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This Agreement (‘the Agreement’) is between the following parties:
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the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

represented for the purposes of signature of this Agreement by Head of Unit, Research Executive Agency (REA), Industrial Leadership and Societal Challenges Department, Spreading Excellence, Widening Participation, Science with and for Society, Peter VAN DER ZANDT,

and

on the other part,
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VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL (VUB), 449012406, established in PLEINLAAN 2, BRUSSEL 1050, Belgium, BE0449012406, represented for the purposes of signing the Agreement by Myriam GIJSEMANS

and the following other beneficiaries, if they sign their ‘Accession Form’ (see Annex 3 and Article 56):

2. THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST (THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST), XN45384, established in UNIVERSITY ROAD LANYON BUILDING, BELFAST BT7 1NN, United Kingdom, GB254799511,

3. UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK (UCC), CHY1691, established in WESTERN ROAD, CORK, Ireland, IE0006286E,

4. UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI SASSARI (UNISS), CF00196350904, established in PIAZZA UNIVERSITA 21, SASSARI 07100, Italy, IT00196350904,

5. WISSENSCHAFTSLADEN BONN EV (WilaBonn) EV, VR5026/CF20557831623, established in REUTERSTRASSE 157, BONN 53113, Germany, DE177825521,

6. DUBLIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (DIT), established in RATHMINES ROAD 143-149, DUBLIN 6, Ireland, IE6517909Q,

7. THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE (UCAM) GB12, established in The Old Schools, Trinity Lane, CAMBRIDGE CB2 1TN, United Kingdom, GB823847609,

8. BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST), 329749, established in FOV AM TER 8, BUDAPEST 1093, Hungary, HU15329743,

9. UNIVERSITAET VECHTA (UNIVERSITAT VECHTA), established in DRIVERSTRASSE 22, VECHTA 49377, Germany, DE811339936,

Text in *italics* shows the options of the Model Grant Agreement that are applicable to this Agreement.
10. **WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY (WU)**, 9215846, established in DROEVENDAALSESTELEG 4, WAGENINGEN 6708 PB, Netherlands, NL811383696B01,

11. **FUNDACIO PRIVADA INSTITUT DE RECERCA DE LA SIDA-CAIXA (IRSICAIXA)** ES3, 873, established in CARRETERA DE CANYET, BARCELONA 08916, Spain, ESG60813227,

12. **COMUNAUTE D'UNIVERSITES ET ETABLISSEMENTS UNIVERSITE DE LYON (UNIVERSITE DE LYON)**, 130003767, established in 92 rue du Pasteur, Lyon 69007, France,

13. **VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJU IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA (Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija)** LT3, 111967673, established in ANTAKALNIO G 54, VILNIUS 10303, Lithuania,

Unless otherwise specified, references to ‘beneficiary’ or ‘beneficiaries’ include the coordinator.

The parties referred to above have agreed to enter into the Agreement under the terms and conditions below.

By signing the Agreement or the Accession Form, the beneficiaries accept the grant and agree to implement it under their own responsibility and in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

The Agreement is composed of:

**Terms and Conditions**

- **Annex 1** Description of the action
- **Annex 2** Estimated budget for the action
- **Annex 3** Accession Forms
- **Annex 4** Model for the financial statements
- **Annex 5** Model for the certificate on the financial statements
- **Annex 6** Model for the certificate on the methodology
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CHAPTER 1   GENERAL

ARTICLE 1 — SUBJECT OF THE AGREEMENT

This Agreement sets out the rights and obligations and the terms and conditions applicable to the grant awarded to the beneficiaries for implementing the action set out in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 2   ACTION

ARTICLE 2 — ACTION TO BE IMPLEMENTED

The grant is awarded for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) — EnRRICH’ (‘action’), as described in Annex 1.

ARTICLE 3 — DURATION AND STARTING DATE OF THE ACTION

The duration of the action will be 30 months as of 1 July 2015 (‘starting date of the action’).

ARTICLE 4 — ESTIMATED BUDGET AND BUDGET TRANSFERS

4.1 Estimated budget

The ‘estimated budget’ for the action is set out in Annex 2.

It contains the estimated eligible costs and the forms of costs, broken down by beneficiary and budget category (see Articles 5, 6).

4.2 Budget transfers

The estimated budget breakdown indicated in Annex 2 may be adjusted by transfers of amounts between beneficiaries or between budget categories (or both). This does not require an amendment according to Article 55, if the action is implemented as described in Annex 1.

However, the beneficiaries may not add costs relating to subcontracts not provided for in Annex 1, unless such additional subcontracts are approved by an amendment or in accordance with Article 13.

CHAPTER 3   GRANT

ARTICLE 5 — GRANT AMOUNT, FORM OF GRANT, REIMBURSEMENT RATES AND FORMS OF COSTS

5.1 Maximum grant amount

The ‘maximum grant amount’ is EUR 1,499,396.63 (one million four hundred and ninety nine thousand three hundred and ninety six EURO and sixty three eurocents).
5.2 Form of grant, reimbursement rates and forms of costs

The grant reimburses 100% of the action's eligible costs (see Article 6) (‘reimbursement of eligible costs grant’) (see Annex 2).

The estimated eligible costs of the action are EUR 1,499,396.63 (one million four hundred and ninety nine thousand three hundred and ninety six EURO and sixty three eurocents).

Eligible costs (see Article 6) must be declared under the following forms (‘forms of costs’):

(a) for direct personnel costs:
   - as actually incurred costs (‘actual costs’) or
   - on the basis of an amount per unit calculated by the beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices (‘unit costs’).

Personnel costs for SME owners or beneficiaries that are natural persons not receiving a salary (see Article 6.2, Points A.4 and A.5) must be declared on the basis of the amount per unit set out in Annex 2 (unit costs);

(b) for direct costs for subcontracting: as actually incurred costs (actual costs);

(c) for direct costs of providing financial support to third parties: not applicable;

(d) for other direct costs: as actually incurred costs (actual costs);

(e) for indirect costs: on the basis of a flat-rate applied as set out in Article 6.2, Point E (‘flat-rate costs’);

(f) specific cost category(ies): not applicable.

