

European Commission



**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**

## **“Continuous Submission Scheme”**

**Proposals for  
FET Open**

**Call part identifier (IST-99-1-2A)**

**Accompanying Measures,**

**Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks**

**(including INCO bursaries)**

**Call part identifier (IST-99-1-2B)**



**Final Edition, 12 March, 1999**

**Reference No. B\_PG2B\_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 under a continuous submission scheme** (*Call part identifiers: IST-99-1-2A and IST-99-1-2B*).

### **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 1, 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 – “Continuous Submission Scheme”**

<b>FOREWORD – PART 2.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>V. SPECIFIC INFORMATION FOR IST PROGRAMME CALL PUBLISHED 19TH MARCH 1999; CONTINUOUS SUBMISSION SCHEME .....</b>	<b>8</b>
V.1. INTRODUCTION .....	8
V.2. IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES .....	8
V.3. PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.....	10
V.4. ADDRESSES FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS .....	11
V.5. SUPPORT FOR PROPOSERS .....	11
V.6. REFERENCES .....	13
<b>APPENDIX 1 - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS .....</b>	<b>15</b>
APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR FET OPEN – SHORT PROPOSALS .....	16
APPENDIX 1B - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR RTD PROPOSALS.....	22
APPENDIX 1C - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES PROPOSALS.....	32
APPENDIX 1D - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR CONCERTED ACTIONS AND THEMATIC NETWORKS .....	40
APPENDIX 1E - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR INCO BURSARIES FOR YOUNG RESEARCHERS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES .....	50
<b>APPENDIX 2 – ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT FORM .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>APPENDIX 3 – NATIONAL CONTACT POINTS .....</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>APPENDIX 4 – DRAFT EVALUATION GUIDELINES, 1<sup>ST</sup> CALL IST PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>64</b>



## PART 2

### V. Specific information for IST Programme Call Published 19th March 1999; Continuous Submission Scheme

#### V.1. Introduction

This section details the procedure which is required for proposals for the “continuous submission” activities in the IST Call of 19th March 1999. The call opens the scheme for continuous submission, with a closing date of 15th September 1999. It is foreseen that the scheme be extended in a call expected to be published in September 1999.

Another version of the PART 2 of the Guide for Proposers (differing by this Call-specific Section V and the Appendices) has been prepared and is available from the European Commission for those who wish to submit proposals for the “fixed deadline” activities which are also included in this Call.

Certain actions foreseen in the Workprogramme, other than those described here, may be sought by means of a public **Call for Tenders**.

Certain dissemination and awareness actions, e. g. support for conferences or exhibitions (See workprogramme sections VI.1 and VIII.3.1), may be implemented as a **subsidy under the applicable Commission procedures**. Further information on how to apply for such activities and which forms to be used can be found on the IST website.

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, opens the Programme to proposals in the “open” domain of future and emerging technologies (FET Open) and for a number of IST Programme support measures. FET Open requires a special two-step submission procedure, using initially the FET Open Proposal Submission Form. The IST Programme support measures are either Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks or Accompanying Measures.

##### V.2.1 FET Open actions [Call part identifier: IST-99-1-2A]:

The open domain in future and emerging technologies, FET Open, is intended for any ideas relevant to information society technologies which could lead to major advances or breakthroughs. These ideas should be bold and innovative involving high risk, or should require substantially longer term research before coming to fruition.

Short term, low risk research, or basic research with little prospect of impact should not be submitted to FET Open. Work that specifically addresses the objectives of an action within an IST key action should be addressed to that key action, not to FET Open.

FET has specifically developed further explanatory information concerning its part of the IST Programme, which can be consulted at <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/fethome>.



In FET Open actions, funding is available for Assessment projects or “normal” shared-cost RTD projects.

