



# Fuel Cells and Hydrogen Joint Undertaking (FCH JU)

## PROPOSALS: from submission to selection

**Mirela ATANASIU**  
FCH JU – Project Manager  
Call coordinator

# CONTENT



**FCH JU RULES for PARTICIPATION**

**PREPARATION, SUBMISSION and EVALUATION of PROPOSALS**

**CLOSING RECOMMENDATIONS**

# **PART I.**

## **FCH JU RULES for PARTICIPATION**

**Definitions**

**Who can participate**

**Funding limits, Eligible costs**

# DEFINITIONS

*according to the model FCH JU Grant Agreement*



- **Public body** means any legal entity established as such by national law, and international organisations
- **Research organisation** means a legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives
- **Industry** – for the purpose of the FCH JU Grant agreement - means a legal entity pursuing an economic activity with a profit objective, or an affiliated entity to such a legal entity
- **Higher and secondary education establishments** - term used by Financial Regulation / Implementing Rules and includes universities, schools for applied sciences and similar
- **SMEs** mean micro, small and medium-sized enterprises within the meaning of Commission Recommendation 2003/361/EC in the version of 6 May 2003<sup>(\*)</sup>

*(\*) enterprises which employ fewer than 250 persons and which have an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 50 million, and/or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 43 million*

# WHO CAN PARTICIPATE in FCH JU ?



- *Participation in projects shall be open to legal entities and international organisations once the minimum conditions have been satisfied*
- *The **minimum conditions** to be fulfilled for Collaborative Projects and Coordinating Actions funded by the FCH JU shall be the following:*
  - a) **At least 3 legal entities must participate**, each of which must be established in a Member State or an Associated Country, and no two of which are established in the same Member State or an Associated Country*
  - b) **All 3 legal entities must be independent of each other** as defined in Article 6 of the Rules for Participation of the Seventh Framework Programme<sup>[1]</sup>*
  - c) **At least 1 legal entity must be a member of the NEW IG or the RG***
- *The **minimum condition** for service and supply contracts, Support Actions, studies and training activities funded by the FCH JU shall be the **participation of one legal entity***

<sup>[1]</sup> 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)

# GENERAL PRINCIPLES

## *Implementation and Grant Agreement*



## Principles of **co-financing** and **no profit**

### Forms of grants (EU Financial contribution):

- *Reimbursement (in whole or in part) of eligible costs is the preferred method*
- *A grant will be awarded by means of a Grant Agreement between the FCH JU and the project participants*
- *The project activities shall be financed through a financial contribution from the FCH JU and through in-kind contributions from the legal entities participating in the activities*
- *The **industry contribution shall at least match the EU contribution**, i.e. the financial (cash) contribution coming from the FCH JU*

# ELIGIBLE COSTS



- actual
- incurred during the duration of project
- in accordance with the usual accounting principles of beneficiary
- recorded in the accounts of beneficiary
- used for the sole purpose of achieving the objectives of the project

**Non-eligible:** identifiable indirect taxes including VAT, duties, interest owed, provisions for future losses or charges, exchange losses, costs declared, incurred or reimbursed in another EU project etc...

# DIRECT/INDIRECT COSTS



## Eligible costs shall be composed of

**Direct costs** = attributable directly to the action

**Indirect costs** = not attributable directly to the action, but which have been incurred in direct relationship with the direct costs

**The reimbursement of participants' costs shall be based on their eligible direct and indirect costs**

# UPPER FUNDING LIMITS



## Reimbursement of direct costs: according to the type of organisation and/or activity

| Type of organisation  | Type of Activity |               |                                 |
|---|------------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
|   | RTD              | Demonstration | Other <sup>[1]</sup>            |
| Industry (other than SME)   | CP: max. 50%     | CP: max. 50%  | CP: max. 100%<br>CSA: max. 100% |
| SME   | CP: max. 75%     | CP: max. 50%  | CP: max. 100%<br>CSA: max. 100% |
| Non-profit public-bodies, universities & higher education establishments, non-profit Research organisations | CP: max. 75%     | CP: max. 50%  | CP: max. 100%<br>CSA: max. 100% |

**Funding schemes:** CP: Collaborative project  
CSA: Coordination and Support Action

<sup>[1]</sup> "Other" activities refer to management activities, training, coordination, networking and dissemination (including publications). Please note that scientific coordination is not considered to be a management activity.

