

**Actions arising from the meeting of the FP6 Task Force on
Instruments
4 October 2002**

Chair: P. Kind (RTD-B)

Present: A. Arabatzis (RTD-A2), G. Hatler (TREN), J.D Malo (RTD-A3), L. Karapiperis (RTD-B2), M.Moller (INFSO), N. Pantalos (ENTR), C. Profilis (RTD-B2), C.Renier (RTD-B2), M. Richards (RTD-G 05), E.Rille (RTD-L4), N. Sabatier (RTD-A3), R.J.Smits (RTD-B2), G. Valgarcel (RTD-B 3), R.Zimmermann (INFSO).

Cost models

- Meeting with DG BUDG: according to DG BUDG, in future, certain public bodies will be obliged to use the "AC model". **JDM** and **NRS** to prepare a document on the issue, to be circulated as well as the "lettre de secteur " from the Court of Auditors on this matter.
- Rate of the overheads for CA and SSA under the AC model: after discussion, the group agrees on the following: application of the 7 % rate (as in the financial regulation) for all coordination actions and specific support actions which result from a call for proposals, except for research infrastructures. For the latter, as well as for CA and SSA not resulting from a call for proposals, examination case by case for possible derogation to the 7 % rule and application of a 20 % rate.

Impact of the FCF model on SMEs

The issue will be submitted to the Steering Group.

Networks of excellence

- Conversion of the headcount of researchers into an average annual grant: the chairman proposes that the figures used in the working document are to be applied in all thematic priorities, except where there are objective reasons to deviate. It was agreed that possible variations should not exceed a +/-25 % margin.
- Doctoral students (wording to be used rather than "pre-doctoral scholars): after discussion, the group agrees to the following:
 - The "doctoral students" to be taken into consideration for the calculation of the supplementary bonus are those enrolled on a recognised course run by one of the participants;
 - They will be engaged in the research activities in the frame of the network;
 - The supplementary bonus for doctoral students will be 4.000 euro/year and won't in any case exceed 10 % of the total amount granted to the network on basis of the headcount of researchers. **CR** to circulate a new text.

- Penalty system: the group agreed that different cases have to be distinguished, among which:
 - Underspending in good faith and delivering the objectives: a formula must be elaborated in order to avoid penalty but at the same time ensuring that less than 100 % of the costs are paid.
 - Non performance: there should be a penalty covering the payments which are not settled: the participants would have to pay back at least a full year advance; in case of use of the “yellow flag” when the objectives are not reached at the end of the following year, the advance related to the previous year would be recovered.
- Withdrawal of a participant, generating the premature termination of the contract and the non delivering of the deliverables: **JDM** and **NRS** to elaborate a document.
- Management costs: the group discussed whether the establishment of a ceiling for the management costs would be relevant or not in the frame of NoE; **JDM** and **NRS** to provide a document on such issue.

Other instruments

Integrated projects:

- Subcontracting: after discussion, the group agreed that the participants must keep the possibility of subcontracting the tasks that require some competence/expertise that are not present within the consortium; nevertheless, the “core management” tasks should not be subcontracted. **MR** to provide a document on the issue, also at the light of the progresses of the contract working group.

Coordination actions, specific support actions

- Management costs: certain costs (audit certificates, insurance) are to be charged as management costs and will be covered up to 100 %; when these costs do not reach the ceiling foreseen in the contract for the management costs to be covered at 100 %, other costs linked to the consortium management may be charged inside that ceiling.
- Cost models: the cost models used will be the same as those used in the other instruments benefiting from a grant to the budget, except that the rte of the overheads will be limited to 7 %.
- Financing of the specific support actions: the group agreed that two options will be included in the contract:
 - Financing inferior to 100 %, the costs of the participants having to be higher than the grant to the budget;

- Financing up to 100 % of a specific component of an action.

STREPs

- Management costs: same position as in the coordination actions; ceiling for the management costs to be covered up to 100 % fixed at 7% of the Community financial contribution.

Settlement of payments

- In NoE and IP, the settlement of the payment is annual, since the participants have to provide annually an audit certificate.
- In STREPs, coordination actions and specific support actions: there can be a settlement each time there is an audit certificate.

**This was the last meeting of the Task Force on Instruments.
The documents referred to above will be circulated or by the
authors directly to the whole list, or via CR as in the past.**

**Updated versions of the working documents regarding the
instruments will be set on the web.**

**A warm thank to all the participants who courageously attended
the weekly meetings where all sorts of difficult technical
problems have been discussed and which contributed to a better
definition of the new instruments thanks to everybody's efforts
and open mind.**