

WORK PROGRAMME 2012

CAPACITIES

ANNEXES 1 - 3

***ANNEX 1: LIST OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION PARTNER
COUNTRIES (ICPC)***

ANNEX 2: ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROPOSALS

***ANNEX 3: FORMS OF GRANT AND MAXIMUM REIMBURSEMENT
RATES FOR PROJECTS FUNDED THROUGH THE CAPACITIES WORK
PROGRAMME***

(European Commission C(2011)5023 of 19 July 2011)

Annex 1: List of International

Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC)¹		• Uganda	L	• Lao People's Democratic Rep.	L	• Morocco ^{2,3}	LM
		• Zambia	L	• Malaysia	UM	• Palestinian-administered areas ³	LM
		• Zimbabwe	L	• Maldives	LM	• Syrian Arab Rep. ³	LM
				• Mongolia	L	• Tunisia ^{2,3}	LM
		- <u>CARIBBEAN</u>		• Nepal	L		
		• Barbados	UM	• Oman	UM		
		• Belize	UM	• Pakistan	L	<u>WESTERN BALKAN COUNTRIES (WBC)</u>	
		• Cuba	LM	• Philippines	LM		
		• Dominica	UM	• Sri Lanka	LM	• Kosovo ⁵	LM
		• Dominican Rep.	LM	• Thailand	LM		
		• Grenada	UM	• Vietnam	L		
		• Guyana	LM	• Yemen	L		
		• Haiti	L				
		• Jamaica	LM	<u>EASTERN EUROPE AND CENTRAL ASIA (EECA)</u>			
		• Saint Kitts and Nevis	UM	• Armenia ³	LM		
		• Saint Lucia	UM	• Azerbaijan ³	LM		
		• Saint Vincent and Grenadines	UM	• Belarus ³	LM		
		• Suriname	LM	• Georgia ³	LM		
		• Trinidad and Tobago	UM	• Kazakhstan	LM		
				• Kyrgyz Republic	L		
		- <u>PACIFIC</u>		• Moldova ^{3,4}	LM		
		• Cook Islands	UM	• Russia ^{2,**}	UM		
		• Timor Leste	L	• Tajikistan	L		
		• Fiji	LM	• Turkmenistan	LM		
		• Kiribati	LM	• Ukraine ^{2,3}	LM		
		• Marshall Islands	LM	• Uzbekistan	L		
		• Micronesia, Federal States of					
		• Nauru	UM	<u>LATIN AMERICA</u>			
		• Niue	UM	• Argentina ²	UM		
		• Palau	UM	• Bolivia	LM		
		• Papua New Guinea	L	• Brazil ^{2,**}	LM		
		• Samoa	LM	• Chile ²	UM		
		• Solomon Islands	L	• Colombia	LM		
		• Tonga	LM	• Costa Rica	UM		
		• Tuvalu	LM	• Ecuador	LM		
		• Vanuatu	LM	• El Salvador	LM		
				• Guatemala	LM		
		<u>ASIA</u>		• Honduras	LM		
		• Afghanistan	L	• Mexico ²	UM		
		• Bangladesh	L	• Nicaragua	LM		
		• Bhutan	L	• Panama	UM		
		• Burma/Myanmar	L	• Paraguay	LM		
		• Cambodia	L	• Peru	LM		
		• China ^{12,**}	LM	• Uruguay	UM		
		• Democratic People's Republic of Korea	L	• Venezuela	UM		
		• India ^{2,**}	L				
		• Indonesia	LM	<u>MEDITERRANEAN PARTNER COUNTRIES (MPC)</u>			
		• Iran	LM	• Algeria ³	LM		
		• Iraq	LM	• Egypt ^{2,3}	LM		
				• Jordan ^{2,3}	LM		
				• Lebanon ³	UM		
				• Libya ³	UM		

*In the 'Specific international cooperation actions', Africa can also be considered as a region on its own, while the Caribbean countries can also participate with Latin American and the Pacific countries with Asia.

