Ireland

Mr Tom Sheedy
FORBAIRT
Enterprise Ireland
Glasnevin
IRL-DUBLIN 9

Tel.: (+353-1)808.2769
Fax: (+353-1)837.0178
E-mail: sheedyt@forbairt.ie

Italy

Dr. Roberto Gagliardi
MURST
Piazzale J.F. Kennedy 20
I-00144 Roma

Fax: (+39)06-5991.2368
E-mail: r.gagliardi@cpr.it

Dr.ssa Laura Savini
APRE (Agenzia per la Promozione della
Ricerca Europea)
Grattacielo Italia
P.zza G. Marconi 25
I-00144 Roma

E-mail: savini@apre.it

Luxembourg

Mr Claude Liesch
Luxinnovation GIE.
National Agency for Innovation &
Research
rue Acide de Gasperi 7
L-1615 LUXEMBOURG-KIRCHBERG

Tel (+352)436.263
Fax (+352)438.120
E-mail: claudel.liesch@luxinnovation.lu

The Netherlands

Ir. Bert Van Werkhoven
EG Liaison/Senter
PO Box 30732
NL-2500 GS 'S GRAVENHAGE

Tel.: (+31-70)361.0250
Fax: (+31-70)356.2811
E-mail: bwerkhov@egl.nl

Portugal

Dr^a. Carla Santos
ICCTI (Instituto de Cooperação
Científica e Tecnológica Internacional)
Ministério da Ciência e da Tecnologia
Av. D. Carlos I, nº126- 6º
P-1200 Lisboa

Tel. (+351-1)392.4488
Fax (+351-1)397.5144
e-mail: carla.santos@mail.telepac.pt

Spain

Mr Narciso GARCÍA SANTOS
OCYT (Oficina de Cienica y
Tecnología)
Rosario Pino, 14-16
E-28020 Madrid

Tel.: (+34-91)336.7353
Fax: (+34-91)336.0576/7350
E-mail : ist@cicyt.es

Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnológico
Industrial (CDTI)
Pº de la Castellana, 141
E-28046 MADRID

Tel.: (+34-91)581.5562
Fax: (+34-91)581.5586
E-mail: colm@cdti.es

Mr Anatolio ALONSO PARDO
Secretaría General de
Comunicaciones
Palacio de Comunicaciones -
Desp. 425-L
Pza. de Cibeles, s/n
E-28071 MADRID
Tel.: (+34-91)346.1527
Fax: (+34-91)346.2723
E-mail: anatolio.alonso@sgc.mfom.es

Mr Luis PRIETO CUERDO
Ministerio de Industria y Energía
Dirección General de Industrias y
Tecnologías de la Información
Pº de la Castellana, 160
E-28071 Madrid

Tel : (+34-91)349.4114
Fax: (+34-91)349.4025
E-mail : lpc1@min.es

Mr Angel CARDAMA AZNAR
ETS Ingenieros de Telecomunicación
Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña
Campus Nord UPC. Edificio D-3
Jordi Girona, 1
E-08034 Barcelona

Tel: (+34-93)401.6797
Fax: (+34-93)401.7232
E-mail : cardama@tsc.upc.es

Sweden

Mr. Henrik Gidlöf
Swedish EC-R&D Council (EU/FoU)
PO Box 7091
S-10387 Stockholm

Tel: (+46-8)454.6449
Fax: (+46-8)454.6451
e-mail: henrik@eufou.se

United Kingdom

Mrs. Margaret Dennis
Department of Trade and Industry
CII 3c
Buckingham Palace Road 151
UK – London SW1W 9SS

Tel.: (+44-171)215.1355
Fax: (+44-171)931.7194
E-mail:
margaret.dennis@ciid.dti.gov.uk

COUNTRIES IN THE PROCESS OF ASSOCIATION

Bulgaria

Prof Kiril Boyanov
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
25A, Acad. G. Bonchev str.
BG-1113 SOFIA, BULGARIA

Tel +359-2-703.260
Fax +359-2-707.273
boyanov@bgcict.acad.bg

Cyprus

Mr I. Papadopoulos
Agricultural Research Institute
Ministry of Agr. & Natural Resources
PO Box 2016
NICOSIA 1516 CYPRUS

Tel +357 2 305101
Fax +357 2 316770

Czech Republic

Dr P. Krenek
Dept. of International Cooperation in
Science &
Technology
Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports
Karmelitska 7
118 12 PRAHA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

Tel +42-2-519.3718
Fax +42-2-519-3713/96

Estonia

Mr. Marek Tiits
Archimedes Foundation
Tähetorn Toomel
Tartu 51003, ESTONIA

Tel: +37-27-447.329
Fax: +37-27-441.722
E-mail: femirc@femirc.ee

Hungary

Mr Vilmos Bogнар
EC Liaison Officer
Dept. of International Relations
OMFB - National Committee for
Technological
Development
Szervita Tér 8
1052 BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

Tel +36-1-318.4101
Fax +36-1-318.4130
e-mail
vilmos.bognar@omfb.x400gw.itb.hu

Iceland

Mr. Grimur Kjartansson
Icelandic Innovation Centre
Dunhagi 5
ISL-107 Reykjavik

Tel. +354-5-254.902
Fax +354-5-528.801
E-mail: grimurk@rthj.hi.is
Web server:
<http://www.rthj.hi.is/ker/index.htm>

Israel

Mr. Myer W. Morron
ISERD
29, Hamered Street
ISR-61500 Tel Aviv

Tel.: +972-54-436.110 (mobile)
E-mail: mwm@iserd.org.il

Latvia

Prof A.R. Silins
Secretary-General
Latvian Academy of Sciences
Turgeneva Street 19
1524 RIGA, LATVIA

Tel +371-2-225.361
Fax +371-2-228.784

Liechtenstein

Mr Gerhard Beck
 Amt für Volkswirtschaft
 Kirchstr. 7
 FL-9490 VADUZ

Tel +41-75-236.6880
 Fax +41-75-236.6889

Lithuania

Mr Kastytis Gecas
 Lithuanian Innovation Centre/
 FEMIRC
 T. Ševcenkos 13
 2600 Vilnius
 Lithuania

Tel.: +370-2-232780
 Fax: +370-2-232781
 E-mail: kgecas@kti.mii.lt

Norway

Mr Ole Andreas Flagstad
 EU Forsknings Info
 Norges forskningsraad
 PO Box 2700 St Hanshaugen
 N-0131 OSLO