5.3 Final grant amount — Calculation

The ‘final grant amount’ depends on the actual extent to which the action is implemented in accordance with the Agreement’s terms and conditions.

This amount is calculated by the Agency — when the payment of the balance is made (see Article 21.4) — in the following steps:

Step 1 – Application of the reimbursement rates to the eligible costs
Step 2 – Limit to the maximum grant amount
Step 3 – Reduction due to the no-profit rule
Step 4 – Reduction due to improper implementation or breach of other obligations

5.3.1 Step 1 — Application of the reimbursement rates to the eligible costs

The reimbursement rate(s) (see Article 5.2) are applied to the eligible costs (actual costs, unit costs and flat-rate costs; see Article 6) declared by the beneficiaries (see Article 20) and approved by the Agency (see Article 21).
5.3.2 Step 2 — Limit to the maximum grant amount

If the amount obtained following Step 1 is higher than the maximum grant amount set out in Article 5.1, it will be limited to the latter.

5.3.3 Step 3 — Reduction due to the no-profit rule

The grant must not produce a profit.

‘Profit’ means the surplus of the amount obtained following Steps 1 and 2 plus the action’s total receipts, over the action’s total eligible costs.

The ‘action’s total eligible costs’ are the consolidated total eligible costs approved by the Agency.

The ‘action’s total receipts’ are the consolidated total receipts generated during its duration (see Article 3).

The following are considered receipts:

(a) income generated by the action; if the income is generated from selling equipment or other assets purchased under the Agreement, the receipt is up to the amount declared as eligible under the Agreement;

(b) financial contributions given by third parties to the beneficiary specifically to be used for the action, and

(c) in-kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge and specifically to be used for the action, if they have been declared as eligible costs.

The following are however not considered receipts:

(a) income generated by exploiting the action’s results (see Article 28);

(b) financial contributions by third parties, if they may be used to cover costs other than the eligible costs (see Article 6);

(c) financial contributions by third parties with no obligation to repay any amount unused at the end of the period set out in Article 3.

If there is a profit, it will be deducted from the amount obtained following Steps 1 and 2.

5.3.4 Step 4 — Reduction due to improper implementation or breach of other obligations — Reduced grant amount — Calculation

If the grant is reduced (see Article 43), the Agency will calculate the reduced grant amount by deducting the amount of the reduction (calculated in proportion to the improper implementation of the action or to the seriousness of the breach of obligations in accordance with Article 43.2) from the maximum grant amount set out in Article 5.1.

The final grant amount will be the lower of the following two:
- the amount obtained following Steps 1 to 3 or
- the reduced grant amount following Step 4.

5.4 Revised final grant amount — Calculation

If — after the payment of the balance (in particular, after checks, reviews, audits or investigations; see Article 22) — the Agency rejects costs (see Article 42) or reduces the grant (see Article 43), it will calculate the ‘revised final grant amount’ for the beneficiary concerned by the findings.

This amount is calculated by the Agency on the basis of the findings, as follows:

- in case of rejection of costs: by applying the reimbursement rate to the revised eligible costs approved by the Agency for the beneficiary concerned;

- in case of reduction of the grant: by calculating the concerned beneficiary’s share in the grant amount reduced in proportion to its improper implementation of the action or to the seriousness of its breach of obligations (see Article 43.2).

In case of rejection of costs and reduction of the grant, the revised final grant amount for the beneficiary concerned will be the lower of the two amounts above.

ARTICLE 6 — ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE COSTS

6.1 General conditions for costs to be eligible

‘Eligible costs’ are costs that meet the following criteria:

(a) for actual costs:

(i) they must be actually incurred by the beneficiary;

(ii) they must be incurred in the period set out in Article 3, with the exception of costs relating to the submission of the periodic report for the last reporting period and the final report (see Article 20);

(iii) they must be indicated in the estimated budget set out in Annex 2;

(iv) they must be incurred in connection with the action as described in Annex 1 and necessary for its implementation;

(v) they must be identifiable and verifiable, in particular recorded in the beneficiary’s accounts in accordance with the accounting standards applicable in the country where the beneficiary is established and with the beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices;

(vi) they must comply with the applicable national law on taxes, labour and social security, and

(vii) they must be reasonable, justified and must comply with the principle of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy and efficiency;

(b) for unit costs:
(i) they must be calculated as follows:
   \{amounts per unit set out in Annex 2 or calculated by the beneficiary in accordance with its usual
cost accounting practices (see Article 6.2, Point A)
multiplied by
the number of actual units\};

(ii) the number of actual units must comply with the following conditions:
   - the units must be actually used or produced in the period set out in Article 3;
   - the units must be necessary for implementing the action or produced by it, and
   - the number of units must be identifiable and verifiable, in particular supported by records
   and documentation (see Article 18);

(c) for flat-rate costs:

(i) they must be calculated by applying the flat-rate set out in Annex 2, and

(ii) the costs (actual costs or unit costs) to which the flat-rate is applied must comply with the
conditions for eligibility set out in this Article.

6.2 Specific conditions for costs to be eligible

Costs are eligible if they comply with the general conditions (see above) and the specific conditions
set out below for each of the following budget categories:

   A. direct personnel costs;
   B. direct costs of subcontracting;
   C. not applicable;
   D. other direct costs;
   E. indirect costs;
   F. not applicable.

‘Direct costs’ are costs that are directly linked to the action implementation and can therefore be
attributed to it directly. They must not include any indirect costs (see Point E below).

‘Indirect costs’ are costs that are not directly linked to the action implementation and therefore cannot
be attributed directly to it.

A. Direct personnel costs

Types of eligible personnel costs

A.1 Personnel costs are eligible, if they are related to personnel working for the beneficiary under
an employment contract (or equivalent appointing act) and assigned to the action (‘costs for
employees (or equivalent)’). They must be limited to salaries (including during parental leave),
social security contributions, taxes and other costs included in the remuneration, if they arise
from national law or the employment contract (or equivalent appointing act).
Beneficiaries that are non-profit legal entities\(^2\) may also declare as personnel costs additional remuneration for personnel assigned to the action (including payments on the basis of supplementary contracts regardless of their nature), if:

(a) it is part of the beneficiary’s usual remuneration practices and is paid in a consistent manner whenever the same kind of work or expertise is required;

(b) the criteria used to calculate the supplementary payments are objective and generally applied by the beneficiary, regardless of the source of funding used.