# INDIRECT COSTS



*Principles and flat rates are set out in the Annual Implementation Plan(s)*

*The reimbursement of indirect costs for every beneficiary will be:*

- Either a maximum of 20% of the direct eligible costs,
- Or a flat rate of 20% of the direct eligible costs,  
*excluding its direct eligible costs for subcontracting and the costs of resources made available by third parties which are not used on the premises of the beneficiaries.*

First option is mandatory for industry, except for those whose accounting system does not allow to distinguishing direct from indirect costs. Under this option, beneficiaries shall declare their actual indirect costs under eligible costs.

***CSA funding scheme: reimbursement limit of 7% of direct costs***

# PART II.



## PREPARATION, SUBMISSION and EVALUATION of PROPOSALS

# ROAD MAP



- *Publication of the Call → 18<sup>th</sup> of June 2010 (tbc)*
- *Submission of Proposals → 5<sup>th</sup> of October 2010*
- *Eligibility and Evaluation criteria*
- *Evaluation process → Oct/Nov 2010*
- *Evaluation results → Nov/Dec 2010*
- *Next steps*

# THREE “BIBLES”



**ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2010**

**GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS *(version 2 – May 2009)***

**Electronic Proposal Submission System (EPSS) -  
USERS GUIDE**

# ANNUAL IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2010



**Includes the Call Fiche for the 2010 Call**

**Identifies the topics specific for the Call**

**Specifies Funding Scheme for each Topic**

**Provides Eligibility criteria as well as Evaluation Criteria**

**Indicates detailed evaluation procedure & timetable**

# GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

*version 2 – May 2009*



**Includes description of Funding Schemes**

**States how to submit proposal incl.  
instructions for Parts A & B**

***(template & page limits)***

# ELECTRONIC PROPOSAL SUBMISSION SYSTEM-EPSS



## Electronic submission of proposals in EPSS ⇒ CORDIS

- Fill in Part A proposal details using on-line web form
- Upload PDF of Part B proposal description
- Remember to Save and Submit regularly
- Latest Submission overwrites previous one
- Don't wait until last minute!

# PARTS of PROPOSAL



**PART A: Administrative information about the proposal and the participants (On-line web forms)**

**PART B: Scientific & Technical content of proposal**

Template or list of headings – provided as WORD/RTF file

To be uploaded into the EPSS

In PDF and within size limit of 10Mbytes

To be only submitted electronically by the coordinator using the Commission's EPSS

# BEFORE SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL

## - *Check List*



- Does your planned work address the topic(s) open in the call?
- Is your proposal eligible?
- Is your proposal complete?
- Are you applying for the right funding scheme?
- Does your proposal follow the required structure?
- Do you have the agreement of all the members of the consortium to submit it on their behalf?

# ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA



Minimum conditions that a proposal must fulfil to be retained for evaluation:

- Submission of proposal before the deadline
- Minimum number of eligible, independent participants (incl. membership of IG/RG)
- Completeness of proposal (parts A & B)
- Scope

# EVALUATION



Peer-review carried out by independent experts selected by the FCH JU

Experts selection is based on high level expertise and appropriate competences. Furthermore, academic/industrial balance, as well as geography, gender, « rotation » balances.

Experts sign confidentiality and no-conflict of interest declarations

Following the FCH JU "Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures"

# EVALUATION CRITERIA



## *Criteria adapted to each funding scheme*

- indicated in the Annual Implementation Plan 2010 and in the Guide for applicants

## *Divided into three main criteria:*

### **S&T Quality (including relevance to the topic of the call)**

Concept, objective/state of the art, work-plan/methodology

### **Implementation (operational capacity of participants)**

Individual participants and consortium as a whole (management structure, complementarity/balance of partners)

Allocation of resources (appropriateness, justification of budget, staff)

### **Impact**

Contribution to expected impacts listed in work programme (at European level)

