



THE SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Sixth Framework Programme covers Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2002 to 2006



Specific Programme “Integrating and strengthening the foundations of the European Research Area”

SUPPORT FOR THE COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES

*Support for the coordination of national, regional and European activities in the field of research and innovation
(Including **ERA-NET**)*

2004-2005 Work Programme

Commission Decision C(2005)27, 14 January 2005

<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/coordination.htm>

Update of 14 January 2005

Table of Contents

I.	GENERAL INTRODUCTION	3
II.	STRENGTHENING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA	12
	<i>Workprogramme: 11. Support for the co-ordination of national, regional and European activities in the field of research and innovation (including ERA-NET)</i>	
III.	GENERAL ANNEXES	31
	A. Overview of Calls for Proposals	32
	B. Common evaluation criteria for evaluating proposals	34
	C. List of groups of target countries for specific measures in support of International Co-operation	51

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. General

Following the adoption of the specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration: "Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area"¹ and the rules of participation and dissemination² under the EC Treaty, the Commission adopted and updated as appropriate, with the assistance of the programme committee, this work programme which sets out in greater detail the objectives and technological priorities and the timetable for implementation of the specific programme.

As regards the **Priority Thematic Areas of Research**, integrated projects and networks of excellence are recognised as being an overall priority means to attain the objectives of critical mass, integration of the research capacities, management simplification and European added value.

These instruments are being used in each theme and, where deemed appropriate, as a priority means, while maintaining the use of specific targeted projects and co-ordination actions.

In terms of participation of the Community in programmes undertaken by several Member States (Article 169 of the Treaty), this is only foreseen, at this stage, in the priority thematic area of research addressing 'Life sciences, genomics and biotechnology for health'.

More information on the provisions for implementing the new instruments (integrated projects and networks of excellence) is available on Cordis (<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/instruments.htm>).

REGARDING RESEARCH ACTIVITIES IN AREAS INVOLVING **SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES COVERING A WIDER FIELD OF RESEARCH**, THESE ARE BEING IMPLEMENTED, AT THIS STAGE, USING SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECTS, CO-ORDINATION ACTIONS, AND SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM SIZED ENTERPRISES (SMEs).

CONCERNING **STRENGTHENING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA**, THE IMPLEMENTATION IS MOSTLY DONE THROUGH SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECTS, SPECIFIC SUPPORT ACTIONS, AND CO-ORDINATION ACTIONS.

Specific support actions, including calls for tender, and co-ordination actions may be applied throughout the programme.

In updating this work programme, the Commission has relied on advice mainly from advisory groups. More information on the list of members of the advisory groups is available on Cordis. These groups of independent high-level experts have been set up to advise on the implementation of Community research policy. The experts are renowned for their knowledge, skills and top-level experience in the field or regarding the issues to be dealt with by the groups.

¹ OJ L 294, 29.10.2002, p. 1.

² OJ L 355, 30.12.2002, p. 23.

2. Scope of Work Programme

The scope of this work programme corresponds to that defined in the specific programme. The calls for proposals planned within this work programme are those foreseen to close in 2004 and 2005 along with, in many cases, an indication of those calls intended to close in 2006. Annex A gives an overview of these calls.

3. Cross Cutting Issues

There are several issues that are important to all parts of the work programme. These are addressed here and, as appropriate, elaborated in the various parts. Please note that the work related to statistics in this work programme will be implemented in close co-operation with EUROSTAT, in particular the parts relating to the priority thematic areas "Information society technologies" and "Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society", as well as the part addressing policy-oriented research under the heading "Specific activities covering a wider field of research".

- a) This work programme places special emphasis on the needs of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). In particular, at least 15% of the funding allocated to the Priority Thematic Areas of Research is foreseen for SMEs. In order to reach this objective, special actions are foreseen such as SME specific calls for proposals in the context of the new instruments, reinforcement of National Contact Points, and specific training and take-up measures. In addition, the involvement of SMEs is taken into account in the evaluation criteria particularly for the new instruments. Also the fact that enterprise groupings which represent large communities of SMEs may play an active role in the new instruments will contribute to reaching the above-mentioned objective.
- b) Proposers based in Associated States may take part in this programme on the same footing and with the same rights and obligations as those based in Member States. In addition, this work programme underlines the importance of involving associated candidate countries in the Community's research policy and in the European Research Area. Further specific support actions will also be implemented to stimulate, encourage and facilitate the participation of organisations from the remaining candidate countries in the activities of the priority thematic areas. Annex D provides details of these specific measures (in particular that relate to the reinforcement of the Associated Candidate Countries research capacities).
- c) International co-operation represents an important dimension of the Sixth Framework Programme. As a contribution to a European Research Area open to the world, it will be implemented in the Sixth Framework Programme through three major routes:
 - The opening of "Focusing and Integrating Community Research" to third country organisations with substantial funding,
 - Specific measures in support of international co-operation, and
 - International activities under the heading of Human Resources in the specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration "structuring the European Research Area".

The first two, as part of the specific programme “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area”, are covered by the present work programme. They also correspond to the second activity referred to in Article 164 of the Treaty, which covers co-operation with third countries and international organisations.

- *Opening of “Focusing and Integrating Community Research” to third country organisations*

Funding is available for the participation of researchers, teams and institutions from third countries in projects within the seven Priority Thematic Areas of Research, as well as under “Specific activities covering a wider field of research”. Under this heading, the activities in question have the following overall objectives:

- To help European researchers, businesses and research organisations in the European Union and in the countries associated with the Framework programme to have access to knowledge and expertise existing elsewhere in the world, and
- To help ensure Europe’s strong and coherent participation in the research initiatives conducted at international level in order to push back the boundaries of knowledge or help to resolve the major global issues.

Any particular issue concerning the international dimension of the seven Priority Thematic Areas of Research and of the Specific activities concerning a wider field of research is set out in the relevant chapter of this work programme. Annex E on the other hand provides details on the specific measures that are envisaged for the promotion of co-operation with targeted third countries.

Participants from all third countries³ and from international organisations may take part in all activities under this heading in addition to the minimum number of participants required.

Participants from developing countries, Mediterranean partner countries, Western Balkan countries, as well as Russia and the new independent states (see the list of countries in Annex C) can be funded in all activities under this heading⁴. Other third country participants can also be funded in those areas where the relevant part of this work programme makes reference to this possibility or if it is essential for carrying out the research activity.

- *Specific measures in support of international co-operation*

315 million Euro will fund “Specific measures in support of international co-operation”. In support of the external relations, including the development policy, of the Community, these measures target the following groups of third countries: Developing countries, Mediterranean partner countries, Western Balkan countries, and Russia and the new independent states. The activities and calls for proposals under this heading, which are complementary to the opening of the Priority Thematic Areas of Research,

³ Please check on Cordis for further details, including regularly updated information.

⁴ 285 million euro has in fact been allocated for participation from the targeted third countries (see Annex C) within the Priority Thematic Areas of Research and specific activities covering a wider field of research.

are presented in Chapter 10 of this work programme. Requirements for consortium composition are set out in this part.

- *Participation and funding for third country entities under the heading “Strengthening the European Research Area”*

International co-operation with third country partners and international organisations will be actively fostered on all topics which will benefit from such co-operation. Furthermore, third country entities and international organisations can benefit from Community financial contribution. To this end, topics for international co-operation will be specified, where appropriate, in calls. This applies particularly to those third countries with which co-operation agreements have been concluded. As mentioned above, Annex E provides details on the specific measures that are envisaged for the promotion of co-operation with targeted third countries.

- d) Research activities carried out under this work programme must respect fundamental ethical principles and the requirements as stipulated in the decision on the specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration: "Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area". More information on the review procedure is foreseen in the “Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Project Selection Procedures” (<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/eval-guidelines>). Annex B to this work programme also details the issues to be covered in any ethical review.
- e) As much as possible and in association with the specific programme for research, technological development and demonstration "Structuring the European Research Area", the mobility of researchers will be promoted, particularly with a view to the successful creation of the European Research Area.
- f) This work programme attempts, where possible, to reinforce and increase the place and role of women in science and research both from the perspective of equal opportunities and gender relevance of the topics covered.
- g) A particular effort will be carried out to take into consideration the ethical, social, legal, regulatory and wider cultural aspects of the research including socio-economic research, and innovation, resulting from the possible deployment, use and effects of the newly developed technologies or processes and scenarios covered by each of the thematic priorities. This effort will be complemented by socio-economic research carried out within the priority addressing ‘Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society’.
- h) In the context of the regular report to be submitted to the European Parliament and the Council, the Commission will continue to report in detail on progress in implementing the specific programme, and, in particular, progress towards achieving its objectives and meeting its priorities.
- i) The promotion of innovation is a cross-cutting issue, relevant to the whole European Community RTD Framework Programme. This issue aims to meet

the Treaty objective of strengthening the scientific and technological bases of Community industry *and encouraging it to become more competitive at international level*⁵.

In this context, an important goal is to promote exploitation of the results of those projects which include R&D components⁶. To this end, consortia should pay sufficient attention to the management of knowledge and pursuit of innovation in their projects. These issues should be well integrated in the proposals through the work content and consortium composition, and will be taken into account during their evaluation⁷. Projects should involve, where appropriate, end-users and other stakeholders to ensure relevance of the research and effective take-up of results.

In particular, the participants should include in their projects “innovation-related activities” that may be supported by EC funding. Examples of such activities include the protection and management of knowledge and intellectual property, the analysis of socio-economic factors affecting the exploitation of the project's results, feasibility studies for the creation of spin-offs, and other activities to promote knowledge transfer between public research and industry.

