PlanetData

Network of Excellence

FP7 – 257641

D8.2 1st PlanetData Program

Coordinator: Thomas Bauereiß (UIBK)
With contributions from: Anna Fensel (UIBK), Serge Tymaniuk (UIBK)
1st **Quality reviewer: Pablo N. Mendes (FUB)**
2nd **Quality reviewer: Elena Simperl (KIT)**

Deliverable nature:	Report (R)
Dissemination level: (Confidentiality)	Public (PU)
Contractual delivery date:	M6: March 31st, 2011
Actual delivery date:	M6: March 31st, 2011
Version:	1.0
Total number of pages:	35
Keywords:	PlanetData Program; Call for Proposals; Linked Data

Abstract

This deliverable reports on the setup and outcome of the PlanetData Programs Call 1. It describes the topic, dissemination, organisation and results of a call for proposals of sub-projects to be carried out in the course of the 1st PlanetData Program.

Executive summary

In addition to the pre-defined work packages and tasks for the nine core partners of the PlanetData consortium, PlanetData has set up an open partnership scheme. The PlanetData Programs provide a framework through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. The Joint Programme of Activities schedules two PlanetData Programs during the runtime of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, each having the duration of 18 months.

For the first PlanetData Program, a call for project proposals focused on the topic of "Consuming Linked Data" has been opened on January 1st, 2011, and closed on February 16th, 2011, 17:00 CET. The call was disseminated via newspapers, magazines, mailing lists, and at events. In response to the call, 37 project proposals were submitted, out of which 36 were eligible for the evaluation. The proposals were evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. After evaluation, 17 proposals were considered eligible for funding. Taking into consideration the budget available for funding sub-projects in the framework of the 1st PlanetData Program, three best ranked relevant proposals were selected for funding.

Pending approval by the European Commission, the three coordinating institutions and their partners who submitted these proposals will be invited to join the PlanetData Network of Excellence as new partners and to receive funding in order to carry out the sub-projects they proposed in the course of the 1st PlanetData Program.

The selected projects and new partners promise to complement the existing PlanetData consortium and activities very well, and vice versa. They can provide significant research contributions and compelling use cases and showcasing applications for the consumption of Linked Data, a key topic in the PlanetData roadmap.

Document Information

IST Project Number	FP7 - 257641		**Acronym**	PlanetData	
Full Title	PlanetData				
Project URL	http://www.planet-data.eu/				
Document URL	http://wiki.planet-data.eu/web/File:D8.2.pdf				
EU Project Officer	Leonhard Maqua				

Deliverable	**Number**	D8.2	**Title**	1st PlanetData Program
Work Package	**Number**	WP8	**Title**	Project Management

Date of Delivery	**Contractual**	M6	**Actual**	M6
Status	version 1.0		final X	
Nature	prototype □ report X dissemination □			
Dissemination level	public X consortium □			

Authors (Partner)	UIBK			
Responsible Author	**Name**	Thomas Bauereiß	**E-mail**	thomas.bauereiss@sti2.at
	Partner	UIBK	**Phone**	+43 512 507 6468

Abstract (for dissemination)	This deliverable reports on the setup and outcome of the PlanetData Programs Call 1. It describes the topic, dissemination, organisation and results of a call for proposals of sub-projects to be carried out in the course of the 1st PlanetData Program.
Keywords	PlanetData Program; Call for Proposals; Linked Data

Version Log			
Issue Date	**Rev. No.**	**Author**	**Change**
2011-03-09	0.1	Thomas Bauereiß, Serge Tymaniuk	First draft
2011-03-10	0.2	Anna Fensel	Second draft
2011-03-21	0.3	Thomas Bauereiß	Incorporated suggestions from quality reviewers
2011-03-23	0.4	Thomas Bauereiß	Removed confidential details of proposals
2011-03-30	1.0	Thomas Bauereiß	Final version for public release

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

NoE – Network of Excellence

RDF – Resource Description Framework

SPARQL – SPARQL Protocol and RDF Query Language

HTTP – Hypertext Transfer Protocol

URI – Uniform Resource Identifier

UK – United Kingdom

US – United States

EU – European Union

EC – European Commission

SME – Small and medium enterprises

1 Introduction

The major objective of PlanetData project is to establish an interdisciplinary, sustainable European community of researchers, aiding organizations to expose their data on the Web. PlanetData project aims to push the state-of-the-art of data management and its applications in large scale for creation of useful, open data sets.