#### **ASSESSMENT PROJECTS**

**Assessment projects provide for the initial assessment of a research idea. They are typically of 1 year’s duration. Commission funding is given as a lump sum and is limited to a maximum of □ 100,000 per annum.**

In the special two-step procedure for FET Open, proposers initially present their idea to the Commission as a **short proposal**, using the FET Open Proposal Submission Form, which is less detailed and more free in format than the standard shared-cost RTD action form (see Appendix 1A). In this form they indicate whether they wish to undertake initially a short Assessment project, or else wish to apply for an RTD project.

Following the evaluation, the successful proposers will be advised either:

- to enter discussions with the Commission for an Assessment project contract. (On completion of an Assessment project, the participants may submit a normal shared-cost RTD project proposal - which is subject to evaluation - so as to follow-up the work, or may choose to end the activity at that point.)
- to expand their short proposal into a normal shared-cost RTD proposal<sup>1</sup>. This proposal is then subject to evaluation. This two-step approach has however meant that proposers only commit effort to the full development of a project plan with the assurance that their idea indeed fits within the goals and activities of FET Open in the IST programme, and with initial feedback from evaluators on that idea.

Acceptance by the Commission of the original FET Open proposal does not oblige the proposers subsequently to submit an RTD proposal, nor does it commit the Commission to supporting a subsequent RTD project.

As an exception to the procedure of a “single entry point” via the FET Open proposal form, consortia which have already completed an assessment phase through the Open Long Term Research modality of the ESPRIT Programme, and who have not yet submitted a second phase proposal, may directly submit a normal shared-cost RTD proposal if it complies with the objectives and conditions of the IST programme.

#### *V.2.2. IST Support Measures [Call part identifier: IST-99-1-2B]:*

IST Support Measures may cover the IST Programme as a whole, a key action, a cluster of action lines or one action line alone.

They include **Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks**<sup>1</sup>, which may involve:

- *IST Project Clusters* to co-ordinate RTD projects already in receipt of funding to develop a coherence of approach.
- *Networks of Excellence and Research Training Networks* designed to bring together industry, users, universities and research centres with a common RTD objective.
- *Working Groups* aiming at improving the systematic exchange of information and the forging of links between teams which carry out RTD or take-up activities around a common theme.

<sup>1</sup> Proposers may if they wish include applications for Bursaries for young researchers from developing countries in conjunction with these proposals, using the special application form supplied.

**Accompanying Measures** comprise activities such as:

- *Studies* to provide both technology and market analysis to the research community, with a view to matching the research activities with international and socio-economic trends.
- *Dissemination and awareness actions* targeted on specific audiences outside of the IST Programme or addressing the IST participants themselves. They are aimed at promoting and stimulating rapid take-up of RTD results.
- *Training measures* to promote and support the dissemination and enhancement of research knowledge in both technical and non-technical fields relevant to the Information Society.

A number of Take-Up Measures are foreseen in the “fixed deadline” part of the Call; however the work to coordinate the Assessment action therein are also included in this “continuous submission” part of the Call. For further information see Semiconductor Equipment Assessment (SEA) at <http://www.cordis.lu/ist/melhome>.

### ***V.3. Proposal requirements***

Proposals must conform to the descriptive and qualifying conditions given in this guide. Proposers are urged to use the Proposal Preparation Tool (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. Proposal structure***

The forms for the preparation of a proposal are appended to this document. Use the correct proposal form i.e. the FET Open short proposal form, the shared-cost RTD project form, the Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks, Accompanying Measures forms or the Application form for Bursaries for young researchers from developing countries, as appropriate to your proposal.

The **FET Open short proposal** is divided into three separate parts:

**Part A**, which contains legal and administrative information concerning the proposers, and a summary of the funding requested. NB! For FET Open proposals the full budget breakdown in form A4 is not required, see Appendix 1A);

**Part B**, which briefly describes the work to be carried out (Part B must be is anonymous);

**Part C**, which describes the participants and the consortium.

The **shared-cost RTD form** is also supplied in an appendix to this document. As described above, this should normally be submitted after Commission acceptance of an initial FET Open short proposal where an assessment project is not requested, or following the conclusion of an assessment project.