During a project, the participants will be requested to report periodically on these issues, in particular by developing and updating throughout the project a *plan for using and disseminating the knowledge*. This plan should describe the innovation-related activities already implemented and those being planned, as well as their actual or expected impact.

Besides these central project-level activities, specific mechanisms will ensure that there is exchange of information and experience between the activities of the different work programmes as regards their innovation dimension, and that the innovation-related achievements be properly analysed, monitored, and evaluated⁸.

4. Submitting a Proposal

Proposals should be submitted under the terms of a call for proposals⁹. In order to submit a proposal, a proposer should consult the following:

- This work programme,
- The relevant call for proposals as it is published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*, and
- The relevant Guide for Proposers.

⁵ EC Treaty, Art. 163.1

⁶ As confirmed in the Council decision of 30.9.2002 relating to the specific RTD programme for “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area” (Annex, section 1.1 – OJ L 294/7)

⁷ As stated in Art. 10.1.e of the rules of participation (OJ L 355/28)

⁸ cf. OJ L 294/50, section 2.f of the Annex

⁹ Proposals for specific support actions, which do not fall within the scope of a call for proposals, may be submitted to the Commission only when it is provided for in this work programme.

These and a number of other useful texts, including the rules for participation and details on the contracts, are available on Cordis (as referred to above).

5. Cross Cutting Proposals

Proposals are invited to be submitted on the basis of calls for proposals, which are, in the case of the Priority Thematic Areas of Research organised thematically. Proposals that address more than one thematic area will be accommodated by the Commission, provided the proposal addresses areas covered by this work programme.

The specific programme is focused on a number of thematic priorities. They encompass a wide range of disciplines and proposals that cut across the boundaries of themes are to be expected. The criterion of relevance to the objectives of the specific programme is a *sine qua non* for the further consideration of such proposals. Furthermore, proposals will not be accepted if they do not fall within the scope of the work programme.

Cross-cutting proposals may be categorised as follows:

- **Proposals with a clear “centre of gravity”.** Given the nature of research carried out today, a large proportion of proposals contain some degree of multi-disciplinarity. These are handled by normal submission and evaluation procedures. For proposals which contain a significant technological or thematic element from a different part of the programme, the procedure involves the proposal being treated by the thematic area represented by the greatest proportion of the proposal (ie, its “centre of gravity”). For proposals where the centre of gravity is not immediately obvious, the Commission will examine the proposal content and decide in which thematic area the proposal is best handled. If a proposal is transferred to a thematic area other than the one to which it was submitted, it will be handled in the framework of the new thematic area. However, if the new centre of gravity does not have an open call at the time of transfer, the proposal will be held over, with the agreement of the proposers, until a suitable call is open, but only if such a call is explicitly foreseen by the work programme. If successful, the proposal will be handled and funded by the thematic centre of gravity.
- **Joint calls for proposals.** In certain fields, it is clear that proposals will always contain a high proportion of interest for different thematic areas. In this instance, the Commission uses calls for proposals issued jointly by two or more programme/thematic areas, with a pooling of budget. This procedure only occurs for well-defined areas where the cross cutting nature of the proposals to be received can be clearly identified in advance.
- **Proposals with horizontal interest.** These relate to proposals which are of general interest to all parts of the specific programme but of no specific interest to an individual part. If such proposals are truly innovative and ground breaking, there is the possibility of referring them to the work programme part that addresses “anticipating scientific and technological needs”, once this part is open for the receipt of such proposals. Proposals with a horizontal interest which do not meet this criterion may, if applicable, be handled like proposals with a centre of gravity (see first bullet point).

6. Evaluation Criteria and Related Issues

The “Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Project Selection Procedures” describes the basic procedures to be followed by all programmes under the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Community.

The set of criteria applicable to this work programme is given in Annex B. Any complementary criteria are clearly stated in the relevant part of this work programme. Evaluation thresholds for each set of criteria are given in Annex B and apply unless otherwise clearly stated. In addition, Annex B outlines how the following will be addressed: gender issues, ethical and/or safety aspects, and the education dimension.

All proposals before they are selected for funding and which deal with ethical issues and any proposal for which ethical concerns have been identified during the scientific evaluation may be reviewed by a separate ethical review panel. The “Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Project Selection Procedures” gives more details on the evaluation procedure as a whole as well as details of the ethical review procedure.

Furthermore, the work programmes, and consequently their calls for proposals, may specify and restrict the participation of legal entities in an indirect action according to their activity and type, according to the instrument deployed and to take into account specific objectives of the Framework Programme.

Calls for proposals may involve a two-stage evaluation procedure. When such a procedure is employed, this is stated clearly in the call for proposals. More information on this process is given in the “Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Project Selection Procedures”.

Finally, when evaluating proposals received in response to a call, the Commission may opt to send the proposals to external experts or make proposals available by electronic means, so that the experts can carry out their examination at their home or place of work.

7. Specific Support Actions

Support activities are more limited in scope than the accompanying measures of the previous Framework Programmes. These projects aim to **contribute actively** to the implementation of activities of the work programme, the analysis and dissemination of results or the preparation of future activities, with a view to enabling the Community to achieve or define its RTD strategic objectives. Therefore, a significant emphasis has been placed on Support Actions:

- to promote and facilitate the dissemination, transfer, exploitation, assessment and/or broad take-up of past and present programme results (over and above the standard diffusion and exploitation activities of individual projects);
- to contribute to strategic objectives, notably regarding the European research area (e.g. pilot initiatives on benchmarking, mapping, networking, etc.);
- to prepare future community RTD activities, (e.g. via prospective studies, exploratory measures. pilot actions etc.);

as opposed to awareness and information exchange activities, e.g. annual Workshops and Conferences, that would take place anyway without Commission support. The latter activities will not be welcome if they do not **serve** the programme's strategic objectives, (in the sense of the European Research Area, improved co-ordination, public awareness, preparation of future Community initiatives, etc.).

A limited number of specific support actions may be funded, where such a request does not fall within the scope of a call for proposals, when they have particular characteristics and value to the objectives and the scientific and technological content of the specific programme. Such requests for grants must be for actions of European significance and could, for example, provide support for major policy-related workshops in the context of activities of the rotating Presidency of the Union. They should be submitted at least five months in advance of the event for which support is requested. The evaluation criteria will be those applicable to specific support actions as laid down in this work programme.

II. STRENGTHENING THE FOUNDATIONS OF THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH AREA

*Workprogramme: 11. Support for the co-ordination
of national, regional and European activities in the
field of research and innovation (including ERA-
NET)*

**Strengthening the foundations of the
European Research Area**

***11. Support for the coordination of
national, regional and European activities
in the field of research and innovation
(including ERA-NET)***

2004-2005 Work Programme

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11.1	INTRODUCTION.....	15
11.2	OBJECTIVES, STRUCTURE, AND OVERALL APPROACH	15
11.2.1	Coordination of national or regional activities	15
11.2.2	Coordination of European level-activities	16
11.3	TECHNICAL CONTENT	16
11.3.1	Coordination of national or regional activities	16
11.3.1.1	<i>The ERA-NET scheme</i>	16
11.3.1.2	<i>Activities undertaken through European cooperation frameworks</i>	20
11.3.1.3	<i>Development of an integrated information system (ERAWATCH)</i>	20
11.3.2	Coordination at European level.....	21
11.3.2.1	<i>Scientific and technological cooperation activities carried out in COST</i>	21
11.3.2.2	<i>Strengthened coordination with EUREKA</i>	21
11.3.2.3	<i>Collaboration and joint initiatives of specialised European scientific cooperation organisations such as CERN, ESA, ESO, ENO, EMBL, ESRF, ILL</i>	22
11.4	TYPES OF INSTRUMENTS TO BE USED	22
11.5	LINKS TO OTHER RESEARCH TOPICS.....	23
11.6	IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RELATED ISSUES	23
11.6.1	Timetable and indicative budget for 2004 and 2005	23
11.6.1.1	<i>ERA-NET</i>	23
11.6.1.2	<i>Activities undertaken through European cooperation frameworks (e.g. EUROCORES)</i>	23
11.6.1.3	<i>Development of an integrated information system (ERAWATCH)</i>	24
11.6.1.4	<i>COST</i>	24
11.6.1.5	<i>EUREKA</i>	24
11.6.2	Special conditions for participation in the ERA-NET scheme.....	24
11.6.3	Type of evaluation procedure for the ERA-NET scheme	25
11.6.4	Indicative budget for the 2004-2005 Work Programme.....	26
11.7	CALL INFORMATION FOR THE OPEN CALL OF THE ERA-NET SCHEME	28

11.1 INTRODUCTION

Making a reality of the European Research Area depends on improving the coherence and coordination of research and innovation activities and policies conducted at national, regional and European level. In this perspective, the objective of Community action under the first part of "Strengthening the foundations of the European Research Area" is to stimulate and support programme coordination and joint actions conducted at national or regional level, as well as among European organisations, and thus help to develop the common knowledge base necessary for the coherent development of policies. These activities may be in any scientific and technological area, including in the thematic priority areas.

11.2 OBJECTIVES, STRUCTURE, AND OVERALL APPROACH

11.2.1 Coordination of national or regional activities

The objective is to encourage and support initiatives undertaken by several countries in areas of common strategic interest, to develop synergy between their existing activities (**understood as research and innovation programmes or parts thereof**) through coordination of their implementation, their mutual opening and mutual access to research results, as well as to define and implement joint actions.

To reach these objectives, several types of actions will be supported :

- ***the ERA-NET Scheme***: the objective of the ERA-NET scheme is to step up the cooperation and coordination of research activities carried out at national or regional level in the Member States and Associated States through the **networking** of research activities, including their mutual opening and the development and implementation of joint activities.