Tel +47-2203.7195
 Fax +47-2203.7001
 E-mail: ole-andreas.flagstad@nfr.no

Poland

Prof. Borys Czerniejewski
 KBN - Komitet Badan Naukowych
 (KBN)
 Departament Systemow
 Informatycznych
 ul. Wspolna 1/3
 00-529 WARSZAWA 53, POLAND

Tel +48-22-625.5151
 Fax +48-22-625.4265
 E-mail: borys@kbn.gov.pl

Romania

Mr Adrian Pascu
 European Integration in R&D
 Programmes
 Ministry of Research & Technology
 21-25 Mendeleev Street
 70168 BUCHAREST, ROMANIA

Tel +40-1-210.9275
 Fax +40-1-210.9275
 E-mail apascu@scou1.mct.ro

Slovakia

Mr Ivan Trebaticky
 Director of Dept. for International S&T
 Cooperation
 Ministry of Education and Science
 Hlboka 2
 813 30 BRATISLAVA, SLOVAKIA

Tel +42-7-394.583
 Fax +42-7-391.524

Slovenia

Prof. Dr. Uros Stanic
 FEMIRC Slovenia
 Jamova 39
 1000 Ljubljana, SLOVENIA
 Tel: +386-61-177.3900
 Fax: +386-61-177.3812
 e-mail : uros.stanic@ijs.si

Switzerland

Mr Robert Lüdi
 KBF, c/o VSM
 Kirchenweg 4
 CH-8032 ZURICH

Tel.: +41-1-384.4844
 Fax: +41-1-384.4843
 E-mail: robert.luedi@vsm.ch

COUNTRIES WITH OR IN THE PROCESS OF HAVING AN S&T AGREEMENT

Australia

Mr Peter de Souza, Assistant Manager
International Science & Technology
Branch
Department of Industry Science &
Resources
GPO Box 9839, Canberra ACT 2601,
Australia
Tel: +61-2-6213.6381
Fax: +61-2-6213.6388
email: Peter.DeSouza@isr.gov.au

USA

Ms Jeanne Hudson
National Science Foundation (NSF)
4201 Wilson Boulevard
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22230
U.S.A.

Tel +1-703-306.1702
Fax +1-703-306.0476
E-mail: jhudson@nsf.gov

Canada

Ms Ruth Girard
Manager, Business Development -
Europe
Information and Communications
Technology Industry Canada
300 Slater Street, 17th Floor
Ottawa ON K1A 0C8, CANADA
Tel.: +1-613-954.0599
Fax.: +1-613-990.4215
E-mail: girard.ruth@ic.gc.ca
<http://strategis.ic.gc.ca/innovation>

Russia

Prof V. M. Mikhov
Institute of Operating Systems
State Committee on Higher Education
of the Russian Federation
IOS, MSIEE
RU-103498 Zelenograd - MOSCOW

Tel +7-095-532-9887
Fax +7-095-532-0200
E-mail: mvm@miet.msk.su

South Africa

Dr. Chris Scheffer
Director: Science and Technology Co-
operation
Department of Arts, Culture, Science
and Technology (DACST)
Private Bag X894
0001 Pretoria, RSA
Tel.: +27-12-337.8142
Fax: +27-12-323.8308
E-mail: wb18@acts2.pwv.gov.za

REST OF THE WORLD

Albania

Dr F. Lena
EU Research Programmes for
Albania
Committee for Science and
Technology
Boulevard Zhan D'ark 2
TIRANA, ALBANIA

Tel +355-42-28371
Fax +355-42-27975

Belarus

Prof A. Soukhodolski
Centre for Information
Technology
113-6 P. Brovki str.
220027 MINSK, BELARUS

Tel +375-172-3984-83
Fax +375-172-3267-66
E-mail: office@cit.org.by

Egypt

Prof. M. El Halwagi
Ministry of Scientific Research
First Undersecretary of State
101 Kasr El Eini Street
CAIRO, EGYPT

Tel +202-354.0804
Fax +202-356.2820

Georgia

Dr P. Kervalishvili
Deputy Chairman of the
Committee for Science and
Technology
12, Jorjashvili Str.
380004 TBILISI, GEORGIA

Tel +995-88-3298.8440
Fax +995-88-3298.8497
E-mail:
nauka@adonis.ias.msk.su

Japan

Mr Teppei Kuroda
Director for Development Programme
Agency of Industrial Science and
Technology (AIST)
Ministry of International Trade and
Industry (MITI)
1-3-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
JAP - TOKYO 100

Tel +81-3-3501.9245
Fax +81-3-3501-7924
E-mail: ktaa3886@miti.go.jp

Jordan

Dr H. Mulki
Royal Scientific Society
President's Office
P.O. Box 925819
AMMAN, JORDAN

Tel +962-6-844.701/9
Fax +962-6-832.969

Lebanon

Dr H. Kouyoumjian
Centre de Recherche Marine
CNRS Liban
PO Box 123
JOUNIEB, LEBANON

Tel +961-918-570
Fax +961-822-639

Malta

Mrs J. Cassingena
Malta Council for Science and
Technology
112 West Street
Valetta, Malta

Tel +356-241.176
Fax +356-241.177

Moldova

Prof N. Andronaty
 Technical Sciences
 Department
 Academy of Sciences of
 Moldova
 1 Stefan cel Mare Ave.
 2001 KISHINEV, MOLDAVIA

Tel +373-2-26-1671
 Fax +373-2-22-3222
 E-mail:
 andronat@tech.moldova.su

Ukraine

Prof A. Y. Savchenko
 Ministry of Science and Technology
 Schors Str. 31
 252133 KYIV, UKRAINE

Tel +380-44-264.0281
 Fax +380-44-264.0790

Morocco

Dr K. Khallaayoune
 CNCPRST
 52 Charii Omarl bn khattab
 PO Box 8027
 AGDAL RABAT , MOROCCO

Tel +212-7-776.33
 Fax +212-7-771.288

Syria

c/o EU Delegation
 Chabkib Arslane Street
 Abou roumaneh
 DAMASCUS, SYRIA

Tel +963-11-247.640 / 247.641
 Fax +963-11-420.683

Tunisia

Dr Chaabouni
 Secrétariat d'Etat à la
 Recherche Scientifique et à la
 Technologie
 TUNIS, TUNISIA

Tel +216-1-795.414
 Fax +216-1-796.165

Turkey

Dr. Cemil Arikan,
 Vice President
 TÜBİTAK
 Atatürk Bulvari 221
 Kavaklıdere
 06100 ANKARA, TURKEY

Tel +90-312-427.7483
 Fax +90-312-427.7483

Appendix 6 – Draft Evaluation Guidelines, 1st call IST programme

**DRAFT EVALUATION GUIDELINES
1st IST CALL 19th MARCH 1999**

1. Overview of the Evaluation Procedure

1.1. Introduction

This document defines the procedure applied to the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the 1st 99 IST Call for Proposals published on 19th March 1999. Any further information in addition to this document, e. g. scheduling for the evaluation, will be provided during the briefing of evaluators.