Additional remuneration for personnel assigned to the action is eligible up to the following amount:

(a) if the person works full time and exclusively on the action during the full year: up to EUR 8 000;

(b) if the person works exclusively on the action but not full-time or not for the full year: up to the corresponding pro-rata amount of EUR 8 000, or

(c) if the person does not work exclusively on the action: up to a pro-rata amount calculated as follows:

\[
\{\text{EUR 8 000 divided by the number of annual productive hours (see below)}\}, \\
\times \text{the number of hours that the person has worked on the action during the year}
\]

A.2 The costs for natural persons working under a direct contract with the beneficiary other than an employment contract are eligible personnel costs, if:

(a) the person works under the beneficiary’s instructions and, unless otherwise agreed with the beneficiary, on the beneficiary’s premises;

(b) the result of the work carried out belongs to the beneficiary, and

(c) the costs are not significantly different from those for personnel performing similar tasks under an employment contract with the beneficiary.

A.3 The costs of personnel seconded by a third party against payment are eligible personnel costs, if the conditions in Article 11.1 are met.

---

\(^2\) For the definition, see Article 2.1(14) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘non-profit legal entity’ means a legal entity which by its legal form is non-profit-making or which has a legal or statutory obligation not to distribute profits to its shareholders or individual members.
A.4 Costs of owners of beneficiaries that are small and medium-sized enterprises (‘SME owners’) who are working on the action and who do not receive a salary are eligible personnel costs, if they correspond to the amount per unit set out in Annex 2 multiplied by the number of actual hours worked on the action.

A.5 Costs of ‘beneficiaries that are natural persons’ not receiving a salary are eligible personnel costs, if they correspond to the amount per unit set out in Annex 2 multiplied by the number of actual hours worked on the action.

**Calculation**

Personnel costs must be calculated by the beneficiaries as follows:

\[
\text{(hourly rate \times \text{the number of actual hours worked on the action}) + \text{for non-profit legal entities: additional remuneration to personnel assigned to the action under the conditions set out above (Point A.1)}}
\]

The number of actual hours declared for a person must be identifiable and verifiable (see Article 18).

The total number of hours declared in EU or Euratom grants, for a person for a year, cannot be higher than the annual productive hours used for the calculations of the hourly rate. Therefore, the maximum number of hours that can be declared for the grant is:

\[
\text{\{the number of annual productive hours for the year (see below) \minus \text{total number of hours declared by the beneficiary for that person in that year for other EU or Euratom grants}\}}
\]

The ‘hourly rate’ is one of the following:

(a) For personnel costs declared as actual costs: the hourly rate is the amount calculated as follows:

\[
\text{\{actual annual personnel costs (excluding additional remuneration) for the person \divided by \text{number of annual productive hours}\}}
\]

The beneficiaries must use the annual personnel costs and the number of annual productive hours for each financial year covered by the reporting period. If a financial year is not closed at the end of the reporting period, the beneficiaries must use the hourly rate of the last closed financial year available.

For the ‘number of annual productive hours’, the beneficiaries may choose one of the following:

(i) ‘fixed number of hours’: 1 720 hours for persons working full time (or corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time);
(ii) ‘individual annual productive hours’: the total number of hours worked by the person in the year for the beneficiary, calculated as follows:

\[
\text{annual workable hours of the person (according to the employment contract, applicable collective labour agreement or national law)}
\]
\[\text{plus}\]
\[\text{overtime worked}\]
\[\text{minus}\]
\[\text{absences (such as sick leave and special leave)}\].

‘Annual workable hours’ means the period during which the personnel must be working, at the employer’s disposal and carrying out his/her activity or duties under the employment contract, applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation.

If the contract (or applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation) does not allow to determine the annual workable hours, this option cannot be used;

(iii) ‘standard annual productive hours’: the ‘standard number of annual hours’ generally applied by the beneficiary for its personnel in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices. This number must be at least 90% of the ‘standard annual workable hours’.

If there is no applicable reference for the standard annual workable hours, this option cannot be used.

For all options, the actual time spent on parental leave by a person assigned to the action may be deducted from the number of annual productive hours;

(b) for personnel costs declared on the basis of unit costs: the hourly rate is one of the following:

(i) for SME owners or beneficiaries that are natural persons: the hourly rate set out in Annex 2 (see Points A.4 and A.5 above), or

(ii) for personnel costs declared on the basis of the beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices: the hourly rate calculated by the beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices, if:

- the cost accounting practices used are applied in a consistent manner, based on objective criteria, regardless of the source of funding;

- the hourly rate is calculated using the actual personnel costs recorded in the beneficiary’s accounts, excluding any ineligible cost or costs included in other budget categories.

The actual personnel costs may be adjusted by the beneficiary on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements. Those elements must be relevant for calculating
the personnel costs, reasonable and correspond to objective and verifiable information;

and

- the hourly rate is calculated using the number of annual productive hours (see above).

B. Direct costs of subcontracting (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible value added tax (VAT) paid by the beneficiary) are eligible if the conditions in Article 13.1.1 are met.

C. Direct costs of providing financial support to third parties not applicable.

D. Other direct costs

D.1 Travel costs and related subsistence allowances (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible value added tax (VAT) paid by the beneficiary) are eligible if they are in line with the beneficiary’s usual practices on travel.

D.2 The depreciation costs of equipment, infrastructure or other assets (new or second-hand) as recorded in the beneficiary’s accounts are eligible, if they were purchased in accordance with Article 10.1.1 and written off in accordance with international accounting standards and the beneficiary’s usual accounting practices.

The costs of renting or leasing equipment, infrastructure or other assets (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible value added tax (VAT) paid by the beneficiary) are also eligible, if they do not exceed the depreciation costs of similar equipment, infrastructure or assets and do not include any financing fees.

The costs of equipment, infrastructure or other assets contributed in-kind against payment are eligible, if they do not exceed the depreciation costs of similar equipment, infrastructure or assets, do not include any financing fees and if the conditions in Article 11.1 are met.

The only portion of the costs that will be taken into account is that which corresponds to the duration of the action and rate of actual use for the purposes of the action.