The scheme will contribute to making a reality of the European Research Area by improving the coherence and coordination across Europe of such research programmes. The scheme will also enable national or regional systems to take on tasks collectively that they would not have been able to tackle independently.

Networking and mutual opening require a progressive approach. The ERA-NET scheme therefore has a long-term perspective that must also allow for the different ways research is organised in different Member States and Associated States.

- ***schemes developed in European cooperation frameworks***: in particular the EUROCORES collaborative scheme of the European Science Foundation (ESF).
- ***the development of an integrated information system (ERAWATCH)***: the Commission supports the development of an integrated information system called ERAWATCH that will facilitate the provision and exchange of information on national and regional research policies, programmes and activities.

11.2.2 Coordination of European level-activities

The objective is to enhance the complementarity and synergy between Community actions undertaken under the Framework Programme and those of other European scientific cooperation organisations (such as COST, EUREKA and various thematic ones), as well as among these organisations themselves. Through increased coordination and collaboration, the various European cooperation frameworks will contribute more effectively to the overall coherence of European research efforts and the establishment of a European Research Area. Community participation in international activities can be supported in duly justified cases.

11.3 TECHNICAL CONTENT

11.3.1 Coordination of national or regional activities

11.3.1.1 *The ERA-NET scheme*

Activities developed within the ERA-NET scheme consist of the networking of research activities carried out at national or regional level, including their mutual opening and the development and implementation of joint activities.

"Research activities carried out at national or regional level" should be understood as **entire research and innovation programmes, or parts of such programmes, or similar initiatives**. Such activities should have all of the following characteristics:

- a) be strategically planned; and
- b) be carried out at national or regional level; and
- c) either be financed or managed directly by national or regional public bodies, or by structures closely related to or mandated by public authorities (e.g. agencies).

The ERA-NET scheme will be implemented through a bottom-up approach, giving no preference to one specific research topic over another. Networking activities under this scheme may be carried out in the **whole field of science and technology, including the social and human sciences**,¹⁰ and across domains and disciplines. They may also be entirely dedicated to "horizontal" issues, such as technology foresight, the promotion of gender equality, etc.

¹⁰ The specific programme "Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area" gives the following examples of topics that could be supported :

- health: health of key population groups; major diseases and disorders (e.g. cancer, diabetes and diabetes-related diseases, degenerative diseases of the nervous system, psychiatric diseases, cardiovascular diseases, hepatitis, allergies, visual impairment, infectious diseases), rare diseases; alternative or non-conventional medicine; and major diseases linked to poverty in developing countries; palliative care; activities involved will be implemented, for instance, through coordination of research and comparative studies, development of European databases and interdisciplinary networks, exchange of clinical practice and coordination of clinical trials.
- biotechnology: non-health and non-food applications.
- environment: urban environment (including sustainable urban development and cultural heritage, including, for example, ecosite concepts); marine environment and land/soil management; seismic risk.
- energy: new generation power plants ("near-zero-emission"), energy storage, transport and distribution.

To advance the process of better European cooperation between research activities carried out at national or regional level, the ERA-NET scheme will allow for a step-by-step approach. As such, an ERA-NET may contain an evolving set of activities, starting with increasing mutual knowledge through information exchange among policy makers and research programme managers of similar scientific areas, leading to stronger forms of cooperation and coordination.

It should be stressed that ERA-NET activities concern the **coordination among programmes** and not among individual scientific projects or the work of individual scientists.

Ways of networking of research activities carried out at national or regional level

Networking activities may involve many levels of cooperation and coordination in an evolutionary perspective, whose precise form will depend on the degree of maturity of the network. The networking foreseen by an ERA-NET should be ambitious, and in this sense it must cover (or go beyond) at least the first two levels described below, and should produce concrete deliverables. In particular, it should lead to sustained cooperation between national or regional research and innovation programmes continuing beyond the duration of the ERA-NET contract itself.

(i) Systematic exchange of information and good practices on existing programmes

The goal of such activities is to improve communication, develop better reciprocal knowledge and promote trust-building among programme managers in similar scientific and technological areas through a mutual learning process, and the systematic exchange of information and good practices.

“Information” should be understood as information on national or regional research and innovation programmes, projects funded therein, research priorities, evaluation practices, organisation and management practices.

(ii) Identification and analysis of common strategic issues

The following types of identification and analysis activities could be jointly carried out by programme managers of national or regional research activities in view of possible cooperation and coordination between programmes:

- Identification and analysis of **research activities** carried out by different programmes that have similar goals and that could lead to the design of future multinational schemes.
- Identification and analysis of **practical networking activities** and mutual opening mechanisms.
- Identification and analysis of **barriers that hinder transnational cooperation** activities such as, for example, administrative and legal barriers.
- Identification of **new opportunities and gaps in research** and stimulation of new interdisciplinary work on the basis of technology assessment and foresight analysis carried out at regional, national and European level.
- Exploration of possibilities of setting up **common evaluation systems**.

- Identification of “**horizontal**” issues of common interest, such as the promotion of gender equality, ethical issues in research, science and society issues, etc.
- Identification of **mutual complementarities** between the programmes of the ERA-NET partners.

(iii) *Development of joint activities between national or regional programmes*

Based on identification and analysis activities such as those described in the previous section, ERA-NETs would be encouraged to advance a step further, toward developing joint activities, such as:

- Development of **mechanisms for clustering of nationally or regionally funded research projects**. This type of clustering will be done where useful complementarities or mutual reinforcement of ongoing nationally or regionally funded research activities can be achieved. Programme managers will set up appropriate mechanisms to achieve this purpose. This could involve the identification and the selection of projects and the organisation of activities such as workshops and working groups among scientists involved in the nationally funded research projects. Such clustering activities should have programmatic objectives that go beyond a simple exchange of scientific information between projects or researchers.
- Development of **multinational evaluation procedures** (common evaluation criteria and methods of implementation). This measure could contribute in the long run to the integration of multinational evaluation practices in the broader national or regional research systems (covering proposal, project and programme evaluation).
- Development of **schemes for joint training activities**, such as co-supervised theses and international PhD schemes, forming an integral part of a wider cooperation in research.
- Development of **schemes for mutual opening of facilities or laboratories** in one country for scientists from another.
- Development of **common schemes for programme monitoring and evaluation**, including joint monitoring or evaluation.
- Development of **schemes for personnel exchange** in the context of the above activities.
- Development and preparation of **specific cooperation agreements or arrangements** between participating programmes, would prepare the ground for further trans-national research activities and assure that legal barriers are removed.
- Development of an **action plan**, which takes up the common strategic issues and prepares for a concrete implementation of joint activities.

(iv) *Implementation of joint trans-national research activities*

A stronger form of networking would consist of implementing a **joint programme of transnational research activities**. This would be expected to involve setting up a common strategy, a joint work programme, pilot activities, common (mutually open) or joint calls for proposals, a common multinational evaluation system and a common plan for dissemination of results or experiences. In such schemes, projects submitted to a common or joint call for proposals should involve at least two teams from two different countries. A posteriori clustering of selected projects should also be done if applicable.

In this context, a number of possibilities could be envisaged:

- a) Each country or region pays for the participation of its own researchers and research activities.
- b) The implementation of a programme of transnational research activities entails transnational flows of national funding. Two approaches are possible:
 - a country pays for participation of other countries' researchers or research teams on the basis of mutually agreed conditions;
 - countries pool funds in order to finance projects resulting from a joint call for proposals, according to commonly agreed evaluation criteria.

In such cases, the ERA-NET scheme would cover the additional coordination activities arising from the joint trans-national implementation of the participating national/regional programmes.

Possible mechanisms for promoting the above types of networking activities could be, amongst others:

- **fora** of programme managers;
- **short-term exchanges** of programme managers;
- **benchmarking** of activities and **dissemination of good practices**;
- development and use of **common electronic communication tools**, including the use of common portals.

Management of an ERA-NET

Given the long-term nature of the cooperation within an ERA-NET, the partners will be advised to establish a "coherent management framework", with dedicated staff, to coordinate their activities and to ensure continuity of operation. Management tasks include, among others:

- the overall management of the networking activities of the participants within the ERA-NET;
- the overall legal, contractual, ethical, financial and administrative management of the consortium, including communication with the Commission and reporting;
- leading the development of the strategic vision of the ERA-NET;
- ensuring high quality standards throughout the activities of the ERA-NET;

- co-ordination at consortium level of knowledge management and other innovation-related activities (if applicable);
- maintenance of any consortium agreement;
- overseeing the promotion of gender equality in the ERA-NET;
- overseeing science and society issues, related to the activities conducted within the ERA-NET.

11.3.1.2 Activities undertaken through European cooperation frameworks

Activities undertaken through European frameworks will be supported, in particular the EUROCORES collaborative scheme of the European Science Foundation (ESF). ESF's EUROCORES scheme is aimed at providing an effective and efficient need-driven collaboration mechanism at a multinational level within Europe, which can be responsive to the emerging priorities of national funding agencies and their analogues within the European Science Foundation membership. It builds on existing national structures and maximises their value through collaboration while leaving funding 'ownership' with the national agencies.

11.3.1.3 Development of an integrated information system (ERAWATCH)

An integrated information system (ERAWATCH) will be developed, to facilitate access to information on national or regional research policies, programmes and activities. The ERAWATCH project is being designed as a long term strategic intelligence service to support evidence-based policy-making in the research field and hence help to accelerate the realisation of ERA.

ERAWATCH will be structured around a user-friendly web-based "research inventory" designed as an "added value hub" as recommended in the feasibility study on an integrated information system carried out for the Commission in 2001. The research inventory will be complemented by an "intelligence service" providing regular and ongoing syntheses, analyses, surveys and reporting on general science policy issues relevant to research policy-making. In addition, some specific studies carried out to meet particular research policy issues addressed in other parts of the framework programme (for example in section 12 of the Work Programme of SP1), could also be integrated in ERAWATCH.