In the **keywords section of Part A (Form A1) of the FET Open form**, proposers should insert either “**FET-ASSESS**” or “**FET-RTD**”; to indicate whether they are seeking an Assessment project, or wish (if successful in this first step) to go to the second step of submitting a normal shared-cost RTD proposal.

Forms for **Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks** and for **Accompanying Measures** are similarly divided into Parts A, B and C.

In the **keywords section of Part A (Form A1) of the Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks form**, proposers should insert “**CLUSTER**”, “**NETWORK**” or “**GROUPS**” to indicate the type of action.

In the **keywords section of Part A (Form A1) of the Accompanying Measure form**, proposers should insert “**STUDY**”, “**DISSEM**” or “**TRAINING**” to indicate the type of Accompanying Measure.

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

#### *V.3.3. Proposal anonymity*

The **anonymity requirement for Part B of a proposal applies only to shared cost RTD actions, and to the FET Open short proposals. It does not apply to proposals for INCO bursaries, Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks or Accompanying Measures.**

#### *V.3.4. Optional pre-proposal checks*

No pre-proposal check service is offered in this continuous submission scheme of the Call.

### ***V.4. Addresses for submission of proposals***

Proposals must be submitted before the deadline by one of the following methods (see also the text of the call in the Official Journal):

- 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*

- Courier<sup>1</sup> 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. Support for Proposers***

#### *V.5.1. 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: +32-2-2968388  
Web: www.cordis.lu/ist*

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

---

<sup>1</sup> For courier services that require a telephone number for the recipient, please use +32-2-2960245.

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](mailto: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 last-minute information.**

#### *V.5.2. 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.5.3. National contact points*

National Contact Points for the IST Programme (see Appendix 3) 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.5.4. 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](mailto:ideal-ist@dlr-de) or access <http://www.ideal-ist.net/>

#### *V.5.5. 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 [idealist-east@dlr.de](mailto:idealist-east@dlr.de) or access <http://www.idealists-east.net/>

#### *V.5.6. 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 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.5.7. 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](mailto:info@ipr-helpdesk.org)**

**URL: <http://www.cordis.lu/ipr-helpdesk>**

## ***V.6. References***

Potential proposers should consult the following documents:

Decision on the Fifth Framework Programme		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/ist/decisions.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/ist/decisions.htm</a>
Decision on the IST Thematic Programme		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/ist/decisions.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/ist/decisions.htm</a>
IST Call text, 19.03.99		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/calls">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/calls</a>
IST Workprogramme 1999		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist">http://www.cordis.lu/ist</a>
IST Evaluation Manual		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm</a>
Proposal Submission Forms (Part A)		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm</a>
Proposal Submission Forms (Part B and C)	Attached	<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/src/library.htm</a>
FET Information		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/fethome">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/fethome</a>
National contact points	Appendix 3	<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/ncps.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/fp5/src/ncps.htm</a>
Information Days calendar		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist">http://www.cordis.lu/ist</a>
Organisations expressing interest in Call		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist/eoi">http://www.cordis.lu/ist/eoi</a>
Innovation Relay Centres		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/innovation-smes/src/supnet.htm">http://www.cordis.lu/innovation-smes/src/supnet.htm</a>

Information and forms on Marie-Curie fellowships		<a href="http://cordis.lu/improving">http://cordis.lu/improving</a>
SME-specific measures		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/sme">http://www.cordis.lu/sme</a>
INCO-web site (Bursaries, international co-operation)		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/inco">http://www.cordis.lu/inco</a>
Other programme web sites accessible via		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/fp5">http://www.cordis.lu/fp5</a>
IPR helpdesk		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ipr-helpdesk">http://www.cordis.lu/ipr-helpdesk</a>
Proposal Preparation Tool (ProTool)		<a href="http://www.cordis.lu/fp5">http://www.cordis.lu/fp5</a>
IDEALIST		<a href="http://www.ideal-ist.net/">http://www.ideal-ist.net/</a>
IDEALIST EAST		<a href="http://www.ideal-ist-east.net/">http://www.ideal-ist-east.net/</a>