D.3 Costs of other goods and services (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible value added tax (VAT) paid by the beneficiary) are eligible, if they are:

(a) purchased specifically for the action and in accordance with Article 10.1.1 or

(b) contributed in kind against payment and in accordance with Article 11.1.

Such goods and services include, for instance, consumables and supplies, dissemination (including open access), protection of results, certificates on the financial statements (if they are required by the Agreement), certificates on the methodology, translations and publications.
D.4 **Capitalised and operating costs of ‘large research infrastructure’**³ directly used for the action are eligible, if:

(a) the value of the large research infrastructure represents at least 75% of the total fixed assets (at historical value in its last closed balance sheet before the date of the signature of the Agreement or as determined on the basis of the rental and leasing costs of the research infrastructure⁴);

(b) the beneficiary’s methodology for declaring the costs for large research infrastructure has been positively assessed by the Commission (‘ex-ante assessment’);

(c) the beneficiary declares as direct eligible costs only the portion which corresponds to the duration of the action and the rate of actual use for the purposes of the action, and

(d) they comply with the conditions as further detailed in the annotations to the H2020 grant agreements.

E. **Indirect costs**

Indirect costs are eligible if they are declared on the basis of the flat-rate of 25% of the eligible direct costs (see Article 5.2 and Points A to D above), from which are excluded:

(a) costs of subcontracting and

(b) costs of in-kind contributions provided by third parties which are not used on the beneficiary’s premises;

(c) not applicable;

(d) not applicable.

Beneficiaries receiving an operating grant⁵ financed by the EU or Euratom budget cannot declare indirect costs for the period covered by the operating grant.

---

³ ‘Large research infrastructure’ means research infrastructure of a total value of at least EUR 20 million, for a beneficiary, calculated as the sum of historical asset values of each individual research infrastructure of that beneficiary, as they appear in its last closed balance sheet before the date of the signature of the Agreement or as determined on the basis of the rental and leasing costs of the research infrastructure.

⁴ For the definition, see Article 2(6) of Regulation (EU) No 1291/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 December 2013 establishing Horizon 2020 - the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020) (OJ L 347, 20.12.2013 p.104)-('Horizon 2020 Framework Programme Regulation No 1291/2013'): ‘Research infrastructure’ are facilities, resources and services that are used by the research communities to conduct research and foster innovation in their fields. Where relevant, they may be used beyond research, e.g. for education or public services. They include: major scientific equipment (or sets of instruments); knowledge-based resources such as collections, archives or scientific data; e-infrastructures such as data and computing systems and communication networks; and any other infrastructure of a unique nature essential to achieve excellence in research and innovation. Such infrastructures may be ‘single-sited’, ‘virtual’ or ‘distributed’.

⁵ For the definition, see Article 121(1)(b) of Regulation (EU, Euratom) No 966/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2012 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union and repealing Council Regulation (EC, Euratom) No 1605/2002 (OJ L 218, 26.10.2012, p.1) (‘Financial Regulation No 966/2012’): ‘operating grant’ means direct financial contribution, by way of donation, from the budget in order to finance the functioning of a body which pursues an aim of general EU interest or has an objective forming part of and supporting an EU policy.
F. Specific cost category(ies)

Not applicable

6.3 Conditions for costs of linked third parties to be eligible

not applicable

6.4 Conditions for in-kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge to be eligible

In-kind contributions provided free of charge are eligible direct costs (for the beneficiary), if the costs incurred by the third party fulfil — mutatis mutandis — the general and specific conditions for eligibility set out in this Article (Article 6.1 and 6.2) and Article 12.1.

6.5 Ineligible costs

‘Ineligible costs’ are:

(a) costs that do not comply with the conditions set out above (Article 6.1 to 6.4), in particular:

(i) costs related to return on capital;

(ii) debt and debt service charges;

(iii) provisions for future losses or debts;

(iv) interest owed;

(v) doubtful debts;

(vi) currency exchange losses;

(vii) bank costs charged by the beneficiary’s bank for transfers from the Agency;

(viii) excessive or reckless expenditure;

(ix) deductible VAT;

(x) costs incurred during suspension of the implementation of the action (see Article 49);

(b) costs declared under another EU or Euratom grant (including grants awarded by a Member State and financed by the EU or Euratom budget and grants awarded by bodies other than the Agency for the purpose of implementing the EU or Euratom budget); in particular, indirect costs if the beneficiary is already receiving an operating grant financed by the EU or Euratom budget in the same period.

6.6 Consequences of declaration of ineligible costs

Declared costs that are ineligible will be rejected (see Article 42).

This may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 4 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS OF THE PARTIES

SECTION 1 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO IMPLEMENTING THE ACTION

ARTICLE 7 — GENERAL OBLIGATION TO PROPERLY IMPLEMENT THE ACTION

7.1 General obligation to properly implement the action

The beneficiaries must implement the action as described in Annex 1 and in compliance with the provisions of the Agreement and all legal obligations under applicable EU, international and national law.

7.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 8 — RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT THE ACTION — THIRD PARTIES INVOLVED IN THE ACTION

The beneficiaries must have the appropriate resources to implement the action.

If it is necessary to implement the action, the beneficiaries may:

- purchase goods, works and services (see Article 10);
- use in-kind contributions provided by third parties against payment (see Article 11);
- use in-kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge (see Article 12);
- call upon subcontractors to implement action tasks described in Annex 1 (see Article 13);
- call upon linked third parties to implement action tasks described in Annex 1 (see Article 14).

In these cases, the beneficiaries retain sole responsibility towards the Agency and the other beneficiaries for implementing the action.

ARTICLE 9 — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY BENEFICIARIES NOT RECEIVING EU FUNDING

Not applicable

ARTICLE 10 — PURCHASE OF GOODS, WORKS OR SERVICES

10.1 Rules for purchasing goods, works or services

10.1.1 If necessary to implement the action, the beneficiaries may purchase goods, works or services.
The beneficiaries must make such purchases ensuring the best value for money or, if appropriate, the lowest price. In doing so, they must avoid any conflict of interests (see Article 35).

The beneficiaries must ensure that the Agency, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) can exercise their rights under Articles 22 and 23 also towards their contractors.