In order to reach this goal, the members of the PlanetData consortium have agreed on a Joint Programme of Activities. For the nine core partners, this includes a pre-defined work plan broken down into work packages and tasks around four main activities: research, data provisioning and data management, impact, and project management.

In addition to this, PlanetData has set up an open partnership scheme. The PlanetData Programs provide a framework through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. The Joint Programme of Activities schedules two PlanetData Programs during the runtime of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, each having the duration of 18 months. The process for these Programs includes calls for project proposals focused on a specific topic. Interested parties can then submit proposals, which are evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. Selected proposers are then invited to join the PlanetData network to carry out the proposed sub-projects.

For the first PlanetData Program, a call for project proposals focused on the topic of "Consuming Linked Data" has been opened on January 1st, 2011, and closed on February 16th, 2011, 17:00 CET. This deliverable reports on the set-up and the results of this call as the first step of the 1st PlanetData Program. Section 2 describes the topic, dissemination and organisation of the call. Section 3 presents the results of the call. Section 4 provides conclusions and next steps for the first PlanetData Program.

2   Call for project proposals

This section describes the background information and motivation behind the PlanetData Programs Call 1, dissemination activities around the Call, and the acquired proposals.

2.1   Call background

At the first plenary meeting of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, the partners discussed possible topics for the PlanetData Programs and agreed to focus on the topic "Consuming Linked Data" for the present first call, PD-1-2011. The term Linked Data refers to a set of best practices to publish and interlink structured data on the Web. These practices include using RDF as a common data model, publishing data on the Web using open protocols like HTTP or SPARQL, and using URIs to identify resources, allowing easy interlinking of data. This foundation of open standards and infrastructures allows anyone to publish data on the Web and create links to other data sources with a low entry barrier. The success of these principles is demonstrated by the drastic growth of the Linked Open Data Cloud, today already containing billions of RDF triples and millions of RDF links. Since the best practices have been proposed in 2006, a grassroots movement started to publish and to interlink open databases on the Web following these practices. Data publishers that are actively contributing to this initiative include the BBC, Thomson Reuters, the New York Times, the Guardian, the Library of Congress, the Germany National Library, as well as the UK and US governments. This ongoing effort resulted in extending the Web with a data global commons. The published datasets include data about books, movies, music, radio and television programs, reviews, scientific publications, genes, proteins, medicine, and clinical trials, geographic locations, people, companies, statistical and census data, etc.

Regarding the usage of this growing Web of Data for concrete applications, however, there are still open research challenges that need to be addressed, including the seamless integration of Linked Data from multiple sources, dynamic discovery of available data and data sources, provenance and information quality assessment, application development environments, and appropriate end-user interfaces. The PlanetData consortium therefore agreed to dedicate its first PlanetData Program to the topic of "Consuming Linked Data". The Program provides a framework for the inclusion of new partners with the necessary expertise to perform research in this area and to demonstrate the results with concrete applications.

The call therefore solicited proposals for research projects with a focus on demonstration of developed technologies in a concrete application context making use of publically available Linked Data sets. Relevant topics mentioned in the call announcement were:

- web-scale data management,
- searching and querying,
- reasoning,
- Linked Sensor Data,
- quality assessment and data curation,
- analytics and mining,
- front-ends and visualisation,
- business and incentives models for data-driven services and applications.

Submissions were asked to demonstrate the applicability of their research results with an application that consumes data from the open Web, ideally of societal value, including, but not limited to the following domains: public sector information and statistical data, bibliographic and media sector information, life sciences, Earth science and environmental data, geospatial data, as well as transportation and urban management.