The activities requested by the 1st 99 IST Call are summed up in the Call announcement which was published in the Official Journal of the European Communities. The activities themselves are described in the 1999 IST Workprogramme. The general procedure for evaluation of proposals for the IST Programme is described in the FP5 Manual of Evaluation Procedures together with its IST specific annex, which is available to evaluators (See appendix 4 to this document). Copies of these documents are available to evaluators and should be studied before evaluation commences.

The present document details this procedure and provides specific supporting information to evaluators taking part in the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the 1st 99 IST Call.

The remainder of this section (Section 1) provides an overview of the general procedure, some basic principles, and the role of the Commission staff supporting this evaluation.

Section 2 describes the required structure of proposals.

Section 3 defines, step by step, how the evaluation is to be undertaken.

Section 4 outlines briefly subsequent stages in the process following completion of the evaluation.

Section 5 completes the picture by detailing the responsibilities of evaluation rapporteurs, and the handling of the various forms which are used in the evaluation.

1.2. Evaluation Schedule

The detailed schedule for the evaluation process will be supplied to evaluators in advance of the evaluation.

On receipt by the Commission the proposals will be registered and sorted, eligibility will be checked and essential data will be entered into a database to support the evaluation process. Furthermore, during this period the Commission staff will make a tentative assignment of evaluators to proposals, taking into account the code of conduct applicable to Commission staff and to evaluators. *During the period preceding the evaluation however no assessment of proposals is carried out.*

The actual evaluation will take place on secure premises in Brussels during the period stated in the schedule. Changes to this schedule may be communicated at the evaluators briefing, or if necessary at other times prior to completion of the evaluation process.

(For certain specific measures, where commercial sensitivity is not an issue, a procedure of remote evaluation will be carried out by evaluators based in their own

homes/place of work. Supplementary instructions for this case will be supplied to participating evaluators.)

1.3. Organisation

The evaluation of the proposals is undertaken by external independent evaluators, who assess each aspect of the proposal and provide advice to the Commission.

The main division of the programme is into four key actions and special areas of future and emerging technologies (FET) and research networking (RN).

Evaluators will be assigned to proposals and grouped in panels. There may be several panels per key action/FET/RN, each panel will evaluate proposals which fall within a particular research area, appropriate to its technical expertise.

For proposals covering more than one research area or key action, either a single prime panel will be identified during the preparation phase and this prime panel will invite members of other relevant panels to participate in its discussion of such proposals, or else joint panel sessions will be held.

Each proposal will be assessed independently by at least three “readers”. These readers will come together to reach consensus on the proposal scores.

One of the readers of each proposal will act as “Proposal Rapporteur”. He/she is responsible for compiling the individual reader’s views in preparation for the consensus discussion of the proposal, the consensus meeting notes and the final recommendations to the panel discussion.

Each panel selects one of its members to act as “Panel Rapporteur”, with overall responsibilities for the panel’s deliberations. The activities of each panel are also supported by a Commission Coordinator.

The procedure is designed to ensure that the first stage of evaluation of shared-cost RTD proposals, which is of the proposal’s scientific/technological quality and innovation aspects, is carried out with no knowledge of the identity of the proposers. If, in this initial anonymous evaluation stage, an evaluator is by chance able to identify the origin of a proposal by, for example, its technical approach and content, he/she is asked *not* to share this knowledge with other evaluators.

1.4. Commission Support

The evaluation process is supported by a team of Commission personnel whose responsibilities are to ensure that the process runs smoothly and fairly, that access to the information pertaining to proposals is strictly controlled, and that the most efficient use possible is made of the time of all concerned. *Commission staff however do not involve themselves in the individual assessment of proposals, and may not express any opinion on the merits or otherwise of any proposal.*

1.5. Conflicts of Interest

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employers or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective and to behave throughout in a professional manner.

They should familiarise themselves with the Code of Conduct for Evaluators (see Annex C of the FP 5 Evaluation Manual) and should act in conformity with it. If they find they are in some way connected with a proposal which they have been asked to evaluate, or have some other allegiance which impairs their impartiality, they must declare this to their panel’s Commission Coordinator (using the form provided as

annex D to the FP5 Evaluation Manual). They will not actively participate in the evaluation process for that proposal (or proposals competing with this proposal, if any) and will be excluded from the panel or asked to leave the room during any subsequent discussion of it or competing proposals.

1.6. Confidentiality and Security

All evaluators and Commission staff directly involved in the evaluation will be issued with identification badges, which are to be worn at all times during the evaluation. No other persons will be permitted entry to the premises on which the evaluation is taking place.

Evaluators must neither discuss specific proposals nor aspects of their evaluation with other persons inside or outside during *or after* the evaluation period except in the meetings convened for that purpose by Commission staff.

Nothing may be photocopied by an evaluator without the express permission of the Commission Coordinator responsible. No documents nor data diskettes may be removed from the premises of the evaluation. In general, phone calls to/from the evaluators are strongly discouraged whilst the actual evaluation is taking place. Evaluators are requested to have their portable phones and computers safely stored by Evaluation staff.

The Commission undertakes to keep confidential any information which could identify which proposals have been read by individual evaluators, and the comments made by an individual evaluator on any proposal. Evaluators undertake never to subsequently reveal the identity or opinion of his/her co-evaluators.

It may be necessary in exceptional cases to seek clarification from proposers regarding the proposals received. However, such contacts with proposers will only be carried out by the Commission services responsible. Any evaluator requiring such clarification must report to the Commission Coordinator, who will then take the necessary action.

2. The Proposals

Proposals are required to be structured in three sections:

2.1. Part A

This part comprises administrative and financial data. It is collected by the Commission mainly for administrative purposes, is not subject to evaluation and only the proposal abstract and/or summary and the estimated budget will be shown to the evaluators.