The "added value hub" system will make it possible to access a detailed meta-structure and meta-data on distributed sources, in a consistent format. It will also provide sophisticated search, fusion, analysis and presentation tools. It will be an effective and user-friendly system, which is flexible enough to adapt to future needs. Mutual compatibility between different information systems developed by the Commission will also be ensured, in particular with the European Information System on Innovation policies, performances and trends in Member States TRENDCHART.

The target audience for ERAWATCH will be all those involved in research policy-making in Europe at national and sub-national levels, research programme managers, public and private research organisations and researchers with interests in the field.

The development, the setting up and the implementation of ERAWATCH will be carried out jointly by the Commission Directorates-General for Research and for the Joint Research Centre (through its Institute for Prospective Technological Studies – IPTS). The JRC-IPTS, through its established networks in Member States, its

independent character and flexibility will provide an institutional platform for the implementation of ERAWATCH. It will also ensure the consistency needed for a project such as ERAWATCH, which is designed to be a tool supporting research policy on a long-term perspective. A network of national partners will assist in implementing ERAWATCH with the help of expert groups appointed when it is necessary to address specific issues. CORDIS will develop and host the central point of access, around which the “added value hub” will be developed. An Advisory Group of a limited size will act as an interface with the user community in order to ensure that the service remains user-driven and that the deliverables respond to needs.

The ERAWATCH project will have two phases, the prototyping phase and the production phase. The aim of the prototyping phase is to test and to validate a number of aspects on which the success of the full scale ERAWATCH service will depend. It is designed primarily to identify and test the outputs of the ERAWATCH service. It will serve also to identify, develop, implement and test in a reduced scale the most appropriate procedures and structures that will guarantee a cost-efficient development and running of the entire service and to demonstrate its feasibility. The prototyping phase started in February 2004 and will have a 11 months duration. The production phase of ERAWATCH is expected to start early 2005 for a duration of maximum 36 months.

11.3.2 Coordination at European level

11.3.2.1 Scientific and technological cooperation activities carried out in COST

COST is a long-standing bottom-up mechanism that facilitates coordination and exchanges between nationally funded scientists and research teams in a variety of research fields. In order for COST to continue to fulfil its intergovernmental role and to ensure a cost-effective contribution to research coordination within the European Research Area, its management arrangements are being adapted to the new context. In December 2002, COST member countries designated European Science Foundation (ESF) as the implementing agent of COST, to which financial support will be granted under this programme.

Reinforced coordination among the activities of the European Science Foundation, COST and the Framework Programme will also be sought in areas of common interest.

11.3.2.2 Strengthened coordination with EUREKA

The specific programme will support coordination activities aimed at increasing synergy and complementarity between EUREKA and the Framework Programme in areas of common interest. The Community is a member of EUREKA.

The following activities are foreseen:

- creating and strengthening synergies between the Framework Programme and EUREKA in order to carry out in a complementary manner large-scale projects across the full spectrum of the research and innovation cycle. The European Investment Bank could be closely associated to such actions;
- bringing together information and assistance networks in support of research and innovation in SMEs (technology transfer, access to funding, intellectual property);

Joint actions/events for the mutual exchange of information or project proposal stimulation (“brokerage events”), and in support of the work of the joint technical groups could be developed.

11.3.2.3 Collaboration and joint initiatives of specialised European scientific cooperation organisations such as CERN, ESA, ESO, ENO, EMBL, ESRF, ILL

With regard to thematic European organisations, such as CERN, ESA, ESO, ENO, EMBL, ESRF, ILL¹¹, the Community will encourage and support specific initiatives aimed at strengthening the coherence and synergies between its own activities and those undertaken by these European organisations, in particular through the development of joint approaches and actions on issues of common interest.

11.4 TYPES OF INSTRUMENTS TO BE USED

Coordination actions and specific support actions will be the principal instruments used to implement the work programme. An indicative financial breakdown by activity and instrument is provided in section 11.6.4.

- *Coordination actions (CA)* are intended to be used for implementing ERA-NET projects. The financial support from the Community will be limited to the costs of the additional activities undertaken to implement the ERA-NET. No support will be provided for the research activities themselves, for which the members of the ERA-NET will be expected to use their own resources. Total Community funding for an ERA-NET could be as high as 3 million €. In exceptional cases, for example if several fields of research are covered by a single ERA-NET, a greater contribution could be envisaged. Each ERA-NET should last sufficiently long to have a durable impact on the research programmes involved. A duration of up to 5 years may be envisaged.
- *Specific support actions (SSA)* will be used to support preparatory actions aimed at developing future ERA-NETs in the form of co-ordination actions, as well as in support of activities undertaken through European cooperation frameworks (e.g. EUROCORES) and in support of COST. In addition, specific support actions may be used to support collaboration and joint initiatives of specialised European scientific cooperation organisations (such as CERN, ESA, ESO, ENO, EMBL, ESRF, ILL) as outlined in section 11.3.2.3.

It should be noted that submission of specific support action proposals in view of preparing future ERA-NETs will not be solicited beyond the 5 October 2004 closure date.

Specific support actions should have a limited scope and may involve conferences, seminars, studies and analyses, working groups and expert groups, operational support and dissemination, information and communication activities, or a combination of these, as appropriate in each case. Community funding could be as high as 200,000 € for a duration of one year, but will exceed 200,000 € only in exceptional cases.

¹¹ CERN: European Organisation for Nuclear Research; ESA: European Space Agency; ESO: European Southern Observatory; ENO: European Northern Observatory; EMBL: European Molecular Biology Laboratory; ESRF: European Synchrotron Radiation Facility; ILL: Laue-Langevin Institute.

Specific support actions may also be an excellent tool to encourage and facilitate the participation of organisations from the candidate countries in the ERA-NET scheme.

- The implementation of the ERAWATCH project will be made through an administrative arrangement between the Directorate-General for Research and the Joint Research Centre. The administrative arrangement will cover initially the prototyping phase of ERAWATCH, which started in February 2004 for a duration of 11 months. The administrative arrangement will be amended to cover the first 18 months of the production phase, which will start in 2005. A second amendment at the end of 2005 will cover the entire production phase.

11.5 LINKS TO OTHER RESEARCH TOPICS

Where the development of networking activities within the context of different ERA-NETs will relate to research topics and activities covered by other parts of the Framework Programme, clear links between them will be established.

It should be noted that coordination activities similar to the ones covered by the ERA-NET scheme on topics addressed by the priority thematic areas of part I of the Specific Programme “Integrating and strengthening the European Research Area” may also be supported by the priority thematic areas themselves.

11.6 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND RELATED ISSUES

11.6.1 Timetable and indicative budget for 2004 and 2005

11.6.1.1 ERA-NET

An open call inviting proposals for ERA-NET activities (coordination actions and specific support actions) on a bottom-up basis was published in the Official Journal on 17 December 2002. The first closure date was 3 June 2003, with an original indicative budget of 24 million €, to which 11 million € was added to support proposals from the reserve list. From March 2004 there will be an intermediary closure date roughly every six months (02.03.2004, 05.10.2004, 02.03.2005) up to the 4 October 2005 deadline. The indicative budget for the closure date of 2 March 2004 was 37 million €, to which 11 million € was added to support projects from the reserve list. The indicative budget for the closure date of 5 October 2004 was 23 million € to which an additional 24 million € will be transferred from the budget previously foreseen for the 2 March 2005 closure date. Consequently, the indicative budget for the closure date of 2 March 2005 is reduced from 40 million € to 16 million €, while that for the final deadline of 4 October 2005 remains 18.6 million €.

Ongoing ERA-NET coordination actions willing to enlarge subsequently the scope of their activities and/or their partnership will be allowed to submit a supplementary proposal at any of the foreseen closure dates up to the October 2005 deadline.

11.6.1.2 Activities undertaken through European cooperation frameworks (e.g. EUROCORES)

A Community grant of up to 20 million € is expected to be awarded to the European Science Foundation under FP6 in order to support the implementation of the

EUROCORES scheme. The grant is subject to a contract (specific support action) between the Commission and the European Science Foundation, initially for a 24-month period up to September 2005. The amount of the grant for this initial period is 6.2 million €. Thereafter, the contract may be extended by twelve-month periods up to the end of FP6. It is expected that the first extension will cover the period from October 2005 to September 2006 with an indicative complementary Community financial contribution of 8 million €.

11.6.1.3 *Development of an integrated information system (ERAWATCH)*

The provisional budget foreseen for the development of the ERAWATCH integrated information system is 10 million €. The contribution to the prototyping phase started in February 2004 with 0.6 million €. 4.4 million € funding for the production phase will be allocated in 2004 and 5 million € in 2005.

11.6.1.4 *COST*

The Community's grant to COST under FP6 will be at least 50 million € and up to 80 million €. The grant is subject to a contract (specific support action) between the Commission and the European Science Foundation, initially for an 18-month period up to the end of 2004. The amount of the grant for this initial period is 22 million €. Thereafter, the contract may be prolonged by twelve-month periods up to the end of FP6. It is expected that the first extension will cover the year 2005 with an indicative complementary Community financial contribution of 12 million €. A further extension to the contract by an additional 12 months covering the year 2006 is expected to be made in the course of 2005, with an indicative budget of 17 million €.

11.6.1.5 *EUREKA*

Funding from the Commission, within this part of the specific programme, consists of between 1.0 and 1.5 million € for the duration of the Framework Programme, primarily as a contribution to the budget of the EUREKA secretariat. This will be committed annually between 2003 and 2006 in four approximately equal tranches.