10.1.2 Beneficiaries that are ‘contracting authorities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC must comply with the applicable national law on public procurement.

10.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under Article 10.1.1, the costs related to the contract concerned will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under Article 10.1.2, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 11 — USE OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS PROVIDED BY THIRD PARTIES AGAINST PAYMENT

11.1 Rules for the use of in-kind contributions against payment

If necessary to implement the action, the beneficiaries may use in-kind contributions provided by third parties against payment.

The beneficiaries may declare costs related to the payment of in-kind contributions as eligible (see Article 6.1 and 6.2), up to the third parties’ costs for the seconded persons, contributed equipment, infrastructure or other assets or other contributed goods and services.

The third parties and their contributions must be set out in Annex 1. The Agency may however approve in-kind contributions not set out in Annex 1 without amendment (see Article 55), if:

- they are specifically justified in the periodic technical report and

- their use does not entail changes to the Agreement which would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants.

The beneficiaries must ensure that the Agency, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) can exercise their rights under Articles 22 and 23 also towards the third parties.

---


11.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the costs related to the payment of the in-kind contribution will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 12 — USE OF IN-KIND CONTRIBUTIONS PROVIDED BY THIRD PARTIES FREE OF CHARGE

12.1 Rules for the use of in-kind contributions free of charge

If necessary to implement the action, the beneficiaries may use in-kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge.

The beneficiaries may declare costs incurred by the third parties for the seconded persons, contributed equipment, infrastructure or other assets or other contributed goods and services as eligible in accordance with Article 6.4.

The third parties and their contributions must be set out in Annex 1. The Agency may however approve in-kind contributions not set out in Annex 1 without amendment (see Article 55), if:

- they are specifically justified in the periodic technical report and
- their use does not entail changes to the Agreement which would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants.

The beneficiaries must ensure that the Agency, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) can exercise their rights under Articles 22 and 23 also towards the third parties.

12.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the costs incurred by the third parties related to the in-kind contribution will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 13 — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY SUBCONTRACTORS

13.1 Rules for subcontracting action tasks

13.1.1 If necessary to implement the action, the beneficiaries may award subcontracts covering the implementation of certain action tasks described in Annex 1.

Subcontracting may cover only a limited part of the action.

The beneficiaries must award the subcontracts ensuring the best value for money or, if appropriate, the lowest price. In doing so, they must avoid any conflict of interests (see Article 35).

The tasks to be implemented and the estimated cost for each subcontract must be set out in Annex 1 and the total estimated costs of subcontracting per beneficiary must be set out in Annex 2.
Agency may however approve subcontracts not set out in Annex 1 and 2 without amendment (see Article 55), if:

- they are specifically justified in the periodic technical report and

- they do not entail changes to the Agreement which would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants.

The beneficiaries must ensure that the Agency, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) can exercise their rights under Articles 22 and 23 also towards their subcontractors.

13.1.2 The beneficiaries must ensure that their obligations under Articles 35, 36, 38 and 46 also apply to the subcontractors.

Beneficiaries that are ‘contracting authorities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC must comply with the applicable national law on public procurement.

13.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under Article 13.1.1, the costs related to the subcontract concerned will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under Article 13.1.2, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 14 — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY LINKED THIRD PARTIES

Not applicable

ARTICLE 15 — FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES

15.1 Rules for providing financial support to third parties

Not applicable

15.2 Financial support in the form of prizes

Not applicable

15.3 Consequences of non-compliance

Not applicable
ARTICLE 16 — PROVISION OF TRANS-NATIONAL OR VIRTUAL ACCESS TO RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

16.1 Rules for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure

Not applicable

16.2 Rules for providing virtual access to research infrastructure

Not applicable

16.3 Consequences of non-compliance

Not applicable

SECTION 2 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO THE GRANT ADMINISTRATION

ARTICLE 17 — GENERAL OBLIGATION TO INFORM

17.1 General obligation to provide information upon request

The beneficiaries must provide — during implementation of the action or afterwards and in accordance with Article 41.2 — any information requested in order to verify eligibility of the costs, proper implementation of the action and compliance with any other obligation under the Agreement.

17.2 Obligation to keep information up to date and to inform about events and circumstances likely to affect the Agreement

Each beneficiary must keep information stored in the 'Beneficiary Register' (via the electronic exchange system; see Article 52) up to date, in particular, its name, address, legal representatives, legal form and organisation type.

Each beneficiary must immediately inform the coordinator — which must immediately inform the Agency and the other beneficiaries — of any of the following:

(a) events which are likely to affect significantly or delay the implementation of the action or the EU’s financial interests, in particular:

   (i) changes in its legal, financial, technical, organisational or ownership situation

(b) circumstances affecting:

   (i) the decision to award the grant or

   (ii) compliance with requirements under the Agreement.
17.3 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 18 — KEEPING RECORDS — SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

18.1 Obligation to keep records and other supporting documentation

The beneficiaries must — for a period of five years after the payment of the balance — keep records and other supporting documentation in order to prove the proper implementation of the action and the costs they declare as eligible.

They must make them available upon request (see Article 17) or in the context of checks, reviews, audits or investigations (see Article 22).

If there are on-going checks, reviews, audits, investigations, litigation or other pursuits of claims under the Agreement (including the extension of findings; see Articles 22), the beneficiaries must keep the records and other supporting documentation until the end of these procedures.

The beneficiaries must keep the original documents. Digital and digitalised documents are considered originals if they are authorised by the applicable national law. The Agency may accept non-original documents if it considers that they offer a comparable level of assurance.

18.1.1 Records and other supporting documentation on the scientific and technical implementation

The beneficiaries must keep records and other supporting documentation on scientific and technical implementation of the action in line with the accepted standards in the respective field.

18.1.2 Records and other documentation to support the costs declared

The beneficiaries must keep the records and documentation supporting the costs declared, in particular the following:

(a) for actual costs: adequate records and other supporting documentation to prove the costs declared, such as contracts, subcontracts, invoices and accounting records. In addition, the beneficiaries’ usual cost accounting practices and internal control procedures must enable direct reconciliation between the amounts declared, the amounts recorded in their accounts and the amounts stated in the supporting documentation;

(b) for unit costs: adequate records and other supporting documentation to prove the number of units declared. Beneficiaries do not need to identify the actual eligible costs covered or to keep or provide supporting documentation (such as accounting statements) to prove the amount per unit.