2.2. Part B

This part comprises the description of scientific and technological objectives, and the detailed project workplan. It consists of text plus supporting pictures, diagrams etc., under six predetermined headings:

- B.1. Title page
- B.2. Contents list
- B.3. Objectives
- B.4. Contribution to programme/key action objectives
- B.5 Innovation (for RTD proposals)

- B.5. Relations to programme (for Accompanying measures)
- B.5. Membership (for Concerted actions/Thematic networks)
- B.6. Project workplan

This is supported by three tables;

- Table B.1 Workpackage list
- Table B.2 Deliverables list
- Table(s) B.3. Workpackage description (one table per workpackage)

It should be noted that this part should not contain any indication of the identity of the proposers in the intended consortium, nor should it contain a direct indication of the costs in financial terms. It does however contain figures relating to the manpower involved in the proposed project. Part B is normally pre-read by Commission staff, and any inadvertent references to the identity of proposers or to costs might be deleted. However it is the responsibility of the consortium to present Part B in an anonymous way and if inadvertent references to partner identities are considered detrimental to a fair evaluation of the proposal the Commission might exclude the proposal from evaluation.

Short proposals for work in the open domain of future and emerging technologies "FET O" have an abbreviated form of Part B, consisting only of a title page and a free-form description of the project plan.

Applications for INCO bursaries does only consist of part A and part B. The evaluation of these proposals are described in annex 3 to this document.

2.3. Part C

This part comprises a description of the proposed project's contribution to EC policies and development, and participants' roles and qualifications. It consists of text plus supporting pictures, diagrams etc., under eight recommended headings:

- C.1. Title page
- C.2. Contents list
- C.3. Community added-value and contribution to EC policies
- C.4. Contribution to Community social objectives
- C.5. Project management
- C.6. Description of consortium
- C.7. Description of participants
- C.8. Economic development and scientific and technological prospects

Short proposals for work in the open domain of future and emerging technologies ("FET O") have an abbreviated form of Part C, consisting only a title page and the sections "Description of consortium" and "Description of participants".

2.4. Combined research and demonstration projects

Proposals for Combined research and demonstration projects normally contain two Parts B and Parts C, treating the research and the demonstration aspects of the proposal separately.

3. Evaluation Procedure

3.1. Evaluation criteria

The contents of Part B of the proposal allow evaluators to score the proposal on a block of criteria concerning **Scientific/Technological quality and innovation**. These criteria are:

- The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;
- The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;
- The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

Evaluators should attribute an individual score to each of these criteria, and then a single summary score for the block as a whole.

The summary score for the block is not simply an arithmetical average of the individual scores, but rather a combined judgement in which the evaluator takes a global view of the block of criteria. It is this single summary score for the block, and not the individual scores, which will be taken into account in the calculation of the overall score of the proposal.

The contents of Part C of the proposal allow evaluators to score the proposal on further blocks of criteria in the same way, as follows.

Community added value and contribution to EC policies

- The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;
- The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;
- The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

Contribution to Community social objectives

- The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);
- The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;
- The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

Economic development and S&T prospects

- The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;
- The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;
- The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

Resources, Partnership and Management

- The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;
- The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;
- The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

3.2. Evaluation criteria scores

The scoring system used is as follows:

- 0 - Unsatisfactory - the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or can not be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information
- 1 - Poor
- 2 - Fair
- 3 - Good
- 4 - Very good
- 5 - Excellent

The single summary score of each block of criteria must also be one of these integers (*not* a calculated average).

To establish the overall score for a proposal, the single summary score in each of the above five blocks of criteria is taken, and these are summed in a weighting scheme which attributes a specific weight to each of the blocks, to give an overall score for the proposal. This weighting scheme differs according to the type of action involved (See annex 4 to this document).

3.3. Eligibility criteria

Prior to the evaluation, Commission staff examined and eliminated from the evaluation any proposal which failed to meet a number of legal eligibility criteria (for example, that deadlines have been respected, that the proposing has at least two participants, that at least one member of the proposing consortium must come from a Member State or Associated State etc.). There are however a number of further eligibility criteria which can only be assessed by the evaluators' following their detailed study of the proposal. These are:

- The proposal addresses the parts of the IST Workprogramme and Action Lines, including policy and regulatory issues, open for the particular call (i.e. the proposal is "in scope");
- The proposal follows the requirements for layout detailed in the Call;
- Relevant ethical issues and safeguards have been adequately taken into account and the proposed research complies with fundamental ethical principles;
- Participation of industrial entities in industrially-orientated shared cost actions is appropriate to the nature and purpose of the activity.

In the case of negative answers to these questions, the experts will be required to provide comments to justify their answers. On the basis of the experts' remarks, the Commission reserves the right not to continue with the evaluation of the proposal. A special procedure (described below) applies to proposals which are only partially in scope.

Evaluation and eligibility criteria

When examining proposals, evaluators will *only* apply the evaluation and eligibility criteria set out in this document. No other factors will be taken into account.

3.4. Overview of steps in the evaluation procedure

Step 1 Opening, registration and preparation

Following the closure of the Call for Proposals, all proposals will be opened, registered and all pages of the proposal will be assigned a reference number if the proposer has omitted to do so. The Commission staff will set up the work schedule for the evaluation itself, including the assignment of proposals to individual evaluators and the selection of Proposal Rapporteurs.

Step 2 Eligibility check by Commission

Proposals' conformity to the requirements of the Call will be verified. Proposals which fail the eligibility check will not go forward to evaluation.

Step 3 Scientific and technical evaluation of proposals

Evaluators then review Part B (the part of the proposal dealing with scientific and technological objectives and the project workplan) for the proposals which have been assigned to them as readers. This is undertaken on an individual basis, working alone.

Once the above evaluation has been completed by the readers of a particular proposal, and their conclusions have been recorded and signed, the evaluators will proceed to evaluate part C of the proposal.

Threshold score

Proposals for shared cost RTD projects which fail to reach an overall rating of at least 3 (“Good”) for part B will not be retained for funding.

Step 4 Policy, management and participation evaluation of proposals

Evaluators then review Part C - the part of the proposal dealing with contribution to EC policies, economic development, project management and participants - for the proposals which have been assigned to them as readers. This is undertaken on an individual basis, working alone. In order to support the evaluators’ judgement on the last block of criteria concerning Management and resources, the Commission will supply summary budget information from proposal Part A.

Once their conclusions on these criteria are recorded and signed, the readers meet under Commission moderation to achieve a consensus view on a summary score for each block (0-5). The panel as a whole will review the readers’ conclusions and approve a summary score for each block of criteria in this part of the proposal

Threshold scores

Several of the blocks of criteria in Part C also have threshold scores, varying according to the type of action. Proposals which fail to achieve these ratings in the panel meeting will automatically be subject to a “non-retained” recommendation by the panel.