2.2   Call dissemination

Information about the call was published on the official PlanetData website [1] in December 2010, including the call announcement with a detailed description of the topic (see Annex A) and an accompanying guide for

applicants (see Annex D). Information about the call was disseminated at the International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC'10) in Shanghai at 7-11 November 2010 and the European Semantic Technology Conference (ESTC) in Vienna at December 1-3, 2010 by informing interested participants via an information booth and printed flyers, and by presenting the first PlanetData program to small and medium enterprises at the co-located event "SMEs accessing funding". The call announcement was also sent to various mailing lists related to the topic, e.g. to the mailing list of the Semantic Web Interest Group at the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), as well as circulated on social networks such as LinkedIn and Facebook by several PlanetData members. Potential proposal evaluators have been informed about the call via individual emails, and partially recruited already at this stage.

In the beginning of January 2011, the call announcement was published in an international selection of high-profile newspapers and magazines, namely, the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) in Germany, Die Presse in Austria, the Heti Világgazdaság in Hungary, and the international ComputerWorld journal based in the USA.

2.3 Call opening phase

On January 1, 2011, the call was opened for submissions via e-mail. A helpdesk was set up to support potential proposers via e-mail and telephone/Skype, providing answers to formal questions as well as to questions regarding content, e.g. about the relevance of proposal drafts to the call. This helpdesk communication channel was extensively used by the potential appliers, and a few dozen enquiries have been processed. On February 16, 2011, at 17:00 Brussels time, the call was closed. At this point of time, 36 valid proposals were submitted. Updated versions of two previously submitted proposals were received after the closing deadline, but only the last versions received before the deadline were considered during the evaluations.

The total EC contribution requested by the 36 proposals combined amounts to 2,798,589 Euro, and the total proposals budget is 3,890,329 Euro. The coordinator proposer organisations are based in 17 different countries, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Countries of proposal coordinator organisations

Country	Number of Proposals
Germany	8
Spain	6
UK	3
Israel	2
Italy	2
Norway	2
Slovenia	2
Switzerland	2
Austria	1
Belarus	1
Finland	1
France	1
Greece	1
Hungary	1
Luxembourg	1
Poland	1
The Netherlands	1

3   Evaluation of submitted proposals

This section presents the onsite evaluation process and the PlanetData Programs Call 1 results.

3.1   Evaluation process

The submitted project proposals were evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)

2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management

3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

Ratings for each of these criteria were given on a scale from 0 (failure to address the criterion) to 5 (criterion successfully addressed in all aspects) points. In sum, a proposal can thus reach a maximum rating of 15 points. Proposals with a rating of at least 10 points were considered eligible for funding.

The evaluations were carried out by a selection of independent international evaluators, coming from both research and industry and agreed with the EC, listed in Table 2. The evaluators were asked to sign a declaration (see Annex B) assuring that they will keep information from the evaluation process confidential and that they don't have a conflict of interest with any of the proposals they evaluate. Each evaluator has received (via email) 8 to 10 proposal submissions right after the Call's closure for the review and production of individual evaluation reports.

Table 2: PlanetData Programs Call 1 evaluators

Evaluator	Affiliation
Dr Ioana Ciuciu	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
Dr Stamatia Dasiopoulou	Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, Greece
MSc Marin Dimitrov	Ontotext, Bulgaria
Dr Juan Miguel Gomez	Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain
MSc Marta Gonzalez Rodriguez	TECNALIA, Spain
DI Werner Haas	JOANNEUM RESEARCH Forschungsgesellschaft mbH, Austria
Dr Monika Kaczmarek	The Poznan University of Economics, Poland
Dr Alina Dia Miron	Recognos, Romania
MSc Heiko Paulheim	SAP Research Darmstadt, Germany
Dr Francois Scharffe	University of Montpellier 2, France
Dr Ilya Zaihrayeu	University of Trento, Italy

Each proposal was reviewed by at least 2, and in most cases, by 3 evaluators. They gave individual reviews of the proposals via an evaluation form (see the end of Annex D). In order to reach consensus on the reviews, evaluation meetings were organised in Innsbruck, Austria, on March 2-4, 2011. The proposal evaluators came together to discuss their individual reviews, produce consensus evaluation summary reports (see Annex C) and to agree on the final proposal ratings. Each out of 36 individual proposal evaluation meetings was moderated by a member of the PlanetData consortium. The duration of the meeting dedicated to each proposal was up to 1.5 hours. The EC project officer of PlanetData has been present onsite for the whole duration of the evaluation meetings as an observer.