In addition, for direct personnel costs declared as unit costs calculated in accordance with the beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices, the beneficiaries must keep adequate...
records and documentation to prove that the cost accounting practices used comply with the conditions set out in Article 6.2, Point A.

The beneficiaries may submit to the Commission, for approval, a certificate (drawn up in accordance with Annex 6) stating that their usual cost accounting practices comply with these conditions (‘certificate on the methodology’). If the certificate is approved, costs declared in line with this methodology will not be challenged subsequently, unless the beneficiaries have concealed information for the purpose of the approval.

(c) for flat-rate costs: adequate records and other supporting documentation to prove the eligibility of the costs to which the flat-rate is applied. The beneficiaries do not need to identify the costs covered or provide supporting documentation (such as accounting statements) to prove the amount declared at a flat-rate.

In addition, for personnel costs (declared as actual costs or on the basis of unit costs), the beneficiaries must keep time records for the number of hours declared. The time records must be in writing and approved by the persons working on the action and their supervisors, at least monthly. In the absence of reliable time records of the hours worked on the action, the Agency may accept alternative evidence supporting the number of hours declared, if it considers that it offers an adequate level of assurance.

As an exception, for persons working exclusively on the action, there is no need to keep time records, if the beneficiary signs a declaration confirming that the persons concerned have worked exclusively on the action.

18.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, costs insufficiently substantiated will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42), and the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 19 — SUBMISSION OF DELIVERABLES

19.1 Obligation to submit deliverables

The coordinator must submit the ‘deliverables’ identified in Annex 1, in accordance with the timing and conditions set out in it.

19.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If the coordinator breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply any of the measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 20 — REPORTING — PAYMENT REQUESTS

20.1 Obligation to submit reports

The coordinator must submit to the Agency (see Article 52) the technical and financial reports set out in this Article. These reports include the requests for payment and must be drawn up using the forms and templates provided in the electronic exchange system (see Article 52).
20.2 Reporting periods

The action is divided into the following ‘reporting periods’:

- RP1: from month 1 to month 12
- RP2: from month 13 to month 30

20.3 Periodic reports — Requests for interim payments

The coordinator must submit a periodic report within 60 days following the end of each reporting period.

The periodic report must include the following:

(a) a ‘periodic technical report’ containing:

   (i) an explanation of the work carried out by the beneficiaries;

   (ii) an overview of the progress towards the objectives of the action, including milestones and deliverables identified in Annex 1.

   This report must include explanations justifying the differences between work expected to be carried out in accordance with Annex 1 and that actually carried out.

   The report must also detail the exploitation and dissemination of the results and — if required in Annex 1 — an updated ‘plan for the exploitation and dissemination of the results’;

   (iii) a summary for publication by the Agency;

   (iv) the answers to the ‘questionnaire’, covering issues related to the action implementation and the economic and societal impact, notably in the context of the Horizon 2020 key performance indicators and the Horizon 2020 monitoring requirements;

(b) a ‘periodic financial report’ containing:

   (i) an ‘individual financial statement’ (see Annex 4) from each beneficiary, for the reporting period concerned.

   The individual financial statement must detail the eligible costs (actual costs, unit costs and flat-rate costs; see Article 6) for each budget category (see Annex 2).

   The beneficiaries must declare all eligible costs, even if — for actual costs, unit costs and flat-rate costs — they exceed the amounts indicated in the estimated budget (see Annex 2). Amounts which are not declared in the individual financial statement will not be taken into account by the Agency.

   If an individual financial statement is not submitted for a reporting period, it may be included in the periodic financial report for the next reporting period.
The individual financial statements of the last reporting period must also detail the **receipts of the action** (see Article 5.3.3).

Each beneficiary must **certify** that:

- the information provided is full, reliable and true;
- the costs declared are eligible (see Article 6);
- the costs can be substantiated by adequate records and supporting documentation (see Article 18) that will be produced upon request (see Article 17) or in the context of checks, reviews, audits and investigations (see Article 22), and
- for the last reporting period: that all the receipts have been declared (see Article 5.3.3);

(ii) an **explanation of the use of resources** and the information on subcontracting (see Article 13) and in-kind contributions provided by third parties (see Articles 11 and 12) from each beneficiary, for the reporting period concerned;

(iii) **not applicable**;

(iv) a ‘**periodic summary financial statement**’ (see Annex 4), created automatically by the electronic exchange system, consolidating the individual financial statements for the reporting period concerned and including — except for the last reporting period — the **request for interim payment**.

### 20.4 Final report — Request for payment of the balance

In addition to the periodic report for the last reporting period, the coordinator must submit the final report within 60 days following the end of the last reporting period.

The **final report** must include the following:

(a) a ‘**final technical report**’ with a **summary** for publication containing:

   (i) an overview of the results and their exploitation and dissemination;

   (ii) the conclusions on the action, and

   (iii) the socio-economic impact of the action;

(b) a ‘**final financial report**’ containing:

   (i) a ‘**final summary financial statement**’ (see Annex 4), created automatically by the electronic exchange system, consolidating the individual financial statements for all reporting periods and including the **request for payment of the balance** and
(ii) a ‘certificate on the financial statements’ (drawn up in accordance with Annex 5) for each beneficiary, if it requests a total contribution of EUR 325,000 or more, as reimbursement of actual costs and unit costs calculated on the basis of its usual cost accounting practices (see Article 5.2 and Article 6.2, Point A).

20.5 Information on cumulative expenditure incurred

Not applicable

20.6 Currency for financial statements and conversion into euro

Financial statements must be drafted in euro.

Beneficiaries with accounting established in a currency other than the euro must convert the costs recorded in their accounts into euro, at the average of the daily exchange rates published in the C series of the Official Journal of the European Union, calculated over the corresponding reporting period.

If no daily euro exchange rate is published in the Official Journal of the European Union for the currency in question, they must be converted at the average of the monthly accounting rates published on the Commission’s website, calculated over the corresponding reporting period.

Beneficiaries with accounting established in euro must convert costs incurred in another currency into euro according to their usual accounting practices.