Step 5 Eligibility check by evaluators

On the basis of their knowledge of Part B and Part C, readers should check the proposal against the list of eligibility criteria. If they judge it eligible, no further action is required. If, however, they suspect ineligibility, the panel as a whole must review the issue and come to a decision.

Eligibility criteria

Proposals which fail on any one of the listed eligibility criteria in the panel meeting will be not be evaluated further, and will automatically be subject to a “non-retained” recommendation by the panel.

Exception note: It is possible that a proposal is partially, but not fully, within the scope of the Call. If in the judgement of the readers the proposal is of sufficient merit, the evaluation of the proposal may continue, confined however only to those parts of the proposal which are in scope without consideration of the remaining material. If however the readers judge it to be without sufficient merit for this, the panel as a whole must review the issue and come to a decision.

Step 6 Proposal Summary Form

The panel completes a Proposal Summary Form recording their conclusions for each proposal. This involves a calculation of the overall weighted score.

The Proposal Summary Form, as well as containing the evaluators' scores and explanatory remarks, should also clearly state any recommendations which the evaluators would like to make concerning modifications to the proposal. The issues of clustering of proposals and third country participation should be addressed here if relevant.

Step 7 Panel ranking

The proposals are then ranked on the basis of the overall weighted scores. The panel will in the ranking also consider the need for calibration of proposal scores or other elements that might be relevant for the ranking, like e. g. their significance to the area of the Workprogramme addressed by the panel. This may lead to slight adjustments of individual proposal scores and overall ranking for which clear justifications must be provided in the evaluation report.

In order to assist in the ranking discussions the Commission will prepare and supply to each panel a compilation of technical summaries of all the received proposal. This will be done by extracting the Form A.2 Proposal Summary from the Part A (Administrative information) of each proposal. In the case of shared-cost RTD proposals, since this part of the project proposal is not required to be anonymous, these summaries will only be released to evaluators when all Part Bs have been scored.

A copy of the Final Proposal Summary Form after the panel ranking will subsequently be sent by the Commission to the proposers.

Step 8 Panel report

The panel prepares a written report on its deliberations. This panel report forms part of the overall Evaluation Report which will be submitted to the IST Committee.

Step 9 Priority list

On the basis of the recommendations of the evaluators, Commission staff will draw up a final ranked list of all retained proposals.

Normally, this ranking will follow the scores and advice received. In drawing up the final ranked list however, the Commission may need to also take into account the programme priorities (for example, coverage of the programme objectives, compatibility with stated Community policy objectives and ethical considerations, if appropriate). For these reasons, the Commission may exceptionally decide not to follow the evaluators' priority order. In this instance, the reasons for overriding the advice of the evaluators will be fully justified in writing in the evaluation report.

4. Post-evaluation Procedure

4.1. Non-retained proposals

The Commission services will draw up a list of the non-retained proposals. This list will comprise all proposals found to be ineligible, out of scope, failing any of the individual thresholds for evaluation criteria, and also those, which cannot be funded for budgetary reasons.

Following an appropriate consultation with other Commission services, the decision on proposal rejection will be taken at the level of the Commission. Proposers will be informed in writing of the Commission's decision.

4.2. Contract preparation and finalisation

The proposers of retained proposals *for which funding is at the time available* will be contacted in writing. They will receive the summary report of the evaluation of their proposal and a request for further administrative and - where required - technical information necessary for the preparation of a project contract. This extra information will include that information necessary for establishing the financial and legal viability of the contract participants and their availability of all the necessary resources to carry out the project.

Among the items to be dealt with in the contract preparation and finalisation phase will be an examination of the costs proposed in relation to the resources requested to achieve cost effectiveness, the detailed technical work to be carried out and where relevant third country participation. In discussing these items with proposers, the Commission staff will take account of the comments of the evaluators. In addition, any arrangements for possible clustering of projects (with the agreement of proposers) will be dealt with in this phase.

Once the details have been finalised and all the necessary financial and legal checks carried out, a draft selection decision will be prepared by the Commission services. This will be adopted by the Commission following normal internal procedures and the procedure adopted in the specific programme decision. Once the selection decision has been taken, contracts will be sent to the proposers for signature.

4.3. "Reserve list" proposals

In estimating availability of funding, the Commission will start at the top of the priority list and allot funding until all currently available funds are attributed. Proposals below that point are nevertheless still retained proposals. It may be that funding will become available later (for example, by savings made in the negotiations with the higher-ranked projects during their contract preparation phase).

Therefore, the proposers of such proposals will receive the summary report on the evaluation of their proposal, noting that they are still retained, but indicating that they have no guarantee of being funded at this point. Such proposals will be retained on the reserve list. (They may also choose to withdraw their proposal and, if the planned calls allow, improve it for submission at a later call).

When the budget for the particular call has been finally used up, any proposals remaining from the "reserve" which it has not been possible to fund will then be rejected by a decision of the Commission as set out above, and the proposers will be informed.

5. Evaluation Forms

5.1. Form overview

A number of forms have been designed, so as to create a permanent record of the evaluation of each proposal. These are:

Form C.1 – Administrative eligibility checklist 1
(for eligibility check by Commission services)

Form E.1 - Scientific and technological evaluation
(in Individual and Collective versions)

Form E.2 - Policy, development, roles and qualifications evaluation
(in Individual and Collective versions)

Form E.3 - Consensus meeting notes, providing the essence of the deliberations in the consensus meeting, in particular justifications for consensus choices in case of relatively large differences in individual scores.

Form C.2 – Expert Eligibility checklist 2
(for eligibility check by evaluators)

Form E.4 - Proposal Summary Form

Examples of these forms - for the RTD proposals - are attached, with necessary supporting documentation.

5.2. Form completion by evaluators

E.1

When a reader of a proposal has completed his (or her) study of Part B, he will complete Form E.1 - Scientific and technological evaluation, recording his personal view without discussion with others. The Individual form shows a score for each criterion, and the single summary score for the whole block.

When all the readers of the proposal have completed and signed their Individual E.1s, and have given them to the Commission Coordinator for archiving, they will be given the part C of the proposal for evaluation.

E.2

When a reader of a proposal has completed his study of Part C, he will complete Form E.2 - Policy, development, roles and qualifications evaluation, recording his personal view without discussion with others. The form is archived by the Commission Coordinator.