3.2   Evaluation results

This subsection summarizes the results of the evaluation. Details of the evaluated proposals and the reviews are not published publicly, as this information is confidential.

In the evaluation process, 17 of the 36 submitted proposals were assigned a rating of at least 10 points according to the evaluation criteria explained above and were therefore considered as candidates eligible for funding.

The proposals were sorted in descending order according to their ranking. The highest ranked proposal received a rating of 13.5 by the evaluators, followed by a proposal with a rating of 12.5. There are several proposals that were assigned equal ratings by the evaluators. In these cases, more detailed considerations of the quality and the relevance of each proposal for the PlanetData network were used to rank the proposals. In particular, there are three proposals that have been assigned a rating of 12 points by the evaluators. In this case, for example, one of these three proposals was ranked highest in the general final assembly of evaluators and PlanetData members, as it adds a highly perspective and relevant expertise to the PlanetData consortium as well as effectively aligned with the technology present in the PlanetData network. The other two proposals were rated equally well by the evaluators, but in direct comparison were ranked lower due to less relevance to the PlanetData's topics, and being too ambitious in one case and a restriction to a too specific application domain, in the other case.

4 Conclusions

This deliverable has reported on the progress of the 1st PlanetData Program. The PlanetData consortium has been running a call for project proposals on the topic of "Consuming Linked Data", open from January 1st to February 16th, 2011, 17:00 CET. 37 proposals have been received and 36 were valid and evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. After the evaluation, 17 proposals were considered eligible for funding. Taking into consideration the budget available for funding sub-projects in the framework of the 1st PlanetData Program, three proposals were selected for funding.

A full report with details of the submitted proposals and the ranking has been submitted to the European Commission and to the evaluators present in the final evaluation meeting. Pending approval by the European Commission and the evaluators, the three institutions who submitted the selected proposals will be invited to join the PlanetData Network of Excellence as new partners and to receive funding in order to carry out the sub-projects they proposed in the course of the 1st PlanetData Program with a running time of up to 12 months, starting earliest in June 2011.

The selected projects and new partners promise to complement the existing PlanetData consortium and activities very well, and vice versa. The projects proposed can benefit from connections to the core partners of the PlanetData network and the projects they are involved in. For the objectives of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, the selected projects can provide significant research contributions and compelling use cases and showcasing applications for the consumption of Linked Data, a key topic in the PlanetData roadmap.

References

[1]   http://www.planet-data.eu/planetdata-programs

Annex A   Announcement of the first competitive call for additional project partners

PLANETDATA PROGRAMS/PD-1-2011
"CONSUMING LINKED DATA"

Project acronym: PlanetData
Project grant agreement number: 257641
Project full name: PlanetData

The project PlanetData, currently active in the Seventh Framework programme of the European Commission for research, technological development and demonstration activities contributing to the creation of the European research area and to innovation (2007-2013), requires the participation of new partners to carry out specific tasks within the project. We have vacancies in our consortium for partners established in an EU Member State or in any FP7 Associated State, eligible for EU FP7 funding, and having comprehensive research and technological expertise in the area of "Consuming Linked Data".

The remainder of this announcement document provides an overview of the tasks and topics solicited through the call. This document is subject to changes. Its final version is expected to be published early January, 2011, while intermediary versions might be made available on the project Web site at http://www.planet-data.eu.

What is PlanetData

The aim of the Network of Excellence PlanetData is to establish an interdisciplinary community of researchers helping organizations to get their data exposed online in a useful form. This will be achieved through an integrated program comprising research, data and technology provisioning, as well as training and dissemination, pushing forward the state-of-the-art in large-scale data management and its application to the creation of useful, open data sets; supporting data owners in mobilizing their data following Linked Data principles; and enabling consumers to leverage such data sources in a variety of scenarios and domains.

The network brings together nine core partners spread over seven European countries, with a renowned profile in the database, data and Web mining, and semantic technologies communities, and an ecosystem of collaborators worldwide. To strengthen the interaction with data owners, technology and application providers, and researchers working on large-scale data management topics, PlanetData has set-up an open partnership scheme. This includes a thematic PlanetData Program, through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. For the present call of the PlanetData Program, PD-1-2011, the area we are focusing on is "Consuming Linked Data", which is introduced in the following.