20.7 Language of reports

All reports (technical and financial reports, including financial statements) must be submitted in the language of the Agreement.

20.8 Consequences of non-compliance — Suspension of the payment deadline — Termination

If the reports submitted do not comply with this Article, the Agency may suspend the payment deadline (see Article 47) and apply any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

If the coordinator breaches its obligation to submit the reports and if it fails to comply with this obligation within 30 days following a written reminder sent by the Agency, the Agreement may be terminated (see Article 50).

ARTICLE 21 — PAYMENTS AND PAYMENT ARRANGEMENTS

21.1 Payments to be made

The following payments will be made to the coordinator:

- one pre-financing payment;

- one or more interim payments, on the basis of the request(s) for interim payment (see Article 20), and

- one payment of the balance, on the basis of the request for payment of the balance (see Article 20).
21.2 Pre-financing payment — Amount — Amount retained for the Guarantee Fund

The aim of the pre-financing is to provide the beneficiaries with a float.

It remains the property of the EU until the payment of the balance.

The amount of the pre-financing payment will be EUR 749,698.32 (seven hundred and forty nine thousand six hundred and ninety eight EURO and thirty two eurocents).

The Agency will — except if Article 48 applies — make the pre-financing payment to the coordinator within 30 days either from the entry into force of the Agreement (see Article 58) or from 10 days before the starting date of the action (see Article 3), whichever is the latest.

An amount of EUR 74,969.83 (seventy four thousand nine hundred and sixty nine EURO and eighty three eurocents), corresponding to 5% of the maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1), is retained by the Agency from the pre-financing payment and transferred into the ‘Guarantee Fund’.

21.3 Interim payments — Amount — Calculation

Interim payments reimburse the eligible costs incurred for the implementation of the action during the corresponding reporting periods.

The Agency will pay to the coordinator the amount due as interim payment within 90 days from receiving the periodic report (see Article 20.3), except if Articles 47 or 48 apply.

Payment is subject to the approval of the periodic report. Its approval does not imply recognition of the compliance, authenticity, completeness or correctness of its content.

The amount due as interim payment is calculated by the Agency in the following steps:

   Step 1 – Application of the reimbursement rates

   Step 2 – Limit to 90% of the maximum grant amount

21.3.1 Step 1 — Application of the reimbursement rates

The reimbursement rate(s) (see Article 5.2) are applied to the eligible costs (actual costs, unit costs and flat-rate costs ; see Article 6) declared by the beneficiaries (see Article 20) and approved by the Agency (see above) for the concerned reporting period.

21.3.2 Step 2 — Limit to 90% of the maximum grant amount

The total amount of pre-financing and interim payments must not exceed 90% of the maximum grant amount set out in Article 5.1. The maximum amount for the interim payment will be calculated as follows:

\[
\{90\% \text{ of the maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1)}\} - \{\text{pre-financing and previous interim payments}\}.
\]
21.4 Payment of the balance — Amount — Calculation — Release of the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund

The payment of the balance reimburses the remaining part of the eligible costs incurred by the beneficiaries for the implementation of the action.

If the total amount of earlier payments is greater than the final grant amount (see Article 5.3), the payment of the balance takes the form of a recovery (see Article 44).

If the total amount of earlier payments is lower than the final grant amount, the Agency will pay the balance within 90 days from receiving the final report (see Article 20.4), except if Articles 47 or 48 apply.

Payment is subject to the approval of the final report. Its approval does not imply recognition of the compliance, authenticity, completeness or correctness of its content.

The amount due as the balance is calculated by the Agency by deducting the total amount of pre-financing and interim payments (if any) already made, from the final grant amount determined in accordance with Article 5.3:

\[
\text{final grant amount (see Article 5.3)} - \text{pre-financing and interim payments (if any) made}
\]

At the payment of the balance, the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund (see above) will be released and:

- if the balance is positive: the amount released will be paid in full to the coordinator together with the amount due as the balance;

- if the balance is negative (payment of the balance taking the form of recovery): it will be deducted from the amount released (see Article 44.1.2). If the resulting amount:

  - is positive, it will be paid to the coordinator
  - is negative, it will be recovered.

The amount to be paid may however be offset — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any other amount owed by the beneficiary to the Agency, the Commission or another executive agency (under the EU or Euratom budget), up to the maximum EU contribution indicated, for that beneficiary, in the estimated budget (see Annex 2).

21.5 Notification of amounts due

When making payments, the Agency will formally notify to the coordinator the amount due, specifying whether it concerns an interim payment or the payment of the balance.

For the payment of the balance, the notification will also specify the final grant amount.
In the case of reduction of the grant or recovery of undue amounts, the notification will be preceded by the contradictory procedure set out in Articles 43 and 44.

**21.6 Currency for payments**

The *Agency* will make all payments in euro.

**21.7 Payments to the coordinator — Distribution to the beneficiaries**

Payments will be made to the coordinator.

Payments to the coordinator will discharge the *Agency* from its payment obligation.

The coordinator must distribute the payments between the beneficiaries without unjustified delay.

Pre-financing may however be distributed only:

(a) if the minimum number of beneficiaries set out in the call for proposals has acceded to the Agreement (see Article 56) and

(b) to beneficiaries that have acceded to the Agreement (see Article 56).

**21.8 Bank account for payments**

All payments will be made to the following bank account:

- **Name of bank:** BNP PARIBAS FORTIS (FORTIS BANK SA/NV)
- **Address of branch:** 3, MONTAGNE DU PARC BRUSSELS, Belgium
- **Full name of the account holder:** VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL
- **Full account number (including bank codes):**
- **IBAN code:** BE10001340957504

**21.9 Costs of payment transfers**

The cost of the payment transfers is borne as follows:

- the *Agency* bears the cost of transfers charged by its bank;
- the beneficiary bears the cost of transfers charged by its bank;
- the party causing a repetition of a transfer bears all costs of the repeated transfer.

**21.10 Date of payment**

Payments by the *Agency* are considered to have been carried out on the date when they are debited to its account.