**For participation in the 'Specific international cooperation actions' each of Brazil, China, India and Russia may be considered individually as a region on its own. Thus, the required two or more partners can be located in these countries. However, in this case, at least two different partners from different provinces, oblasts, republics or states within Brazil, China, India or Russia are necessary.

In accordance with Article 2(12) of the Rules for Participation in FP7, 'International Cooperation Partner Country' (ICPC) means a third country which the Commission classifies as a low-income (L), lower-middle-income (LM) or upper-middle-income (UM) country. Countries associated to the Seventh EU Framework Programme do not qualify as ICP Countries and therefore do not appear in this list.

¹ Legal entities established in the high-income territories Hong Kong, Macao and Taiwan, are not eligible under the ICPC provisions.

¹ Legal entities established in countries in which the European Union under Articles 75 and 215 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union has issued actions to interrupt or to reduce, in part or completely, economic relations, may only participate and receive a financial contribution if it complies with these actions.

² Signed an agreement with the EU covering Science & Technology.

³ These countries are also part of the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP).

⁴ Until the country becomes Associated to FP7
⁵ As defined by UNSC resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999.

Annex 2: Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria for Proposals

Eligibility criteria

A proposal will only be considered eligible if it meets all of the following conditions:

- It is received by the Commission before the deadline given in the call text.
- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call text.
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)
- The content of the proposal relates to the topic(s) and funding scheme(s), including any special conditions, set out in those parts of the relevant work programme

Other eligibility criteria may be given in the call text.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria against which proposals will be judged are set out in article 15 of the Rules for Participation. For the 'Capacities' specific programme these are:

- scientific and/or technological excellence;
- relevance to the objectives of these specific programmes²;
- the potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results;
- the quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.

Within this framework, the work programmes will specify the evaluation and selection criteria and may add additional requirements, weightings and thresholds, or set out further details on the application of the criteria.

² **Relevance** will be considered in relation to the topic(s) of the work programme open in a given call, and to the objectives of a call. In the scheme set out on the following page, these aspects will be integrated in the application of the criterion "S/T excellence", and the first sub-criterion under "Impact" respectively. When a proposal is **partially relevant** because it only marginally addresses the topic(s) of a call, or because only part of the proposal addresses the topic(s), this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected on eligibility grounds.

The purpose of this annex is to set out such specifications. Unless otherwise indicated in the relevant parts of this work programme, the criteria, weightings and thresholds given here will apply to all calls for proposals.

Proposals will be evaluated in line with the Commission 'Rules on Submission of Proposals and the Related Evaluation, Selection and Award Procedures'.

A proposal which contravenes fundamental ethical principles, fails to comply with the relevant security procedures, or which does not fulfil any other of the conditions set out in the specific programme, the work programme or in the call for proposals shall not be selected. Such a proposal may be excluded from the evaluation, selection and award procedures at any time. Details of the procedure to be followed are given in the Commission rules mentioned above.

The arrangements for a particular call will be set out in the relevant Guide for Applicants.

		1. Scientific and/or technological excellence <i>(relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</i>	2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management (selection)	3. The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results (award)
All funding schemes		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under relevant topic/activity</i>
Collaborative projects		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Progress beyond the state-of-the-art</i> • Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property.
Networks of Excellence		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Contribution to long-term integration of high quality S/T research</i> • Quality and effectiveness of the joint programme of activities and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including ability to tackle fragmentation of the research field, and commitment towards a deep and durable integration) • Adequacy of resources for successfully carrying out the joint programme of activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and disseminating knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large.
Co-ordination & Support Actions	CA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to the co-ordination of high quality research • Quality and effectiveness of the co-ordination mechanisms, and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) [for SA: only if relevant] • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and dissemination knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders, and the public at large.
	SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and effectiveness of the support action mechanisms, and associated work plan 		
Research for the benefit of specific groups		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovative character in relation to the state-of-the art • Contribution to advancement of knowledge / technological progress • Quality and effectiveness of S/T methodology and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance) • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