Consuming Linked Data

The term Linked Data refers to a set of best practices to publish and interlink structured data on the Web. Since the best practices have been proposed in 2006, a grass-roots movement started to publish and to interlink open databases on the Web following **these** practices. Data publishers that are actively contributing to this initiative include the BBC, Thomson Reuters, the New York Times, the Guardian, the Library of Congress, the Germany National Library, as well as the UK and US governments. This ongoing effort resulted in extending the Web with a data global commons. Today, this Web of Linked Data comprises billions of RDF triples and millions of RDF links. The published datasets include data about books, movies, music, radio and television programs, reviews, scientific publications, genes, proteins, medicine, and clinical trials, geographic locations, people, companies, statistical and census data, etc.

However, applications that consume this data are still in their infancy. The reasons for this state of affairs could be tracked back to the lack of methods for seamless integration of Linked Data from multiple sources, dynamic discovery of available data and data sources, provenance and information quality assessment, application development environments, and appropriate end-user interfaces. Addressing these issues requires well-founded research, including the development and investigation of concepts that can be applied in systems which consume Linked Data from the Web. PlanetData aims to provide a framework for collaboration on these open research problems, supported through the thematic calls of the PlanetData Program.

Topics of the competitive call

We solicit proposals for research projects with a focus on demonstration of developed technologies in a concrete application context making use of publically available Linked Data sets. Relevant topics include but are not limited to

- Web-scale data management (indexing, crawling, etc)
- Searching and query processing over multiple linked datasets
- Reasoning on Linked Data from multiple sources
- Dataset dynamics
- Linked Sensor Data
- Data quality assessment
- Data curation
- Analytics and Web of Data mining
- User interface and visualisation research
- Business and incentives models for Linked Data and Linked Data services and applications

Submissions should demonstrate the applicability of their research results with an application that consumes data from the open Web, ideally of societal value, including, but not limited to the following domains

- Public sector information, including statistical data
- Bibliographic and media sector information
- Life sciences
- Earth science and environmental data
- Geospatial data
- Transport and urban management

Evaluation criteria

Submissions will be evaluated according to the following criteria: (i) Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call); (ii) quality and efficiency of the implementation plan; and (iii) potential impact.

Facts and figures

Call open: 01.01.2011
Deadline for submission of proposals: 11.02.2011
Expected duration of participation in project: 4 to 12 months, starting earliest in June, 2011.
Total EC funding: In this call the total funding available for new partners is up to € 250.000.
Proposal format: proposals can include one or more organisations eligible for EU funding, and should have an indicative funding between €15000 and €100000.
Call identifier: PD-1-2011.
Language in which proposal should be submitted: English.
Web address for further information (full call text/proposal guidelines): www.planet-data.eu
Email address for further information: alice.carpentier@sti2.at

Annex B   Confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration

I the undersigned declare that, in participating as an independent expert in the evaluation of proposals received in the competitive call of the ICT project PlanetData.

I undertake to treat as confidential all information contained in the proposals which I am asked to evaluate, both during the evaluation and afterwards.

I will not reveal to any third party the identity or any details of the views of my fellow evaluator(s), neither during the evaluation nor afterwards

I do not, to the best of my knowledge, have any interest in any of the proposals submitted in this call, I have not been involved in their preparation and I do not benefit either directly or indirectly from the eventual selection. Should I discover a conflict of interest during the evaluation, I undertake to declare this and to withdraw from the evaluation.

Name	
Signature	
Date	

Annex C   Evaluation consensus form

Proposal No. :	Acronym :

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) *Note: when a proposal only **partially addresses the topics,** this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion*	**Score:** *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)*
2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management	**Score:** *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)* *For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an above-threshold score for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the proposer(s) has the operational capacity to carry out the work*

3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results	**Score:** *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)*
Remarks	**Overall score:** *(Threshold 10/15)*

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?	**NO** ☐	**YES** ☐

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name		Name	
Signature		Signature	
Date		Date	

Name		Name	
Signature		Signature	
Date		Date	

Annex D   Guide for applicants

Annex D   Guide for applicants

THE SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

**The Seventh Framework Programme focuses on Community
activities in the field of research, technological development
and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2007 to 2013**

GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

participating in a competitive call for additional beneficiaries in
an ICT Integrated Project or Network of excellence

**Additional beneficiaries in the ICT Project
Number 257641 Acronym PlanetData**

01-Jan-2011

CONTENTS

GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS
for the selection of additional beneficiaries in an ICT Integrated Project or Network of excellence

1. Introduction

The participants in the consortium managing an Integrated project or Network of excellence funded by the *Seventh Framework programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities contributing to the creation of the European research area and to innovation (2007-2013)* can, during their initial grant agreement negotiation with the Commission, reserve a portion of the project budget for specific tasks to be carried out by a new beneficiary or beneficiaries which will join the consortium at a later date. These later-joining beneficiaries are selected by means of a competitive call.

This **Guide for applicants** contains the basic information needed to guide you in preparing a proposal to join an existing ICT project which has launched such a competitive call. It gives instructions on how to structure your proposal. It also describes how the proposal should be submitted, and the criteria on which it will be evaluated.

Conditions of participation and funding are those of the Seventh Framework programme, as defined principally in *Regulation (EC) No 1906/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 laying down the rules for the participation of undertakings, research centres and universities in actions under the Seventh Framework Programme and for the dissemination of research results (2007-2013).* This can be found at http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html in the document "EC Rules for participation".

The proposer which is selected to join the consortium will be required to accede to the existing grant agreement; a model example of which can also be found at the above website ("Standard model grant agreement"). It will also be required to sign the existing consortium agreement, an internal project document concerning the relations between the partners.

> **This Guide for applicants does not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Seventh Framework Programme**

1.2 Funding of participation

Participation as a beneficiary in an FP7 project is on a <u>cost-shared</u> basis, the Commission making only a partial contribution to the total cost of the work.

The following may receive EU funding in an FP7 project:
- Any legal entity established in a Member State or an FP7 Associated country[1] (including the European Commission's Joint Research Centre), or created under Community law (e.g. a European Economic Interest Grouping),

---

[1] The FP7 Associated countries are Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey.

- Any international European interest organisation
- Any legal entity established in an FP7 International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC). A complete list of these countries is given in annex 1 of the ICT Workprogramme[2], but in principle it includes the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, as well as those European countries which are not already Member states or Associated countries.

Organisations from certain other countries may also receive a Community financial contribution, as defined in the Rules of Participation in FP7.

Fuller details of the Commission's funding arrangements can be found at http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html in the document "Guide to Financial Issues".

2. How to prepare and submit a proposal

2.1 One stage submission
Proposals for selection as an additional beneficiary in an ICT project are submitted in a single stage, by submitting a complete proposal application which is prepared as described in Annex 1 of this document.

Existing participants in the ICT project may not respond to this call.

2.2 Proposal language
The proposal must be prepared in the working language of the ICT project which you wish to join. This is identified in the Call announcement which the project published. Proposals submitted in any other language will not be evaluated.

2.3 Submission of proposals
Proposals must be submitted electronically in PDF format to the address given in the call announcement.

If you discover an error in your proposal, and provided the call deadline has not passed, you may submit a new version. Only the last version received before the call deadline will be considered in the evaluation.

Proposals must be received by the closing time and date of the call. Late proposals, or proposals submitted to any other address or by any other means than email, will not be evaluated.

Do not wait until the last minute to submit your proposal. Failure of your proposal to arrive in time for any reason, including communications delays, is not acceptable as an extenuating circumstance. The time of receipt of your message as recorded by the email system will be definitive

---

[2] Obtainable at http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/

2.4 Acknowledgement of receipt

You should request a delivery receipt for your email (For example, in Microsoft Outlook select this under View/Options)

As soon as possible after the close of call, an Acknowledgment of receipt will be emailed to you by the ICT project. The sending of an Acknowledgement of receipt does not imply that your proposal has been accepted as eligible for evaluation.

3. Proposal evaluation and selection

The ICT project will evaluate proposals received in the light of the criteria that governed the Commission's original evaluation and selection of their project, using the form shown in Annex 2 of this document and with the assistance of at least two experts who are independent of any member of the consortium and of any proposer. The experts will be individuals from the fields of science, industry and/or with experience in the field of innovation and also with the highest level of knowledge, and who are internationally recognised authorities in the relevant specialist area.