When all the readers of the proposal have completed and signed their Individual E.2s, and have given them to the Commission Coordinator for archiving, they will meet to discuss their conclusions and make a draft Collective E.1 and E.2 forms. These forms will show only a single summary score (0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5) for the 5 blocks of evaluation criteria, plus any supporting remarks or explanations. The reader who has

been nominated by the Commission services as Proposal Rapporteur will be responsible for the completion of these forms.

E.3

The proposal rapporteur records the conclusions of the consensus meeting on the E.3 form. This form provides the essence of the consensus discussions. It will give justifications for the choices made, in particular if the individual scores are relatively differ considerably. It will form the basis of further comments in the summary form and for information to proposers about the reasons for the scores given. It is signed by all three readers.

The Proposal Rapporteur will then present these drafts to the panel as a whole, which will approve or modify the conclusions. The Proposal Rapporteur will record the panel's decision in a final version of the Collective E.1 and E.2 forms which will form the basis for the draft E.4 form.

Proposals which have failed to reach the threshold on this stage will be put aside and not further considered.

C.2

Each reader will also check the proposal for eligibility criteria. No individual forms are required in this case. Readers instead will come to conclusions during the consensus meeting to confirm (or otherwise) each eligibility point and complete a single Form C.2, Expert Eligibility checklist 2.

If the proposal is judged eligible, no further action is required. The form will be archived by the Commission Coordinator. If however the readers conclude that the proposal may be ineligible on one or more of the criteria, the issue must be presented to the panel (by the Proposal Rapporteur), and the panel as a whole will rule on the issue.

E.4.

Form E.4 - Proposal Summary Form is completed by the panel to summarise their conclusions and recommendations.

Form E.4 can only be complete in full for proposals which completed the whole evaluation process. Proposals which failed at one of the applied thresholds can only be completed for those parts which were evaluated prior to their failure and withdrawal from the evaluation process. (In such cases, the evaluators' written comments must make clear why the proposal failed to reach the necessary threshold).

The Form E.4 will be archived by the Commission Coordinator, and a copy will be subsequently sent to the proposers.

Appendix 1 – Draft Evaluation Forms

IST PROGRAMME

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL - RTD ACTIONS PART B**E.1**

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:		
Evaluator:			Panel:	
Signature:			Date:	

Scores: 0 Unsatisfactory* 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 4 Very good 5 Excellent

(*Does not address issue; information missing or incomplete)

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation		<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>Comments:</i>		
a) The contribution of the proposal to address the key scientific and technological issues for the objectives of the programme and/or key action:		
<i>Comments:</i>		
b) The originality, degree of innovation and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project:		
<i>Comments:</i>		
c) The adequacy of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.		
<i>Comments:</i>		

IST PROGRAMME

Page 1 of 2

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL - RTD ACTIONS PART C**E.2**

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator:		Panel:	
Signature:		Date:	

Scores: 0 Unsatisfactory* 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 4 Very good 5 Excellent

(*Does not address issue; information missing or incomplete)

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies		<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>General/overall comments:</i>		
a) The European dimension of the problem.		
<i>Comments:</i>		
b) The European added value of the consortium		
<i>Comments:</i>		
c) The project's contribution to EC policies or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.		
<i>Comments:</i>		
3. Contribution to Community social objectives		<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>General/overall comments:</i>		
a) The contribution to improving the quality of life and health and safety.		
<i>Comments:</i>		
b) The contribution to improving employment prospects.		
<i>Comments:</i>		
c) The contribution to preserving and/or enhancing the environment.		
<i>Comments:</i>		

--

IST PROGRAMME

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL - RTD ACTIONS PART C**E.2**

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator:		Panel:	
Signature:		Date:	

Grades: 0 Unsatisfactory* 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 4 Very good 5 Excellent

(*Does not address issue; information missing or incomplete)

4. Economic development and S&T prospects	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>General/overall comments:</i>	
a) The usefulness and range of applications and quality of exploitation plans	
<i>Comments:</i>	
b) The strategic impact of the proposed project	
<i>Comments:</i>	
c) Contribution to European technological progress and dissemination strategies	
<i>Comments:</i>	
5. Resources, partnership and management	<input type="checkbox"/>
<i>General/overall comments:</i>	
a) The quality of the management and project approach	
<i>Comments:</i>	
b) The quality of the partnership and involvement of users and/or other actors	
<i>Comments:</i>	
If Applicable: The appropriateness of Third country participation	
<i>Comments:</i>	
c) The appropriateness of the resources	
<i>Comments:</i>	

IST PROGRAMME
CONSENSUS MEETING NOTES - RTD ACTIONS PART B&C

E.3

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:			
Panel:				Date:	
Evaluator 1		Evaluator 2		Evaluator 3	
Signature		Signature		Signature	

Minutes of the consensus meeting (*Describe how the decisions regarding the evaluation results were reached. Always provide comments if the consolidated evaluation differs significantly from the individual scores on given criteria and/or if scores have moved above or below thresholds. Record any dissenting views*):

IST PROGRAMME

PROPOSAL SUMMARY FORM - RTD ACTIONS PART B&C**E.4**

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:			
Panel:				Date:	
Evaluator 1		Evaluator 2		Evaluator 3	
Signature		Signature		Signature	

Grades: 0 Unsatisfactory 1 Poor 2 Fair 3 Good 4 Very good 5 Excellent

Marks achieved for evaluation criteria:

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

Comments:

☐

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

Comments:

☐

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

Comments:

☐

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

Comments:

☐

5. Resources, partnership and management

Comments:

☐

Overall score

General/overall comments (including proposals for modifications and possibilities for clustering/fusion with other proposals):

☐

IST PROGRAMME
ADMINISTRATIVE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST – RTD ACTIONS

C.1

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Commission Official:		DG/Unit:	
Signature:		Date:	

Eligibility criteria	YES	NO
1. For proposals submitted electronically, date of dispatch of electronic validation file or proposal before deadline for dispatching		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
2. For proposals submitted electronically, agreement between the unique identifier code sent with the validation file and that calculated from the proposal file		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
3. For proposals submitted in paper: Date of reception of proposal before deadline for reception		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
4. Original signature of the coordinating legal entity (or appropriate electronic “signature”)		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
5. Original signatures of the participants who would contribute to the funding of a project (i.e. potential contractors, assistant contractors and members) or a signed declaration of the proposal coordinator that he/she is authorised to send the proposal and that the proposal is agreed to by the partners		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
6. Minimum number of eligible, independent partners, as referred to in the call for proposals²⁶		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
7. Completeness of the proposal, i.e. presence of all relevant administrative forms and the proposal description (Parts A, B and C)		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
8. If applicable: Does the proposal description part B respect the requirements for anonymity?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
OVERALL ELIGIBILITY:		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		

²⁶ See Article 4 of Council Decision of 22 December, 1998 concerning the rules for participation of undertakings, research centres and universities and for the dissemination of research results for the implementation of the fifth framework programme of the European Community (1998-2002); 1999/65/EC.