<b>Last-minute information (IST)</b>		<b><a href="http://www.cordis.lu/ist">http://www.cordis.lu/ist</a></b>
--------------------------------------	--	--

## Appendix 1 - Proposal Submission Forms

Proposal Submission form is 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 1E you find the following B and C forms:

- APPENDIX 1A - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR FET OPEN SHORT PROPOSALS
- APPENDIX 1B - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR SHARED-COST RTD PROJECTS
- APPENDIX 1C - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES
- APPENDIX 1D - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR CONCERTED ACTIONS/THEMATIC NETWORKS
- APPENDIX 1E - PROPOSAL SUBMISSION FORMS FOR INCO BURSARIES

## ***Appendix 1A - Proposal Submission Forms for FET Open – Short Proposals***

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

In the **keywords section of Part A** (Form A1) of the FET Open form, proposers should insert either “**FET-ASSESS**” or “**FET-RTD**”; to indicate whether they are seeking an Assessment project, or wish to go to a shared-cost RTD proposal.

FET-Open short proposals do not require a breakdown per cost category, simply a breakdown per partner , i. e. only last 4 columns of Form A4 to be completed. In the case an assessment project is not requested, this budget breakdown per partner can be a rough estimate, more detailed estimates will be required later in the normal shared-cost RTD proposal.





# Part B – FET Open Short Proposals:

## Project description

**!NB! PART B MUST ANONYMOUS**

### **B1. Title page**

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

### **B2. Project description**

There is **no** prescribed format for this part. Proposers should state their case as best they can within **5 pages maximum**, including pictures or diagrams as needed. Proposers should:

- describe **what** they want to do,
- **why** it is important,
- and **indicate whether an Assessment project or RTD project is requested.**



## ***Part C – FET Open Short proposals: Description of the participants.***

**!NB! PART C IS NOT ANONYMOUS**

### **C1. Title page**

Proposal full title

Proposal acronym

(Date of preparation)

Proposal number (if applicable)

### **C2. Short description of the consortium and the participants**

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. 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)*



## Appendix 1B - Proposal Submission Forms for RTD Proposals

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.

**Proposers should note that proposals that do 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.**

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.

**If the RTD proposal for FET Open is a follow-up to an Assessment project, then an outline of the results of the Assessment project should be included as an annex to part C, indicating:**

- how these results establish the feasibility of the original idea
- how these results determine the RTD project being proposed

**For RTD proposals for FET Open please use the same proposal number and acronym as for the short proposal.**



# 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).





<b>B1.</b>	<b>Workpackage list</b>
------------	-------------------------

Work-package No <sup>1</sup>	Workpackage title	Lead contractor No <sup>2</sup>	Person-months <sup>3</sup>	Start month <sup>4</sup>	End month <sup>5</sup>	Phase <sup>6</sup>	Deliverable No <sup>7</sup>
	TOTAL						

<sup>1</sup> Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

<sup>2</sup> Number of the contractor leading the work in this workpackage.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

<sup>6</sup> Only for combined research and demonstration projects: Please indicate R for research and D for demonstration.

<sup>7</sup> Deliverable number: Number for the deliverable(s)/result(s) mentioned in the workpackage: D1 - Dn.

**B2.****Deliverables list**

<b>Deliverable No<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Deliverable title</b>	<b>Delivery date<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Nature<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Dissemination level<sup>4</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

<sup>4</sup> 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 1C - Proposal Submission Forms for Accompanying Measures Proposals***

### *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.**

This section contains only the Parts B and C of the Proposal submission forms for Accompanying 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.

In the **keywords section** of Part A of the Accompanying Measure form, proposers should insert **"STUDY"**, **"DISSEM"** or **"TRAINING"** to indicate the type of Accompanying Measure.

An Accompanying Measure may be proposed by a single contractor or a consortium.