Each independent expert will record his/her individual opinion of each proposal on the attached form. They will then meet or communicate together to prepare a "consensus" form for each proposal. Using the results given on the consensus form, the consortium will normally select the proposal with the highest overall score.

However, the ICT project is not obliged to select the highest scoring proposal where it has objective grounds, for example commercial competition. In this case the choice may pass to the next-ranked proposal.

Also the ICT project may conclude that even the highest scoring proposal is of inadequate quality, in which case it will make no selection. In the event of no selection being made, the project may or may not re-open the call at a later date.

All proposers will receive from the ICT project the report of the consensus view of the experts who examined their proposal. The selected proposer(s) will be invited to accede to the project's grant agreement with the Commission.

4. Support to proposers

4.1 Call Helpdesk

For further information on the call, contact:

Name Alice Carpentier
Email: alice.carpentier@sti2.at
Telephone: +43 512 507 6484

4.2 National Contact Points

The ICT Theme supports a network of National Contact Points (NCPs), which can be helpful to organisations from their country both in general advice and particularly on preparing proposals.

Organisations should contact the NCP of their own country for further information. http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/ncps_en.html .

4.3 The Intellectual Property Rights Helpdesk

The IPR-Helpdesk has as its main objective to assist potential and current beneficiaries taking part in Community funded projects on Intellectual Property Rights issues, and in particular on Community diffusion and protection rules and issues relating to IPR in international projects.
http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org

Annex 1 – Proposal format

Proposals must be submitted:

- **as a single file in PDF format**
- **in the language stated in the call announcement**
- **to the address given in the call announcement (request a delivery receipt)**
- **before the date and time given as the call deadline in the call announcement**
- **with, as the subject line of your message, "Competitive call – 1"**

<u>Front page</u>
Full title of the existing project you wish to join
Acronym of the existing project
Grant agreement number of existing project
Type of instrument (Integrated project/Network of excellence)

Date of preparation of your proposal
Version number *(optional)*

Your organisation name
Your organisation address
Name of the coordinating person
Coordinator telephone number
Coordinator email

Email address to which the Acknowledgement of Receipt should be sent:

(insert)

Proposal abstract
(maximum 2000 character summary of your proposed work)

<u>Contents page</u>
(Show contents list)

Cost and funding breakdown

Please show your figures in euros (not thousands of euros)

	RTD	Demonstration	Other	Management	Total
1. Personnel costs					
2. Other direct costs					
3. Total direct costs (Sum of row 1 and 2)					
4. Indirect costs					
5. Total costs (Sum of row 3 and 4)					
6. Requested EC contribution					

In row 1, insert your personnel costs for the work involved, differentiating between:
RTD activities: activities directly aimed at creating new knowledge, new technology, and products including scientific coordination.
Demonstration activities: activities designed to prove the viability of new technologies that offer a potential economic advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product like prototypes).
Other activities: any specific activities not covered by the above mentioned types of activity such as training, coordination, networking and dissemination (including publications). These activities should be specified later in the proposal.
Management activities include the maintenance of the consortium agreement, if it is obligatory, the overall legal, ethical, financial and administrative management including for each of the participants obtaining the certificates on the financial statements or on the methodology, the implementation of competitive calls by the consortium for the participation of new participants and, any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities

In row 2, insert any other direct costs, for example equipment or travel costs.

In row 3, calculate the sum of your personnel and other direct costs

In row 4, insert your indirect (overhead) costs.
Indirect costs are all those eligible costs which cannot be identified by the participant as being directly attributed to the project but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project
You may use your actual overhead costs if this is possible within your organisation's accounting system. If not, you may use a calculated figure of 20% of the sum in row 3. If you are a non-profit public body, a research organisation, a secondary or higher education establishment or a small or medium enterprise, you may use a calculated figure of 60% of the sum in row 3.

In row 5, calculate the sum of your direct and indirect costs.