11.6.2 Special conditions for participation in the ERA-NET scheme

The participants in the ERA-NET scheme shall be:

- public bodies responsible for financing or managing research activities¹² carried out at national or regional level;
- other national or regional bodies that finance or manage such research activities;
- bodies operating at European level that include as part of their mission the pan-European coordination of nationally-funded research activities¹³.

The legally established minimum number of participants for each of the two instruments given below must only include entities belonging to the above three categories. However, over and above this minimum, may also participate and receive Community funding:

¹² “activities” understood as research and innovation programmes or parts thereof.

¹³ “activities” understood as research and innovation programmes or parts thereof.

- legal entities such as charities or other private organisations which also manage research programmes that are strategically planned and executed at national or regional level.

Coordination actions

For ERA-NET scheme coordination actions, the minimum number of participants has been set at three independent legal entities, belonging to any of the first three categories above, established in different Member States or Associated States, of which at least two shall be Member States or Associated candidate countries.

However, an European Economic Interest Group (EEIG) or any legal entity established in a Member State or Associated State according to its national law and which is made up of independent legal entities managing publicly funded national or regional programmes from at least three different Member States or Associated States, of which at least two shall be a Member State or Associated candidate country, may be the sole participant in an ERA-NET.

It has to be emphasised that preference will be given to ERA-NET actions involving a more substantial number of Member States or Associated States than the legally required minimum number of three in order to obtain a significant structuring effect at European level.

Specific support actions

For ERA-NET scheme specific support actions, the minimum number of participants is one legal entity established in a Member State or Associated State.

11.6.3 Type of evaluation procedure for the ERA-NET scheme

The evaluation of proposals will involve a single stage submission procedure.

The criteria applicable to coordination actions and specific support actions, which are the two instruments for the implementation of the ERA-NET scheme, are described in the annex.

To supplement the criteria applicable to coordination actions and provided for in annex B of the work programme, three complementary items will be added for the evaluation of ERA-NET proposals:

- Quality of coordination

The extent to which:

- the coordination mechanisms include a **suitable governance structure** involving the participating organisations at an appropriate level.

- Potential impact

The extent to which:

- the ERA-NET involves **the key actors** within their national or regional research systems;

- the ERA-NET activities lay the foundations for a **durable cooperation** between the partners involved.

The evaluation procedure is described in the Commission's evaluation manual.

11.6.4 Indicative budget for the 2004-2005 Work Programme

<i>Coordination of national activities</i>	<i>2004 (M€)</i>	<i>2005 (M€)</i>
ERA-NET (CAs and SSAs ¹⁴) - 48 M€ earmarked for the closure of 2/3/2004 - 47 M€ earmarked for the closure of 5/10/2004 ¹⁵ - 16 M€ earmarked for the closure of 2/3/2005 ¹⁶ - 18.6 M€ earmarked for the closure of 4/10/2005 ¹⁷	95	34.6
EUROCORES (SSA) – complementary contribution to prolong the initial contract with ESF by 12 months	0	8
Integrated information system (ERAWATCH) - Prototyping phase - Production phase	0.6 4.4	5
SUB-TOTAL 1	100	47.6

<i>Coordination at European level</i>	<i>2004 (M€)</i>	<i>2005 (M€)</i>
COST (SSA) – complementary contribution to prolong the initial contract with ESF by 12 months	12	17
EUREKA – contribution to EUREKA secretariat budget	0.26	0.3
Other	0.2	0.3
SUB-TOTAL 2	12.46	17.6

SUPPORT FOR ALL COORDINATION ACTIVITIES	112.46	65.2
--	---------------	-------------

¹⁴ SSA proposals in the ERA-NET scheme can only be submitted up to the 4 October 2004 closure date.

¹⁵ The amount is to be partially committed in 2005

¹⁶ The amount is to be partially committed in 2006

¹⁷ The amount is to be partially committed in 2006

**Call Information for the open call of the
ERA-NET Scheme**

11.7 CALL INFORMATION FOR THE OPEN CALL OF THE ERA-NET SCHEME

1) **Specific programme:** Integrating and strengthening the foundations of the European Research Area.

2) **Thematic priority/Domain:** Support for coordination activities.

3) **Call title:** Supporting the cooperation and the coordination of research activities carried out at national or regional level (ERA-NET Scheme).

4) **Call identifier:** FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA

Proposers are encouraged to use the following sub-identifiers for the closure dates of the call for proposals:

1st closure date: (3 June 2003) FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA-A

2nd closure date (2 March 2004): FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA-B

3rd closure date (5 October 2004): FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA-C

4th closure date (2 March 2005): FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA-D

5th closure date (4 October 2005): FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA-E

5) **Date of publication**¹⁸: 17 December 2002.

6) **Closure dates**¹⁹: 03.06.2003, 02.03.2004, 05.10.2004, 02.03.2005 and 04.10.2005, at 17:00 (Brussels local time).

7) **Total indicative budget for 2004 and 2005 closure dates:** 48 million € for the 02.03.2004 closure date, 47 million € for the 05.10.2004 closure date, 16 million € for the 02.03.2005 closure date and 18.6 million € for the 04.10.2005 final deadline. .

<u>Instrument</u> ²⁰	<u>2004 (M€)</u>	<u>2005 (M€)</u>
CA and SSA	95	34.6 (only CA)

8) **Areas and instruments:**

<u>Area</u>	<u>Instruments</u>
11.3.1.1	Up to closure date of 5.10.2004: CA and SSA After closure date of 5.10.2004: only CA

¹⁸ The director-general responsible for the call may publish it up to one month prior or after the envisaged date of publication.

¹⁹ Where the envisaged date of publication is either advanced or delayed, closure date(s) will be adjusted automatically, if needed, in the published call for proposals.

²⁰ CA = Coordination action; SSA = Specific support action. Please note that SSA proposals can only be submitted up to the 5.10.2004 closure date.

9) **Minimum number of participants²¹:**

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Minimum number</u>
CA	3 independent legal entities from 3 different MS or AS, with at least 2 MS or ACC
SSA	1 legal entity from 1 MS or AS

10) **Restriction on participation:** The minimum number of participants must include only:

- public bodies responsible for financing or managing research activities carried out at national or regional level;
- other national or regional organisations that finance or manage such research activities;
- bodies operating at European level that include as part of their mission the pan-European coordination of nationally-funded research.

Other legal entities such as charities or other private organisations, which also manage research programmes that are strategically planned and executed at national or regional level, may participate over and above the minimum number of participants.

11) **Consortium agreement:** Participants in RTD actions resulting from this call are not required to conclude a consortium agreement.

12) **Evaluation procedure:**

- the evaluation will follow a single stage procedure;
- proposals will not be evaluated anonymously.

13) **Evaluation criteria:**

- see Annex B of the work programme for the applicable criteria (including their individual weights and thresholds and the overall threshold) per instrument.
- in addition, for coordination actions, 3 complementary items will be added in 2 of the 6 applicable criteria in accordance with section 11.6.3 of the work programme:

²¹ MS = Member States of the EU; AS (incl. ACC) = Associated States; ACC: Associated candidate countries. Any legal entity established in a Member State or Associated State and which is made up of the requested number of participant may be the sole participant in an indirect action.

<u>Instrument</u>	<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Complementary items</u>
Coordination actions	Quality of coordination	- the coordination mechanisms include a suitable governance structure involving the participating organisations at an appropriate level.
	Potential impact	- the ERA-NET involves the key actors within their national or regional research systems.
		- the ERA-NET activities lay the foundations for a durable cooperation between the partners involved.

14) **Indicative evaluation and contractual timetable:**

- Evaluation results: estimated to be available within 2 months after the closure date.
- Contract signature : it is estimated that the first contracts related to this call will come into force 6 months after the closure date.

III. GENERAL ANNEXES

- A. Overview of Calls for Proposals
- B. Common evaluation criteria for evaluating proposals
- C. List of groups of target countries for specific measures in support of International Co-operation

ANNEX A Overview of Calls for Proposals foreseen in this Work Programme (see relevant work programme part for details) - SP1