IST PROGRAMME
ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST - RTD ACTIONS

C.2

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator:		Panel:	
Signature:		Date:	

Eligibility criteria	YES	NO
1. Does the proposal address the parts of the Workprogramme, including policy issues, which are open for this Call?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
2. If the proposal is only partially in line with the Call, does it have sufficient merit to be considered in its entirety or in part?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
3. Have relevant ethical issues been adequately taken into account in the preparation of the proposal; is the proposed research compliant with fundamental ethical principles, if relevant?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
4. Is the research proposed in line with Community policies, if relevant;		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
5. Have appropriate safeguards/impact assessment regarding Community policies (e.g. environment) been taken into account, where necessary?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
6. Does the proposal follow the requirements for layout (e.g. requirements for anonymity)?		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
OVERALL ELIGIBILITY:		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		

Appendix 2 - Supporting Information

Supporting information for evaluation criteria

In examining each of the evaluation criteria, evaluators may be guided by the following remarks:

Scientific/Technological quality and innovation

Quality

An overall assessment of the quality of the research proposed to be carried out, from a scientific and technical point of view. To what extent will it contribute to solving the scientific and/or technological problems of the key action, action line etc. to which this proposal belongs? Recommend improvements.

Innovation and risk

Does the proposals demonstrate awareness of the current state-of-the-art, and show a degree of originality, innovation and promise of progress beyond it. Does the proposal strike an appropriate balance in the level of risk associated with the project compared to its potential benefits - high risk may be acceptable in return for high benefits. Warn of unacceptable levels of risk.

Adequacy

Examine the adequacy of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the objective(s). Is the role and contribution of each participant clear, and is it unambiguously linked to the planned activities. Do the participants foresee appropriate procedures for self-assessment.

Any possible improvements in the methodology and workplan can be suggested here. These improvements may be incorporated by the proposers during the contract negotiation phase

Community added value and contribution to EC policies

European dimension

Does the proposal address European issues or merely address a national issue. Assess the extent to which the project is required by the EU as a whole. Does the proposal identify and describe interdependencies or links with other national or international activities.

European added-value

What are the European/international dimension in the execution of the work, for example is there a need to establish a critical mass in human or financial terms, or does adequate resources and expertise not exist in individual countries? Will the impact of carrying out the work at the European level be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects?

EC policy

Will the project's results contribute to the implementation or the future evolution of an EC policy (excluding the three EC social objectives which are covered in the following criterion)? Does it address EU-wide standardisation or regulation issues?

Contribution to Community social objectives

Quality of life

Will the results of the project improve the quality of life of European citizens, and in particular their health and safety at home or at work?

Employment

Will the project help to improve general employment prospects at the shorter or longer term and /or the use and develop individual's skills, within the EU?

Conservation

Will the project contribute to preserving or enhancing the European environment, or minimise or make more effective the use of natural resources consumed by the EU?

Economic development and S&T prospects

Exploitation

Assess the usefulness and range of applications which might arise from the project. Take into account the partners' capability to exploit the results of the project. To what extent do they already foresee how they will do this, and are these plans credible? Suggest improvements.

Strategic impact

Does the project have a significant strategic impact and not merely satisfy intellectual curiosity? Does the proposal demonstrate a clear view of the market segment(s) and market needs which it addresses? Does it convincingly describe the impact it will have on its industry/commerce/research sector? Will it improve European competitiveness? Will it assist in market development?

Dissemination

The project is not funded merely to benefit the participating organisations. Does the proposal show that results will be adequately disseminated so as to support general European scientific or technological progress? To what extent does the proposal have specific plans for dissemination, with explicit commitments by participants? Suggest improvements.

Management and resources

Quality of the management

Is the workplan appropriate, clear, consistent, and efficient? Is it complete or are there serious omissions? Is a clear working schedule foreseen, how effectively will progress be monitored? Will an effective management structure be put in place, with agreed lines of communication and responsibility? How will corrective actions be initiated, how will conflicts be resolved? Suggest improvements.

Quality of partnership, involvement of users

Are the organisations involved in the consortium capable of doing the tasks allotted to them? Is there redundancy and duplication in the make-up of the consortium? Does the consortium lack a participant with some essential skill or resource?

Where a non-EU/Associated State participation is involved, is it in conformity with the interest of the Community, and is it of substantial added value for implementing all or part of the specific programme?

If the goals of the project require the involvement of users or other actors external to the consortium itself, how credible are the plans for assuring their participation and co-operation?

Resources

Examine the manpower effort, if possible for each partner and workpackage. Is it credible, or seriously under/over estimated? If possible, make a quantitative recommendation for modification to the effort. Review the other resources required. Are these credible also? Are there resources required which appear not to be foreseen in the budget?

Clusters

Any suggestion for clustering with other projects should be noted down and included in the E.4 form during the final panel meeting.

Appendix 3 - SPECIFIC PROCEDURE FOR BURSARIES FOR YOUNG RESEARCHERS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Consortia preparing a research, demonstration or a combined research and demonstration proposal or a concerted action proposal for any of the specific programmes may include an application for an International Co-operation Training Bursary. If successful, the bursary will be funded from the budget of the specific programme "Confirming the International Role of Community Research". The following procedures apply to the evaluation of such bursaries under all specific programmes of the EC fifth framework programme.

Evaluation Experts

Bursary applications must be submitted together with a project proposal (concerted action or joint research project) for any programme. The bursary application will then be evaluated simultaneously with the project proposal, by the same experts.

Eligibility criteria

In order for a bursary application to be eligible, it must satisfy the following requirements:

The Candidate :

- Must be a national of, and established in one of the eligible regions.
- He/she should not be more than 40 years of age (at the time of application).
- He/she must have a good knowledge of a working language of the host institute.

The Host Institute :

- Must be established in an EU Member State or in a State associated to the 5th Framework Programme.
- Must be a member of the consortium proposing the joint research project or Concerted Action.