In row 6, insert your requested EC contribution
RTD activities: you may request up to 50% of the total cost figure. If you are a non-profit public body, a research organisation, a secondary or higher education establishment or a small or medium enterprise, you may request up to 75% funding.
Demonstration: you may request up to 50% funding
Other, **Management**: you may request up to 100% funding

Note: If you are successful in the evaluation, your final costs and funding estimates agreed with the ICT project will also be subject to legal and financial verification by the Commission services

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

1.1   Concept and objectives
Describe in detail the S&T objectives of your proposed action. Show how they relate to the topic(s) addressed by the competitive call. These objectives should be those achievable within your proposed action, not through subsequent development. They should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form.

1.2   S/T methodology and associated work plan
A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages[3] (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of the implementation of your work, and include management and assessment of progress and results.

Please present your plans as follows:
i)   Describe the overall strategy of the work plan
ii)   Show the timing of the different WPs and their components (Gantt chart or similar).
iii)   Provide a detailed work description broken down into work packages:
   •   Work package list (please use table 1.2a);
   •   Description of each work package (please use table 1.2b)
   •   Deliverables list (please use table 1.2c);
iv)   Provide a graphical presentation of the components showing their interdependencies (Pert diagram or similar)
v)   Describe any significant risks, and associated contingency plans

Note: The number of work packages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work, a small action with very specific goals could consist of one work package only. The planning should be sufficiently detailed to justify the proposed effort and allow progress monitoring by the ICT project coordinator.

---

[3] A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed work with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable or a milestone in the overall action.

Table 1.2a: Template - Work package list

Work package list

Work package No[4]	Work package title	Type of activity[5]	Person-months[6]	Start month[7]	End month
	TOTAL				

---

[4]   Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

[5]   Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:
RTD = Research and technological development; DEM = Demonstration; MGT = Management of the consortium;
OTHER = Other specific activities if applicable in this call, including any activities to prepare for the
dissemination and/or exploitation of project results and coordination activities.

[6]   The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

[7]   Measured in months from your action start date (month 1).

Table 1.2b: Template - Work package description

Work package description

Work package number		Start date or starting event:	
Work package title			
Activity type[8]			

Objectives

Description of work (possibly broken down into tasks)

Deliverables (brief description) and month of delivery

Total effort (person months) -

---

[8] Please indicate <u>one</u> activity per work package:

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

Table 1.2c: Template - Deliverables List

List of Deliverables

Del. no. [9]	Deliverable name	WP no.	Nature[10]	Dissemi-nation level [11]	Delivery date[12] (proj. month)

---

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

[10] Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

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

[11] 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).

[12] Measured in months from your action start date (month 1).

Section 2.   Implementation

2.2   Participant
     Provide a brief description of your organisation, and your previous experience relevant to the
     tasks you will undertake in this action. Provide also a short profile of the main individuals who
     will be undertaking the work.

2.4   Resources to be committed
     Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised, including any resources
     that will complement the EC contribution. Show how the resources will be integrated in a
     coherent way, and show how your overall financial plan for the action is adequate.

     Please identify any major non-personnel direct costs and explain why they are necessary for the
     activity you propose.

Section 3.   Impact

3.1   Expected impact
     Describe how your activity will contribute towards the expected impact of the ICT project.
     Mention the steps that will be needed to bring about these impacts. Mention any assumptions
     and external factors that may determine whether the impacts will be achieved.

3.2   Dissemination and/or exploitation of results, and management of intellectual property
     Describe the measures you propose for the dissemination and/or exploitation of the results of
     your action, first within the ICT project and then show how your contribution will increase the
     impact of the project as a whole.

     If appropriate, describe your plans for the management of knowledge (intellectual property)
     acquired in the course of the action.

Section 4.   Ethical Issues
     Describe any ethical issues that may arise in the action.

Annex 2 – Evaluation form

Individual evaluation/Consensus

Proposal No. :	Acronym :

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) *Note: when a proposal only **partially addresses the topics,** this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion*	**Score:** *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)*
2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management	**Score:** *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)* *For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an above-threshold score for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the proposer(s) has the operational capacity to carry out the work*

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

3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results	Score: *(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)*
Remarks	**Overall score:** *(Threshold 10/15)*

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?	**NO** ☐	**YES** ☐

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

Name	
Signature	
Date	

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