1. Life sciences, genomics and biotechnology for health	<p>(i) FP6-2002-Lifescihealth - publication 17/12/2002; closure 25/03/2003; budget 513 M€ (ii) FP6-2003-Lifescihealth-I - publication 15/07/2003; closure 13/11/2003; budget 411 M€ (iii) FP6-2003-Lifescihealth-II - publication 15/07/2003; closure 15/04/2004; budget 4 M€ (iv) FP6-2003-Lifescihealth-3 - publication 13/12/2003; closure 24/03/2004; budget 12 M€ (v) FP6-2004-Lifescihealth-4 – publication 15/06/2004; closure 09/09/2004; budget 4M€ (vi) FP6-2004-Lifescihealth-5 – publication 15/06/2004; closure 17/11/2004; budget 540M€</p>
2. Information Society technologies	<p>(i) FP6-2002-IST-1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 24/04/2003; budget 1070 M€ (ii) FP6-2002-IST-FET Open domain-publication 17/12/2002; closing 31/12/2004; budget 60 M€ (iii) FP6-2002-IST-NMP-1 (joint) - publication 17/12/2002; closing 24/04/2003; budget 60 M€ (iv) FP6-2002-IST-2- publication 17/06/2003; closure 15/10/2003; budget 525 M€ (v) FP6-2004-IST-3- publication 8/06/2004; closure 22/09/2004; budget 28 M€ (vi) FP6-2004-IST-NMP-2 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closing 14/10/2004; budget 180 M€ (vii) FP6-2004-IST-FET Proactive initiatives-publication 8/06/2004; closing 22/09/2004; budget 80 M€</p>
3. Nano-technologies and nano-sciences, knowledge-based multifunctional materials, and new production processes and devices	<p>(i) FP6-NMP-1- publication 17/12/2002; closures 6/03/2003 and 10/04/2003; budget 400 M€ (ii) FP6-2002-IST-NMP-1-(joint) publication 17/12/2002; closing 24/04/2003; budget 60 M€ (iii) FP6-NMP-2- publication 17/12/2002; closure 10/04/2003; budget 40 M€ (iv) FP6-2003-NMP-NI-3- publication 13/12/2003; closure 02/03/2004; budget 245 M€ (v) FP6-2003-NMP-TI-3- publication 13/12/2003; closure 12/05/2004; budget 105 M€ (vi) FP6-2003-NMP-SME-3- publication 13/12/2003; closure 02/03/2004; budget 80 M€ (vii) FP6-2002-STEEL-3(joint) - publication 13/12/2003; closing 17/03/2004; budget 25 M€ (with 20 M€ from FP6, the balance from the Research Fund for Coal and Steel) (viii) FP6-2004-IST-NMP-2 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closing 14/10/2004; budget 180 M€ (ix) FP6-2004-NMP-NSF-1 - publication 8 June 2004; closing 14/10/2004; budget 6 M€</p>
4. Aeronautics and space	<p>(i) FP6-Aero-1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 20/03/2003; budget 240 M€ (ii) FP6-Aero-2- publication 17/12/2002; closure 20 March 2003 and 23 September 2003; budget 7 M€ (iii) FP6-2002-TREN-1 (joint)-publication 17/12/2002; closures 18,20/03/2003 and 15/04/2003; budget 140 M€ (iv) FP6-2003-TREN-2 (joint)-publication 17/06/2003 closure 17/12/2003; budget 175 M€ (v) FP6-2002-Space-1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 20/03/2003; budget 60 M€ (vi) FP6-2003-Aero-1- publication 13/12/2003; closure 31/3/2004; budget 300 M€ (vii) FP6-2003-Aero-2 - publication 13/12/2003; closure 31/3/2004, and 28/9/2004; budget 7 M€ (viii) FP6-2003-Space-1 - publication 13/12/2003; closure 31/3/2004; budget 60 M€ (ix) FP6-2003-TREN-3 (joint)- publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 252 M€ (x) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-1 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 35 M€ (xi) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-2 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 4.5 M€</p>
5. Food quality and safety	<p>(i) FP6-2002-Food-1 - publication 17/12/2002; closure 15/04/2003; budget 204 M€ (ii) FP6-2003-Food-2A & B - publication 5/11/2003; closures 5/02/2004 and 29/09/2004.; budget 197 M€ (iii) FP6-2004-FOOD-3A - publication 7/7/2004; closure 7/10/2004; budget 152 M€ (iv) FP6-2004-FOOD-3B - publication 7/7/2004; closure 8/02/2005; budget 59 M€ (v) FP6-2004-FOOD-3C - publication 7/7/2004; closure 7/09/2005; budget 5 M€</p>

6.Sustainable development, global change and ecosystems	<p>(a) Sustainable Energy Systems: (i) FP6-2002-TREN-1(joint)-publication 17/12/2002; closures 18,20/03/2003 and 15/04/2003; budget 140 M€ (ii) FP6-2002-Energy 1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 18/03/2003; budget 198 M€ (iii) FP6-2003-TREN-2(joint)- publication 17/06/2003; closure 17/12/2003; budget 175 M€ (iv) FP6-2003-Energy-2- publication 4/10/2003; closure 17/12/2003; budget 3 M€ (v) FP6-2003-TREN-3 (joint)- publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 252 M€ (vi) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-1 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 35 M€ (vii) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-2 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 4.5 M€</p> <p>(b) Sustainable surface transport: (i) FP6-2002-TREN-1(joint)-publication 17/12/2002; closures 18,20/03/2003 and 15/04/2003; budget 140 M€ (ii) FP6-2003-TREN-2 (joint)-publication 17/06/2003 closure 17/12/2003; budget 175 M€ (iii) FP6-2002-Transport 1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 15/04/2003; budget 170 M€ (iv) FP6-2002-Transport 2- publication 17/12/2002; closure 3 April 2003 and 23 September 2003, budget 5 M€ (v) FP6-2003-Transport-3 - publication 13/12/2003; closure 6/4/ 2004; budget 150 M€ (vi) FP6-2003-Transport-2 - publication 13/12/2003; closure 6/4/2004 and 22 September 2004; budget 5 M€ (vii) FP6-2003-TREN-3 (joint)- publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 252 M€ (viii) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-1 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 35 M€ (ix) FP6-2004-Hydrogen-2 (joint) - publication 8/06/2004; closure 8/12/2004; budget 4.5 M€</p> <p>(c) Global change and ecosystems: (i) FP6-2002-Global 1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 8/4/2003; budget 170 M€ (ii) FP6-2003-Global 2-publication 3/07/2003; closure 9 October 2003 and 17 February 2004; budget 180 M€ (iii) FP6-2004- Global 3-publication 16/06/2004; closure 26 October 2004; budget 205 M€</p>
7. Citizens and governance in a knowledge-based society	<p>(i) FP6-2002-Citizens 1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 15/04/2003; budget 20 M€ (ii) FP6-2002-Citizens 2-publication 17/12/2002; closure 15/04/2003, budget 33 M€ (iii) FP6-2002-Citizens 3-publication 17/12/2002; closure 10/12/2003; budget 48 M€</p>
8. Policy support and anticipating scientific and technological needs	<p>(a) Policy-oriented research: (i) FP6-2002-SSP 1 - publication 17/12/2002; closure 13/03/2003; budget 149,1 M€ (ii) FP6-2003-SSP-SARS 1 - publication 3/7/2003; closure 30/09/2003; budget 9 M€ (iii) FP6-2003-SSP3 - publication 4/10/2003; closure 5/01/2004; budget 83.1 M€</p> <p>(b) New and Emerging S&T problems and opportunities: (i) FP6-2003-NEST-A-publication 26/02/2003; closure 22/10/2003; budget 28M€ (ii) FP6-2003-NEST-B1, B2, B3, B4 - publication 17/12/2003; closure 14/4/2004 and 15/9/2004; budget 30M€ (iii) FP6-2003-NEST-Path - publication 17/12/2003; closure 14/4/2004; budget 35M€</p>
9. Horizontal research activities involving SMEs	<p>(i) FP6-2002-SME 1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 27/11/2003; budget 155 M€ (ii) FP6-2002-SME 2-publication 17/12/2002; closure 6/03/2003; budget 40 M€ (iii) FP6-2003-SME 1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 21/10/2004; budget 75 M€ (iv) FP6-2003-SME 2-publication 17/12/2003; closure 6/04/2004; budget 41 M€ (v) FP6-2003-SME 3-publication 17/12/2003; closure 6/04/2004; budget 2 M€</p>

10. Specific measures in support of international co-operation	<p>(i) FP6-2002-INCO DEV 1- publication 17/12/2002; closure 11/09/2003, budget 50 M€</p> <p>(ii) FP6-2002-INCO MPC 1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 7/05/2003; budget 25 M€</p> <p>(iii) FP6-2002-INCO WBC1-publication 17/12/2002; closure 7/05/2003, budget 13.5 M€</p> <p>(iv) FP6-2002-INCO DEV/SSA 1 - published 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 6/03/2006; budget 1 M€ for 2003, 1.9 M€ for 2004</p> <p>(v) FP6-2002-INCO MPC/SSA 2 - published 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 6/03/2006; budget 0.6 M€ for 2003, 0.9 M€ for 2004</p> <p>(vi) FP6-2002-INCO WBC/SSA3 - published 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 6/03/2006; budget 0.6 M€ for 2003, 0.9 M€ for 2004</p> <p>(vii)FP6-2002-INCO-Russia+NIS/SSA-4 - published 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 6/03/2006; budget 0.6 M€ for 2003, 0.9 M€ for 2004</p> <p>(viii) FP6-2002-INCO-COMultilatRTD/SSA 5 - published 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 6/03/2006; budget 0.6 M€ for 2003, 1.5 M€ for 2004</p> <p>(ix) FP6-2003-INCO-DEV-2 - publication 17/12/2003; closure 14/09/2004, budget 36.2 M€</p> <p>(x) FP6-2003-INCO-MPC-2 - publication 17/12/2003; closure 14/9/2004; budget 27.1 M€</p> <p>(xi) FP6-2003-INCO-Russia+NIS-1 - publication 17/12/2003; closure 27/4/2004, budget 14 M€</p>
11. Support for the co-ordination of activities	(i) FP6-2002-ERA-NET-1-CA-SSA - publication 17/12/2002; open call; final closure 4/10/2005; budget, 71 M€ for 2004, and 58.6 M€ for 2005
12. Support for the coherent development of policies	None foreseen under the current work programme.
D. Promotion of co-operation with Associated Candidate Countries: "Reinforcement of the Associated Candidate Countries' Research Capacities"	<p>(i) FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-General - publication 26/03/2003; closure 26/06/2003, budget 9 M€</p> <p>(ii) FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-NMP; FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-Aero-Space; FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-Food; FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-Energy;</p> <p>(iii) FP6-2003-ACC-SSA-Transport - publication 26/03/2003; closure 26/06/2003, budget up to 4 M€</p> <p>(iv) FP6-2004-ACC-SSA-2 - publication 15/06/2004; closure 14/10/2004, budget 19.8 M€</p>
E. Promotion of co-operation with targeted third countries	(i) FP6-2004-TC-SSA-General - publication 15/06/2004; closure 14/10/2004, budget 2.9 M€

COMMON EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING PROPOSALS

A number of evaluation criteria are common to all the programmes of the Sixth Framework Programme and are set out in the European Parliament and the Council Regulations on the Rules for Participation (Article 10). These are:

- a) “Scientific and technological excellence and the degree of innovation;
- b) Ability to carry out the indirect action successfully and to ensure its efficient management, assessed in terms of resources and competences and including the organisational modalities foreseen by the participants;
- c) Relevance to the objectives of the specific programme;
- d) European added value, critical mass of resources mobilised and contribution to Community policies;
- e) Quality of the plan for using and disseminating the knowledge, potential for promoting innovation, and clear plans for the management of intellectual property.”