Notes:

1. Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the three criteria, and not for the sub-criteria. Each criterion will be scored out of 5. No weightings will apply. The threshold for individual criteria will be 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, will be 10.
2. The second column corresponds to the **selection criteria** in the meaning of the financial regulation³ (article 115) and its implementing rules⁴ (article 176). They also will be the basis for assessing the 'operational capacity' of participants. The other two criteria correspond to the **award criteria**.
3. For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the sub-criteria in italics apply.

Priority order for proposals with the same score

As part of the evaluation by independent experts, a panel review will recommend one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above. A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget shown in the call fiche.

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. Whether or not such a prioritisation is carried out will depend on the available budget or other conditions set out in the call fiche. The following approach will be applied successively for every group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

- (i) Proposals that address topics not otherwise covered by more highly-rated proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.
- (ii) These proposals will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion *scientific and/or technological excellence*. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion *impact*. If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on other appropriate characteristics, to be decided by the panel, related to the contribution of the proposal to the European Research Area and/or general objectives mentioned in the work programme (e.g. presence of SMEs, international co-operation, public engagement).
- (iii) The method described in (ii) will then be applied to the remaining *ex aequos* in the group.

NOTE: the call fiche may indicate provisions that supplement or override the above.

³ OJ L248 16.9.2002, p1.

⁴ OJ L357 31.12.2002, p1

Annex 3: Forms of Grant and Maximum Reimbursement Rates for Projects Funded Through the Capacities Work Programme

Forms of Grant

The FP7 'Rules for Participation' propose three potential forms of grant for the European Union financial contribution: reimbursement of eligible costs, flat rate financing including scale of unit costs, and lump sum financing. In this work programme, for all funding schemes, the reimbursement of eligible costs (including the different options for flat rates on indirect costs as established in Article 32 of the Rules for Participation) will be the only form of grant used.

Three exceptions to this will apply. Pursuant to Article 30 of the Rules for Participation and Commission Decision C(2007)2287 of 4 June 2007, participants from International Cooperation Partner Countries (see Annex 1) may choose to opt for lump sum financing.

In accordance with Article 2 of the Commission Decision of 23 March 2009 under reference C (2009) 1942, the present work programme provides for the possibility to use flat rates to cover subsistence costs incurred by beneficiaries during travel carried out within grants for indirect actions. The applicable flat rates are available at the following website: http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html under 'Guidance documents/Flat rates for daily allowances'. Please note this option is only available when stated explicitly in the call fiche.

In addition, Part 5 of this work programme 'Science in Society' provides for lump sum reimbursement for travel and subsistence costs, up to a maximum of EUR 25 000 per beneficiary. This option is not available for participants wishing to cover cost categories other than travel and subsistence and for those participants requesting a total EU contribution of more than EUR 25 000. Further information on this is given in Part 5.

Maximum Reimbursement Rates

The upper limits foreseen in the Rules for Participation (Article 33) for the Community financial contribution are summarised in the following table.

	Non-profit public bodies, secondary and higher education establishments, research organisations and SMEs	All other organisations
Research and technological development activities	75%	50% ⁵
Demonstration activities	50%	50%
Coordination and support actions	100%	100%
Management, audit certificates and other activities ⁶	100%	100%

⁵ For security related research and technological development activities, (Chapter 10 of this work programme) the Community financial contribution may reach a maximum of 75% in the case of the development of capabilities in domains with very limited market size and a risk of 'market failure' and for accelerated equipment development in response to new threats. Further information is given in Chapter 10.

⁶ Including, inter alia training in actions that do not fall under the funding schemes for training and career development of researchers, coordination, networking and dissemination (as set out in Article 33(4) of the Rules for Participation).