Evaluation Criteria

Eligible bursary applications will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

	Criteria	Score range
1.	Excellence of the scientific and/or training objectives of the application	0-50
2.	Potential value of the bursary to the applicant and to his/her own home institute	0-20
3.	Relevance of the proposed bursary to the project as a whole	0-15
4.	Experience and professional training of the candidate	0-15

Proposal marking

The score range is 0 to 100 as detailed above. In order for a bursary to be granted, a bursary application must reach a score of at least 60, of which at least 30 should be excellence of scientific and/or training objectives. A score of at least 5 must be reached for each of the other criteria. The evaluated applications will be ranked by each Programme according to their score.

Note : Only if the whole project is selected for funding and the bursary application is highly rated will the bursary be granted.

Appendix 4 - EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR THE PROGRAMME “USER-FRIENDLY INFORMATION SOCIETY” (IST PROGRAMME)

1. The Evaluation Process

1.1 Anonymity: The key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the Key Actions, Research Networking and Cross Programme Activities of the IST Programme, are closely inter-linked with industrial relevance and credibility of the consortium.

It is considered that evaluation of the criterion on scientific and technological quality for actions other than RTD projects can only be properly evaluated with the knowledge of the partners involved in the proposal.

The IST programme will therefore in the case that evaluation is done in the Commission premises, ask evaluators to initially assess part B of proposals for RTD projects on the criterion *Scientific/Technological excellence and innovation* without knowledge of the participants.

1.2 Two-step submission: a two-step submission procedure will be applied in FET-Open and for those RTD projects for which it is duly specified in the Call.

1.3 Evaluation through mailing: The evaluation of FET Pro-active proposals and the second submission of FET-Open can be conducted through mailing to evaluators for obtaining individual assessment (non-anonymous, see 1.1). These written assessments form the basis of final recommendations established by an expert panel invited to the evaluation offices. In other cases that evaluation will be performed through mailings, this will be indicated in the Call.

2. Application of Evaluation criteria

The IST Programme applies the five blocks of evaluation criteria as provided in the FP5 Evaluation manual. Evaluators will, after individual assessment, jointly seek consensus on a final mark for each of the five groups of criteria and propose an overall mark. Panels of evaluators shall agree on a comparative ranking of groups of proposals as well as the overall marks of the proposals compared.

The following questions will be addressed at an appropriate moment in the evaluation.

- (1) Does the proposal address work as specified in Action Lines of the IST Work programme open for the particular call.
- (2) Are ethical principles and safeguards respected
- (3) In compliance with Art. 3.2 of the IST Specific Programme Decision: is participation of industrial entities in industrially-oriented shared cost actions appropriate to the nature and purpose of the activity (detailed conditions with respect to these questions can also be given below for specific action types).

In case of negative answers to one or more of these questions, the Commission may decide not to continue with the evaluation of any such proposal.

The application of the criterion with respect to the Contribution to Community Social Objective, e.g. employment prospects, will take into account direct as well as indirect effects, as appropriate.

3. Detailed provisions

– **First-step submission in RTD projects (if specified in the Call).**

In the first-step submission (short proposals) no details are required on: exploitation or dissemination plans, partner budgets.

– **Demonstration projects or Combined projects**

The Consortium must contain technology developers and technology users.

– **FET Open (shared cost RTD)**

The assessment of Scientific/Technological quality and innovation will focus on innovation, bold ideas involving high risk, or high quality long-term research.

In the first-step submission (short proposals) no details are required on: exploitation or dissemination plans, partner budgets.

In the first-step submission in which an assessment phase is requested, appropriate criteria for measuring success must be defined.

– **Pro-active initiatives in FET shared cost RTD**

Evaluation of Scientific/Technological quality and innovation focuses on innovation and the specific objectives given in the Work programme.

The management plan must define appropriate criteria for measuring the success of the action.

– **Research Networking R.N1**

Concerted actions with funding organisations and communities of users will be launched to help specify the required services. These services will be procured following public procurement by competitive calls for tenders.

– **IST Take-up actions²⁷**

These actions will be coordinated/clustered to gain optimal benefit.

In Assessment actions user-supplier cooperation is necessary. The consortium must contain one or more industrial users (depending on the maturity of the technologies to be assessed - from proof of concept to close to production conditions).

In Access actions the consortium must demonstrate proven capability to provide access to required technologies and services, and the ability to stimulate relevant use of advanced, emerging technologies and services. It must have the potential to be self-supporting at long term.

²⁷ A support document giving additional guidance to constitute a proposal will be provided as part of the call specific IST information.

– **Concerted Actions and Thematic Networks**

The criterion on Scientific/Technological quality and innovation will not address the research quality, but will focus on how programme objectives are supported and the approach to awareness and relations to relevant scientific and technological work.

Community added value addresses interdependencies between national and international R&D when relevant.

Economic development and S&T perspectives particularly addresses the potential for creating added value for industry, the economy or general technical progress. Dissemination plans must be detailed.

The consortium/network must be open to new partners, provide clear procedures for coordination and consensus building; show appropriate critical mass of skills and top level expertise, as well as an appropriate balance between academic and industrial participation.

– **Technology stimulation for SME participation.**

The specific evaluation procedures are defined in the specific annex for the programme "Promotion of Innovation and Encouragement of Participation of SMEs".

– **Training Fellowships**

The specific evaluation procedures are defined in the specific annex for the programme "Improving human research potential and the socio-economic knowledge base".

Table of weights (on a scale of 1 –10 with total 10) and thresholds

TYPE OF ACTION	SELECTION CRITERIA									
	Scientific / technological excellence, innovation		Community Added value and contribution to EU policies		Contribution to Community Social objectives		Economic Development and S&T prospects		Resources, Partnership and Management	
	Weight	Threshold*	Weight	Threshold*	Weight	Threshold*	Weight	Threshold*	Weight	Threshold*
RTD step 1 (if applicable)	4	• 3	1	• 2	1	-	3	• 3	1	-
RTD one-step or step 2	4	• 3	1	• 2	1	-	2	• 3	2	• 2
Demonstration projects	3	• 3	2	• 2	1	-	2	• 3	2	• 2
Combined projects	4	• 3	1	• 2	1	-	2	• 3	2	• 2
FET Open										
Step 1	5	• 3	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	-
Step 2	4	• 3	1	• 3	1	-	2	-	2	• 2
FET Pro-active	4	• 3	1	• 1	1	-	2	-	2	• 2
Take-up										
Assessment	4	-	1	• 2	1	-	2	-	2	• 4
Access	4	-	1	• 2	1	-	2	-	2	• 4
Concerted Actions	2	-	3	-	1	-	2	-	2	• 2
Accompanying Measures	2	• 3	3	• 4	2	-	2	-	1	• 2

* Note that the threshold refers to the mark (0-5) given to the block of criteria (see Manual page 16)