Plans for dissemination/exploitation (appropriateness of measures, including IPR)

# NEXT STEPS

*After evaluation*



Results of evaluation are communicated to the coordinator in the initial information letter which includes the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)

FCH JU informs relevant advisory bodies (States Representative Group, SRG and Scientific Committee, SC)

FCH JU draws up final list of proposals for possible funding (respecting funding availability, including matching principle)

→ Governing Board decision

Opening negotiation letters are sent

# PART III.



## CLOSING RECOMMENDATIONS

# Do's and Don'ts

*(best practise from the previous calls)*



- **What exactly is the novelty of the proposal?**

- Do:** Include a clear State of the Art, SoA (not only EU but international) which illustrates this novelty

- Do:** Provide details of any "preliminary" activities already performed by some members of the consortium to show that they don't start from 'scratch' and that the risk is limited

- **What are you planning to do and how?**

- Do:** Critically review the number of deliverables (too many OR too few are bad indicators)

- Do:** Provide clear milestones which allow to evaluate the progress of the project (including Go/NoGo decision points)

- Do:** Structure the Work Plan in a clear and consistent way showing the relationship among the different Work Packages (WP) and/or tasks

- Do:** Try to have a balanced (sectorial and geographical) and complementary consortium; avoid adding "cosmetic" partners

- Don't:** mix deliverables and milestones

- Don't:** Avoid using sub-contractors and third parties - a strong consortium should be able to perform the major tasks with their own resources

- **How is your budget/resources planned over the activities and duration of the project ?**

**Do:** explain as clear as possible the allocated resources (e.g. man-months) per partner and activities - avoid to over-estimate the effort needed

**Do:** try to declare as accurately as possible the estimated costs, especially for indirect costs (use the correct method of declaration of indirect costs)

**Don't:** include partners with 0 total costs - the requested funds could be zero, but the total should be definitely higher, reflecting their contribution to the project

- **What can be expected as a result of the project?**

**Do:** Describe precisely the main outcome of the project - avoid using too many ambiguous terms (e.g. illustrate, evaluate, assess, recommend, etc)

- **What would be the impact on energy technology?**

**Do:** Describe the potential impact of the "project outcome" not of the "technology" being addressed

**Do:** Provide "quantitative" estimates of critical parameters (e.g. performance, size, weight, cost, etc) which allow to compare the resulting outcome with the SoA

*The proposal should provide clear and short answers to the questions above (which are most of the questions addressed by the criteria/sub-criteria of evaluation)*

# CLOSING RECOMMENDATIONS



Choose your partners carefully to cover the needed expertise

Check your proposal against the check list provided in the Guide for Applicants

Do not wait until the last moment to submit the proposal

Read the reference documents before preparing the proposal

**Reference documents:**

- ***Annual Implementation Plan 2010 (including call fiche)***
- ***Guide for Applicants***
- ***FCH JU Rules for submission, evaluation and award procedures***
- ***FCH JU model Grant Agreement***

**Find a document :**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/fch/index\\_en.cfm?pg=documents](http://ec.europa.eu/research/fch/index_en.cfm?pg=documents)

**Do not hesitate to ask for help or further information at:**

[fch-projects@fch.europa.eu](mailto:fch-projects@fch.europa.eu)

# FCH JU Project Managers



*Transportation & Refuelling Infrastructure*

**Carlos NAVAS**

[Carlos.Navas@fch.europa.eu](mailto:Carlos.Navas@fch.europa.eu) // +32 2 2218137

*Hydrogen Production & Distribution*

**Eveline WEIDNER**

[Eveline.Weidner@fch.europa.eu](mailto:Eveline.Weidner@fch.europa.eu) // +32 2 2218139

*Stationary Power Generation & CHP*

**Mirela ATANASIU**

[Mirela.Atanasiu@fch.europa.eu](mailto:Mirela.Atanasiu@fch.europa.eu) // +32 2 2218140

*Early Markets*

**Enrique GIRON**

[Enrique.Giron@fch.europa.eu](mailto:Enrique.Giron@fch.europa.eu) // +32 2 2218136



*THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!*