Furthermore, in applying paragraph (d) above, the following criteria are also to be taken into account:

- a) “For networks of excellence, the scope and degree of the effort to achieve integration and the network’s capacity to promote excellence beyond its membership, as well as the prospects of the durable integration of their research capabilities and resources after the end of the period covered by the Community’s financial contribution;
- b) For integrated projects, the scale of the ambition of the objectives and the capacity of the resources to make a significant contribution to reinforcing competitiveness or solving societal problems;
- c) For integrated initiatives relating to infrastructure, the prospects of the initiative’s continuing long term after the end of the period covered by the Community’s financial contribution.”

As set out in the Rules for Participation, the calls for proposals determine, in accordance with the type of instruments deployed or the objectives of the RTD activity, how the criteria set out above are applied by the Commission.

The purpose of this annex is to indicate how these criteria shall be applied. In particular, as the Sixth Framework Programme contains a differentiated set of instruments, the way in which each criterion translates into the issues to be examined as the basis for marking proposals will differ. In evaluating against these criteria, the checklists of issues set out in the following pages are intended to be universal for each type of instrument.

Unless otherwise specified in the relevant parts of this work programme, the principal issues set out below (i.e. the main numbered headings) will be given equal weighting in the evaluation. For each principal issue, a minimum score to be achieved is also indicated as well as a minimum overall score for each instrument. Proposals that fail to achieve these minimum threshold scores shall be rejected. Any departures from these threshold scores are indicated in the relevant part of this work programme.

In addition to the basic checklists below and any specific criteria or interpretations of the criteria required for a call, the following issues are also addressed for all proposals at any appropriate moment in the evaluation:

- Are there **gender** issues associated with the subject of the proposal? If so, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential **ethical** and/or **safety** aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? If so, have they been adequately taken into account in the preparation of the proposal?

An ethical check will take place for all proposals during the evaluation. A specific ethical review will be implemented following the evaluation for proposals recommended for funding and which deal with specific sensitive issues or whenever recommended following the ethical check during the evaluation. To this end, additional information on ethical aspects may be requested from proposers to allow the specific ethical review to be carried out. (See the section “The ethical review of proposals” below for more details on the criteria to be applied).

When appropriate, the following additional issues may also be addressed during the evaluation:

- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider **societal implications** of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with **education** at all levels been clearly set out?
- If **third country participation** is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

INTEGRATED PROJECTS (IP)

The following set of issues is intended to be a common basis for the evaluation of proposals for integrated projects.

1. Relevance (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which the proposed project **addresses the objectives** of the work programme.

2. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposed project is **suitably ambitious** in terms of its strategic impact on **reinforcing competitiveness (including that of SMEs) or on solving societal problems**.
- the innovation-related activities and exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**.
- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).

3. S&T excellence (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project has **clearly defined objectives**.
- the objectives represent **clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art**.
- the **proposed S&T approach** is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation.

4. Quality of the consortium (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the participants collectively constitute a **consortium of high quality**.
- the participants are **well-suited and committed to the tasks** assigned to them.
- there is **good complementarity** between participants.
- the **profiles** of the participants, including those to be included later, have been clearly described.
- the real involvement of **SMEs** has been adequately addressed.

5. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **organisational structure** is well matched to the complexity of the project and to the degree of integration required.
- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.
- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.

6. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project mobilises the minimum **critical mass of resources** (personnel, equipment, finance...) necessary for success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project.
- the overall **financial plan** for the project is adequate.

Overall threshold score 24 out of 30.

NETWORKS OF EXCELLENCE (NOE)

The following set of issues is intended to be a common basis for the evaluation of proposals for networks of excellence.

1. Relevance (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which the proposed project **addresses the objectives** of the work programme.

2. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- Europe has a **strategic need to strengthen S&T excellence on the topic** by means of a restructuring of the existing research capacities and the way research is carried out.
- the goals of the network are, in that connection, **suitably ambitious** particularly, in terms of achieving European leadership and acting as a world force on this topic.
- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- there is an effective plan for **spreading excellence**, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge, including to SMEs and to those outside the network.
- the proposed **approach is likely to have a durable structuring impact** on European research.

3. Excellence of the participants (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **participants are** currently conducting **excellent research** relevant to the topic of the network or are capable of important contributions to the joint programme of activities.
- the participants are **well suited to the tasks** assigned to them.
- they **collectively have the necessary critical mass of expertise and resources** to carry out the joint programme of activities successfully.

4. Degree of integration and the joint programme of activities (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the expected **degree of integration** justifies supporting the proposal as a network of excellence.
- the **joint programme of activities is** sufficiently well designed to achieve the expected degree of integration.
- the participating organisations have made a convincing commitment towards a **deep and durable integration** continuing beyond the period of Community support.

5. Organisation and management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the organisational structure of the network provides a **secure framework for any necessary structural decisions** to be taken
- the **management of the network is** demonstrably of high quality.
- there is a well-considered plan for **promoting gender equality** in the network.

Overall threshold score 20 out of 25.

SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH PROJECTS OR INNOVATION PROJECTS

The following set of issues is intended to be a common basis for the evaluation of proposals for (1) Specific Targeted Research Projects or (2) Specific Targeted Innovation Projects.

1. Relevance (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which the proposed project **addresses the objectives** of the work programme.

2. S&T excellence (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project has clearly **defined and well focused objectives**.
- the objectives represent **clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art**.
- the **proposed S&T approach** is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation

3. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposed project is likely to have an **impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal problems**.
- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**.

4. Quality of the consortium (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the participants collectively constitute a **consortium of high quality**.
- the participants are **well-suited and committed to the tasks** assigned to them.
- there is **good complementarity** between participants.
- the opportunity of involving SMEs has been adequately addressed.

5. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.
- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.

6. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project foresees the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project.
- the overall **financial plan** for the project **is adequate**.

Overall threshold score 21 out of 30.

COORDINATION ACTIONS

The following set of issues is intended to be a common basis for the evaluation of proposals for coordination actions.

1. Relevance (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which the proposed project **addresses the objectives** of the work programme.

2. Quality of the coordination (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of **demonstrably high quality**.
- the **coordination mechanisms** proposed are sufficiently **robust** for ensuring the goals of the action

3. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- the Community support would have a real impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome.
- the project mobilises a critical mass of resources in Europe
- exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**, where possible beyond the participants in the project.

4. Quality of the consortium (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the participants collectively constitute a **consortium of high quality**.
- the participants are **well-suited to the tasks** assigned to them.
- the project combines the **complementary expertise** of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes.

5. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.
- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.

6. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project provides for the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project.
- the overall **financial plan** for the project **is adequate**.

Overall threshold score 21 out of 30.

SPECIFIC SUPPORT ACTIONS

The following set of issues is intended to be common to all parts of FP6 for the evaluation of proposals for specific support actions.

1. Relevance (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which

- the proposal addresses key issues to defined in the work programme/call, specific programmes or ERA, as appropriate.

2. Quality of the support action (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposed objectives are sound and the proposed approach, methodology and work plan are of a sufficiently high quality for achieving these objectives.
- the applicant(s) represent(s) a high level of competence in terms of professional qualifications and/or experience.
- the proposed activities are innovative and original (*if applicable*).

3. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the impact of the proposed work can only be achieved if carried out at European level.
- the Community support would have a substantial impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome.
- exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**, where possible beyond the participants in the project.

4. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which the management structure is credible in terms of professional qualifications, experience, track record and capacity to deliver.

5. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which :

- the project provides for the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success.
- the overall **financial plan** for the project **is adequate**.

Overall threshold score 17.5 out of 25.

SPECIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS FOR SMES

The following set of issues is intended to be a common basis for the evaluation of proposals for Horizontal Research Activities for SMEs (for (1) Co-operative Research projects - CRAFT and for (2) Collective Research projects).

(1) For Co-operative Research Projects (CRAFT)

1. Relevance to the objectives of co-operative research (threshold score 3 out of 5)

- The extent to which **the proposed project** addresses a specific scientific and/or technological problem or need of a group of SMEs.

2. S&T excellence (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project has **clearly defined and well focused objectives.**
- the objectives represent substantial **progress beyond the current state-of-the-art.**
- the **proposed S&T approach** is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation.

3. Potential impact (threshold score 4 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposed project has **an impact on the competitiveness of the participant SMEs and/or contributes to solving societal problems.**
- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- exploitation and, where relevant, dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results.**
- the proposed project **will lead to new and improved products, processes or services** with clear market potential.

4. Quality of the consortium (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the participation of **other enterprises and end-users**, if relevant, **is in the interest of the SME participants.**
- the SMEs are **well-suited and committed to the tasks** assigned to them and to **exploiting** the results.
- the **RTD performers are of high quality** and there is **good complementarity** between them.
- there is a **balanced contribution** by the SMEs, other enterprises and end-users to the project.

5. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.

- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.

6. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project foresees the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project.
- the **financial plan is adequate**.

Overall threshold score 21 out of 30

(2) For Collective Research Projects

1. Relevance to the objectives of Collective Research (threshold score 4 out of 5)

- the extent to which **the proposed project** addresses a specific scientific and/or technological problem or need of large communities of SMEs.