# Part B- Accompanying Measures:

## Description of scientific/technological objectives and workplan

**NB! THERE IS NO ANONYMITY REQUIREMENT FOR ACCOMPANYING MEASURES**

### **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. 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).

<b>B1.</b>	<b>Workpackage list</b>
------------	-------------------------

Work-package No <sup>1</sup>	Workpackage title	Lead contractor No <sup>2</sup>	Person-months <sup>3</sup>	Start month <sup>4</sup>	End month <sup>5</sup>	Phase <sup>6</sup>	Deliverable No <sup>7</sup>
	<b>TOTAL</b>						

<sup>1</sup> Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

<sup>2</sup> Number of the contractor leading the work in this workpackage.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

<sup>6</sup> Only for combined research and demonstration projects: Please indicate R for research and D for demonstration.

<sup>7</sup> Deliverable number: Number for the deliverable(s)/result(s) mentioned in the workpackage: D1 - Dn.

**B2.****Deliverables list**

<b>Deliverable No<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Deliverable title</b>	<b>Delivery date<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Nature<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Dissemination level<sup>4</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

<sup>4</sup> 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 – Accompanying Measures: 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.

## **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

## **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.

## **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 accompanying measure in terms of improvement of competitiveness or creation of market opportunities for the participants.

## ***Appendix 1D - Proposal Submission Forms for Concerted Actions and Thematic Networks***

This section contains only the Parts B and C of the Proposal submission forms for Concerted Actions and Thematic Networks 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.

### *Proposal structure and description.*

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

- **Part B** presents the objectives, summarises the scientific background to the project and describes the advances that it represents with regard to the state of the art, and its industrial or user context.
- **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 does 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.**

In the **keywords section of Part A** (Form A1) of the Concerted Actions/Thematic Networks form, proposers should insert "**CLUSTER**", "**NETWORK**" or "**GROUPS**" to indicate the type of action.

A Concerted Action or a Thematic Network may be proposed by at least two participants, i. e. a single contractor and a member or a consortium of contractors and members from different member states or associated states.





# Part B - Concerted Action / Thematic Network:

## Description of scientific/technological objectives and workplan

**NB! THERE IS NO ANONYMITY REQUIREMENT FOR CONCERTED ACTIONS/THEMATIC NETWORKS**

### **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 concerted action/thematic network 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 concerted action/thematic network will contribute to the objectives of the programme and/or key action.

### **B5. Membership**

This section, not exceeding two pages, describes the individuals/organisations/projects etc. which will be invited to take part in the concerted action/thematic network, how they will be recruited and how their cooperation will be assured. Any special terms or conditions to which they are expected to conform should be described.

### **B6. Workplan:**

*This section concisely describes the work planned to achieve the objectives of the proposed concerted action/thematic network. 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 contractor/consortium to achieve the objectives of the proposal. The workplan must be broken down into workpackages (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of a concerted action/thematic network'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) Action plan and time table; (Gantt chart)
- c) Graphical presentation of the concerted action/thematic network's components; (Pert diagram)
- d) Detailed concerted action/thematic network 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 concerted action/thematic network. Each workpackage should be a major sub-division of the proposed concerted action/thematic network and should also have a verifiable end-point (normally a deliverable or an important milestone in the overall workplan).

<b>B1.</b>	<b>Workpackage list</b>
------------	-------------------------

Work-package No <sup>1</sup>	Workpackage title	Lead contractor No <sup>2</sup>	Person-months <sup>3</sup>	Start month <sup>4</sup>	End month <sup>5</sup>	Phase <sup>6</sup>	Deliverable No <sup>7</sup>
	TOTAL						

<sup>1</sup> Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

<sup>2</sup> Number of the contractor leading the work in this workpackage.

<sup>3</sup> The total number of person-months allocated to each workpackage.

<sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> Relative end date, month 0 marking the start of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

<sup>6</sup> Only for combined research and demonstration projects: Please indicate R for research and D for demonstration.

<sup>7</sup> Deliverable number: Number for the deliverable(s)/result(s) mentioned in the workpackage: D1 - Dn.

