

**Actions arising from the meeting of the Task Force on
instruments
14 June 2002**

Chair: P. Kind (RTD-B)

Present: J. Fuchs (FISH), X. Goenaga (RTD-E3), L. Karapiperis (RTD-B2), J.D. Malo (RTD-A3), M. Moller (INFSO), N. Pantalos (ENTR), C. Profilis (RTD-B2), C. Renier (RTD-B2), M. Richards (RTD-G4), E. Rille (RTD-L4), K. Rouhana (INFSO), I. Sabater (TREN), N. Sabatier (RTD-A3), R.J Smits (RTD-A3), R. Zimmermann (INFSO)

Weekly events

Rules for Participation:

- the informal Trialogue held on 10 June was successful. Ms Quisthoudt Rowohl presented the result to ITRE, which gave its approval in principle, the formal vote being foreseen next week and the vote in plenary being foreseen for early July.
- COREPER will discuss the result of the ITRE vote on 19 June, send the dossier to the Research Group, which will examine it on 21 June, and finally approve the text on 24 June.

Financial regime for the “grant to the budget

The TF discussed a series of basic principles for the financial regime of instruments implemented through a grant to the budget.

The following basic principles were agreed specifically for the IPs:

- That there should be 2 cost models – one full-cost model, incorporating the option of a flat-rate component for certain of its costs, and one additional-cost model incorporating a mandatory flat-rate component. The question of precisely which costs are to be covered by the flat-rate components needs careful work and needs to be completed before any estimate of the flat-rates themselves can be made.
- That one contractor may choose only one of these cost models (or sub-model in the case of full-cost) for all his relevant participations in FP6. The constraints as to which contractors may choose the AC model needs to be spelled out.
- That the following rates of Community support would apply to all full-cost participants:
 - 50% for RTD activities;
 - 50% for innovation-related activities, even if these arise from demonstration activities;
 - 35% for demonstration activities;
 - 100% for consortium management activities (needing a very careful definition).

- 100% for training activities (also needing a careful definition to exclude the personnel costs of those being trained, which may however be charged at 35/50% if they are contributing to the project).
- For an IP, the ceiling for management costs at 100% should be 7%.
- That additional cost participant would be supported at 100% of additional costs for all activities in the project. There is a question mark however over the treatment of management costs when the management activity involves persons who would not normally be chargeable under an AC contract.
 - That the question of limitations on subcontracts needs further discussion (for technical services only? autonomy within financial limits? autonomy within geographic limits?). The possibility to subcontract consortium management at 100% also requires further discussion.
 - That the contract will contain the following financial information only:
 - a binding financial ceiling for the Community contribution;
 - a non-binding budget for the current period of the detailed implementation plan
 - That annually the consortium would provide:
 - a summary cost statement by each participant showing the total eligible costs claimed broken down only by the four groups of activity (i.e. RTD and innovation-related activities, demonstration activities, consortium management activities, and training activities);
 - an audit certificate per participant, certifying the overall total of the eligible costs incurred;
 - a management-level justification of costs per participant (linking costs to resources used);
 - a summary cost sheet prepared by the co-ordinator bringing together all the costs claimed.
 - That instructions need to be given to auditors on confidence levels and materiality.

On this basis, **JDM** and **NRS** will propose a coherent text for inclusion in the IP model contract. It will be circulated by Wednesday 19 June, so that the TF may discuss it at its next meeting on 21 June.

SMEs in Integrated projects and networks of excellence

XG presented to the TF a document (already circulated) regarding possible measures aimed at stimulating the participation of SMEs in the new instruments. The concept of topping-up ongoing IPs and NoEs with SME participants was fully endorsed.

XG was asked to revise the document, in particular to examine the possibility of introducing an evaluation criterion related to SMEs' that

would send a signal to the research community that the participation of SMEs is beneficial, to provide a more reasoned justification for supporting the costs of loan guarantee premiums, and to examine ways of stimulating SME-led proposals using the new specific support action scheme.

Next meetings

Friday 21 June (9.00, SDME 7E)

- **cost models** for the instruments implemented with a grant to the budget (on basis of **JDM-NRS** document to be circulated by 19 June).
- **audit certificates.**
- **STREPs** (on basis of working document already circulated)

Friday 28 June (9.00, SDME 1F)

- **financial regime for NoE**
- **evaluation criteria**, particularly for NoEs and STREPs;
- **two-stage submission** (on the basis of a document from the evaluation group (**LvdB**)).
- **content of proposals** (on basis of first draft of the infopack from the infopack group (+ **Juergen Rosenbaum**)).
- results and implications of the EoI exercise(+ **David Miles**).
- procedures (+ **Robert Krengel**).

Friday 5 July (9.00, SDME 2F)

- Final discussion of the updated IP/NoE/STRP working documents with a view to publication on the web by 8 July.
- First discussion of working documents for co-ordination actions and specific support actions (on basis of drafts by **MM**).
- Discussion of the role of the project officer, particularly in negotiation and contract follow-up.

CR 14/06/02 18:55:08