2. S&T excellence (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project has **clearly defined and well focused objectives**.
- the objectives represent substantial **progress beyond the current state-of-the-art**.
- the **proposed S&T approach** is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation.

3. Potential impact (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the proposed project has an impact on the **competitiveness of large communities of European SMEs** and/or contributes to **solving societal problems**.
- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- dissemination and training plans and, where relevant, exploitation plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**.

4. Quality of the consortium (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the industrial associations or industry groupings are committed to disseminating the project results, to the training of managers of SMEs and SME associations and, when appropriate, to **exploiting the project results**.
- the 'core group' of SMEs are **committed to exploiting** the project results.
- the **RTD performers are of high quality** and there is good **complementarity** between them.

5. Quality of the management (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.

- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.
- the '**core group**' of SMEs associated to the project will contribute from the definition phase of the project to the dissemination of the results obtained.

6. Mobilisation of resources (threshold score 3 out of 5)

The extent to which:

- the project foresees the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial, etc.) necessary for success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project.
- the **financial plan for the project is adequate**.

Overall threshold score 21 out of 30.



THE ETHICAL REVIEW OF PROPOSALS

In accordance with Article 3 of the Framework Programme and Article 10 of the Rules for Participation, the evaluation procedure includes a check of any ethical issues raised by proposals. A specific ethical review of proposals involving sensitive ethical issues may take place after the evaluation and before any selection decision by the Commission. For this purpose, an ethical review (ER) panel may be convened.

The ER panel assesses the following elements:

- The awareness of the proposers of the ethical aspects of the research they propose
- Whether the researchers respect the ethical requirements of the 6th Framework Programme. In this respect, a declaration to the minutes of the Council meeting of 30.09.2002 was made; this is set out at the end of this section.
- Whether the proposers have taken into account the legislation, regulations and/or guidelines in place in the country(ies) where the research takes place
- Whether the relevant international conventions and declarations are taken into account²²
- Whether the relevant Community Directives are taken into account.
- Whether the proposer is seeking the approval/favourable opinion of relevant local ethics committees

For research involving human beings, the ER panel assesses in particular:

- The information which is given to the participants (healthy volunteers, tissue donors, patients, etc.)
- Measures taken to protect participants' personal data (including genetic data) and privacy
- Recruitment criteria and means by which the recruitment is to be conducted
- Level of care offered to participants

For research involving isolated or banked human embryonic stem cells in culture and foetal tissues and cells (for which restrictions apply, see the declaration to the Council minutes below) the ER panel assesses in particular:

- Whether the proposers have taken into account the legislation, regulations and/or codes of conduct in place in the country(ies) where the research using human embryonic stem cells in culture will take place. The procedures for obtaining informed consent
- The source of the human embryonic and foetal tissues/cells.
- Measures taken to protect personal data (including genetic data) and privacy
- The nature of financial inducements, if any.

²² Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, signed in Nice, 7 December 2000
Convention on Human rights and Biomedicine – Oviedo, 4.04. 1997 - Council of Europe
and the Additional protocol on the prohibition of Cloning of human beings (1998)
Universal declaration on the Human genome and human rights - Unesco - 11 November 1997
Declaration of Helsinki (in its latest version) - World Medical Association
Convention on the Rights of the Child – United Nations - 20 November 1989
Amsterdam protocol on an animal protection and welfare

For research involving animals, the ER panel assesses in particular:

- Whether the proposers are applying the ‘Three Rs’ principle: Replacement, Reduction and Refinement, and in particular:
 - ◆ Are animal experiments replaced by alternatives whenever possible?
 - ◆ Is animal suffering avoided or kept to a minimum?
 - ◆ Is animal welfare guaranteed and are the principles of biodiversity respected?

With respect to research involving human embryonic stem cells (as mentioned above), the relevant declaration to the minutes of the Council meeting of 30 September 2002 is as follows:

“The Council and the Commission agree that detailed implementing provisions concerning research activities involving the use of human embryos and human embryonic stem cells which may be funded under the 6th Framework Programme shall be established by 31 December 2003. The Commission states that, during that period and pending establishment of the detailed implementing provisions, it will not propose to fund such research, with the exception of the study of banked or isolated human embryonic stem cells in culture. The Commission will monitor the scientific advances and needs as well as the evolution of international and national legislation, regulations and ethical rules regarding this issue, taking into account also the opinions of the European Group of Advisers on the Ethical Implications of Biotechnology (1991–1997) and the opinions of the European Group on Ethics in Science and New technologies (as from 1998), and report to the European Parliament and the Council by September 2003.

The Council states that it intends to discuss this issue at a meeting in September 2003.

In the review of any subsequent proposal submitted to Council when applying Article 5 of the Decision 1999/468/EC the Commission recalls its statement concerning Article 5 of Decision 1999/468/EC, according to which the Commission, in order to find a balanced solution, will act in such a way as to avoid going against any predominant position which might emerge within the Council against the appropriateness of an implementing measure (cf. OJ C 203, 17.7.1999, p. 1).

The Council notes the intention of the Commission to submit to the programme Committee, established under the specific Research programme "Integrating and strengthening the ERA", procedural modalities concerning research involving the use of human embryos and human embryonic stem cells, in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3, first indent.

The Council further notes the intention of the Commission to present to Council and Parliament in Spring 2003 a report on human embryonic stem cell research which will form the basis for discussion at an inter-institutional seminar on bioethics.

Taking into account the seminar's outcome, the Commission will submit, based on article 166 (4) of the Treaty, a proposal establishing further guidelines on principles for deciding on the Community funding of research projects involving the use of human embryos and human embryonic stem cells.

The Council and the Commission will do their utmost, counting on the support of the European Parliament, to complete the legislative procedure as early as possible and at the latest in December 2003.

The Council and the Commission expect that the above mentioned seminar will contribute, as suggested by the European Parliament, to a Europe-wide and well-structured discussion process on the ethical issues of modern biotechnology, particularly on human embryonic stem cells, in order to enhance public understanding.

The Council and the Commission note that the ethical acceptability of various research fields is related to the diversity among Member States, and is governed by national law in accordance with the principle of subsidiarity. Moreover, the Commission notes that research using human embryos and human embryonic stem cells is allowed in several Member States, but not in others.”

Annex C : List of Groups of target countries for specific measures in support of International Co-operation DEVELOPING COUNTRIES (ACP, ASIA, LATIN AMERICA)

- ACP

AFRICAN

- Angola
- Benin
- Botswana
- Burkina-Faso
- Burundi
- Cameroon
- Cape Verde
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Comoros
- Congo (Republic)
- Congo (Democratic Rep. of)
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Djibouti
- Equatorial Guinea
- Eritrea
- Ethiopia
- Gabon
- Gambia
- Ghana
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Kenya
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Madagascar
- Malawi
- Mali
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mozambique
- Namibia
- Niger
- Nigeria
- Rwanda
- Sao Tome and Principe
- Senegal
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Somalia
- South Africa
- Sudan
- Swaziland

- Tanzania
- Togo
- Uganda
- Zambia
- Zimbabwe

CARIBBEAN

- Antigua and Barbuda
- Bahamas
- Barbados
- Belize*
- Cuba*
- Dominica
- Dominican Rep.
- Grenada
- Guyana*
- Haiti
- Jamaica
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Saint Vincent and Grenadines
- Suriname*
- Trinidad and Tobago

PACIFIC

- Cook Islands
- East Timor **
- Fiji
- Kiribati
- Marshall Islands
- Micronesia, Federal States of
- Nauru
- Niue
- Palau
- Papua New Guinea**
- Solomon Islands
- Tonga
- Tuvalu
- Vanuatu
- Western Samoa

- ASIA

- Bangladesh
- Bhutan
- Brunei
- Cambodia
- China***
- India***
- Indonesia
- Lao (People's Democratic Rep. of)
- Malaysia
- Maldives
- Mongolia
- Nepal
- Pakistan
- Philippines
- Singapore
- Sri Lanka
- Thailand
- Vietnam

- LATIN AMERICA

- Argentina
- Bolivia
- Brazil
- Chile
- Colombia
- Costa Rica
- Ecuador
- El Salvador
- Guatemala
- Honduras
- Mexico
- Nicaragua
- Panama
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Uruguay
- Venezuela

MEDITERRANEAN PARTNER COUNTRIES¹

- Algeria
- Egypt
- Jordan
- Lebanon
- Morocco
- Syrian Arab Rep.
- Tunisia
- West Bank and Gaza Strip

RUSSIA AND THE OTHER NEW INDEPENDENT STATES

- Armenia
- Azerbaijan
- Belarus
- Georgia
- Kazakhstan
- Kyrgyzstan
- Moldova
- Russia ***
- Tajikistan
- Turkmenistan
- Ukraine
- Uzbekistan

WESTERN BALKAN COUNTRIES

- Albania
- Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Croatia****
- Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (FYROM)
- Serbia and Montenegro²

*For participation in the « Specific measures in support of international co-operation », these countries can be considered both in ACP and Latin American regions.

**For participation in the « Specific measures in support of international co-operation », these countries can be considered both in ACP and Asian regions.

***For participation in the « Specific measures in support of international co-operation » China, India and Russia may be considered individually as a region, however, in this case, at least 3 different partners from different provinces or states within China, India or Russia are necessary.

**** On 18-06-2004 Croatia became a Candidate Country, however, Croatia is not yet an associated country to FP6 and thus remains a target country for INCO.

¹ Mediterranean partner countries were the 12 countries involved in the Barcelona process: Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Syrian Arab republic, Tunisia, Turkey, West Bank and Gaza Strip. However, Cyprus and Malta are now Member States; Turkey (Candidate Country) and Israel are associated countries to FP6.

² Including Kosovo as defined by UNSC resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999