**B2.****Deliverables list**

<b>Deliverable No<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Deliverable title</b>	<b>Delivery date<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Nature<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Dissemination level<sup>4</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates: D1 – Dn

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

<sup>4</sup> 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 - Concerted Action / Thematic Network:

## 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 concerted action/thematic network management plan, the consortium structure, the participants 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 concerted action/thematic network 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 concerted action/thematic network 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, if the concerted action/thematic network brings together complementary expertise existing in different organisations, or the proposed concerted action/thematic network addresses problems connected with standardisation and regulation

### **C4. Contribution to Community social objectives.**

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the proposed concerted action/thematic network 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.

### **C5. Management**

This section, not exceeding two pages, should describe how the proposed concerted action/thematic network will be managed by the contractor/consortium, the decision making structures to be applied, the communication flow within the consortium (if applicable) and to and within the members of the concerted action/thematic network, the quality assurance measures which will be implemented, and how legal and ethical obligations will be met.

### **C6. Description of consortium**



If the proposal is by a consortium, a short description in one page of the consortium stating who the participants in the consortium are, what their roles and functions in the consortium are, and how they complement each other.

**C7. Description of participants**

Short description of the contractor/consortium participants, including, at 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 beyond the members of the concerted action/thematic network, for example by describing the dissemination and/or exploitation strategies, 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 concerted action/thematic network in terms of improvement of competitiveness or creation of market opportunities.

## ***Appendix 1E - 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 2 – 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 3 – 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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@tekkes.fi](mailto:mikko.uusitalo@tekkes.fi)

De heer Karel Goossens  
 IWT  
 Bischoffsheimlaan 25  
 B-1000 Brussel

Tel: (+32-2)209.0900  
 Fax: (+32-2)223.1181  
 E-mail: [krge@iwt.be](mailto:krge@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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:bwerkhov@egl.nl)

**Portugal**

Dr<sup>a</sup>. 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](mailto:carla.santos@mail.telepac.pt)

**Spain**

Mr Narciso GARCÍA SANTOS  
OCYT (Oficina de Ciencia 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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto:femirc@femirc.ee)

### Hungary

Mr Vilmos Bognar  
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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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](mailto: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

**Morocco**

Dr K. Khallaayoune  
 CNCPRST  
 52 Charii Omar 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 Bulvarı 221  
 Kavaklıdere  
 06100 ANKARA, TURKEY

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

**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



**Appendix 4 – DRAFT Evaluation Guidelines, 1<sup>st</sup> 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**

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>		
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)

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

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

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>	
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)

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





## IST PROGRAMME

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

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>	
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)

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

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

**E.3**

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>			
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**

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>			
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**

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

<b>Eligibility criteria</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
<b>1. For proposals submitted electronically, date of dispatch of electronic validation file or proposal before deadline for dispatching</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>2. For proposals submitted electronically, agreement between the unique identifier code sent with the validation file and that calculated from the proposal file</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>3. For proposals submitted in paper: Date of reception of proposal before deadline for reception</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>4. Original signature of the coordinating legal entity (or appropriate electronic “signature”)</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>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</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>6. Minimum number of eligible, independent partners, as referred to in the call for proposals<sup>1</sup></b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>7. Completeness of the proposal, i.e. presence of all relevant administrative forms and the proposal description (Parts A, B and C)</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>8. If applicable: Does the proposal description part B respect the requirements for anonymity?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>OVERALL ELIGIBILITY:</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		

<sup>1</sup> 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**

<b>C.2</b>
------------

<b>Proposal No.:</b>		<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>	
Evaluator:		Panel:	
Signature:		Date:	

Eligibility criteria	YES	NO
<b>1. Does the proposal address the parts of the Workprogramme, including policy issues, which are open for this Call?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>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?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>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?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>4. Is the research proposed in line with Community policies, if relevant;</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>5. Have appropriate safeguards/impact assessment regarding Community policies (e.g. environment) been taken into account, where necessary?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>6. Does the proposal follow the requirements for layout (e.g. requirements for anonymity)?</b>		
<i>If NO: Comments:</i>		
<b>OVERALL ELIGIBILITY:</b>		
<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 5<sup>th</sup> 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 actions<sup>1</sup>**

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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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)