**21.11 Consequences of non-compliance**

21.11.1 If the *Agency* does not pay within the payment deadlines (see above), the beneficiaries are entitled to **late-payment interest** at the rate applied by the European Central Bank (ECB) for its main
refinancing operations in euros (‘reference rate’), plus three and a half points. The reference rate is the rate in force on the first day of the month in which the payment deadline expires, as published in the C series of the Official Journal of the European Union.

If the late-payment interest is lower than or equal to EUR 200, it will be paid to the coordinator only upon request submitted within two months of receiving the late payment.

Late-payment interest is not due if all beneficiaries are EU Member States (including regional and local government authorities or other public bodies acting on behalf of a Member State for the purpose of this Agreement).

Suspension of the payment deadline or payments (see Articles 47 and 48) will not be considered as late payment.

Late-payment interest covers the period running from the day following the due date for payment (see above), up to and including the date of payment.

Late-payment interest is not considered for the purposes of calculating the final grant amount.

21.11.2 If the coordinator breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43) and the Agreement or the participation of the coordinator may be terminated (see Article 50).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 22 — CHECKS, REVIEWS, AUDITS AND INVESTIGATIONS — EXTENSION OF FINDINGS

22.1 Checks, reviews and audits by the Agency and the Commission

22.1.1 Right to carry out checks

The Agency or the Commission will — during the implementation of the action or afterwards — check the proper implementation of the action and compliance with the obligations under the Agreement, including assessing deliverables and reports.

For this purpose the Agency or the Commission may be assisted by external persons or bodies.

The Agency or the Commission may also request additional information in accordance with Article 17. The Agency or the Commission may request beneficiaries to provide such information to it directly.

Information provided must be accurate, precise and complete and in the format requested, including electronic format.

22.1.2 Right to carry out reviews

The Agency or the Commission may — during the implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out reviews on the proper implementation of the action (including assessment of deliverables and reports), compliance with the obligations under the Agreement and continued scientific or technological relevance of the action.
Reviews may be started up to two years after the payment of the balance. They will be formally notified to the coordinator or beneficiary concerned and will be considered to have started on the date of the formal notification.

If the review is carried out on a third party (see Articles 10 to 16), the beneficiary concerned must inform the third party.

The Agency or the Commission may carry out reviews directly (using its own staff) or indirectly (using external persons or bodies appointed to do so). It will inform the coordinator or beneficiary concerned of the identity of the external persons or bodies. They have the right to object to the appointment on grounds of commercial confidentiality.

The coordinator or beneficiary concerned must provide — within the deadline requested — any information and data in addition to deliverables and reports already submitted (including information on the use of resources). The Agency or the Commission may request beneficiaries to provide such information to it directly.

The coordinator or beneficiary concerned may be requested to participate in meetings, including with external experts.

For on-the-spot reviews, the beneficiaries must allow access to their sites and premises, including to external persons or bodies, and must ensure that information requested is readily available.

Information provided must be accurate, precise and complete and in the format requested, including electronic format.

On the basis of the review findings, a ‘review report’ will be drawn up.

The Agency or the Commission will formally notify the review report to the coordinator or beneficiary concerned, which has 30 days to formally notify observations (‘contradictory review procedure’).

Reviews (including review reports) are in the language of the Agreement.

22.1.3 Right to carry out audits

The Agency or the Commission may — during the implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out audits on the proper implementation of the action and compliance with the obligations under the Agreement.

Audits may be started up to two years after the payment of the balance. They will be formally notified to the coordinator or beneficiary concerned and will be considered to have started on the date of the formal notification.

If the audit is carried out on a third party (see Articles 10 to 16), the beneficiary concerned must inform the third party.

The Agency or the Commission may carry out audits directly (using its own staff) or indirectly (using external persons or bodies appointed to do so). It will inform the coordinator or beneficiary concerned of the identity of the external persons or bodies. They have the right to object to the appointment on grounds of commercial confidentiality.
The coordinator or beneficiary concerned must provide — within the deadline requested — any information (including complete accounts, individual salary statements or other personal data) to verify compliance with the Agreement. The Agency or the Commission may request beneficiaries to provide such information to it directly.

For on-the-spot audits, the beneficiaries must allow access to their sites and premises, including to external persons or bodies, and must ensure that information requested is readily available.

Information provided must be accurate, precise and complete and in the format requested, including electronic format.

On the basis of the audit findings, a ‘draft audit report’ will be drawn up.

The Agency or the Commission will formally notify the draft audit report to the coordinator or beneficiary concerned, which has 30 days to formally notify observations (‘contradictory audit procedure’). This period may be extended by the Agency or the Commission in justified cases.

The ‘final audit report’ will take into account observations by the coordinator or beneficiary concerned. The report will be formally notified to it.

Audits (including audit reports) are in the language of the Agreement.

The Agency or the Commission may also access the beneficiaries’ statutory records for the periodical assessment of unit costs or flat-rate amounts.

22.2 Investigations by the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF)

Under Regulations No 883/2013 and No 2185/96 (and in accordance with their provisions and procedures) the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) may — at any moment during implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out investigations, including on-the-spot checks and inspections, to establish whether there has been fraud, corruption or any other illegal activity affecting the financial interests of the EU.

22.3 Checks and audits by the European Court of Auditors (ECA)

Under Article 287 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) and Article 161 of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) may — at any moment during implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out audits.

The ECA has the right of access for the purpose of checks and audits.

22.4 Checks, reviews, audits and investigations for international organisations

Not applicable

22.5 Consequences of findings in checks, reviews, audits and investigations — Extension of findings

22.5.1 Findings in this grant

Findings in checks, reviews, audits or investigations carried out in the context of this grant may lead to the rejection of ineligible costs (see Article 42), reduction of the grant (see Article 43), recovery of undue amounts (see Article 44) or to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

Rejection of costs or reduction of the grant after the payment of the balance will lead to a revised final grant amount (see Article 5.4).

Findings in checks, reviews, audits or investigations may lead to a request for amendment for the modification of Annex 1 (see Article 55).

Checks, reviews, audits or investigations that find systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or breach of obligations may also lead to consequences in other EU or Euratom grants awarded under similar conditions (‘extension of findings from this grant to other grants’).

Moreover, findings arising from an OLAF investigation may lead to criminal prosecution under national law.

22.5.2 Findings in other grants

The Agency or the Commission may extend findings from other grants to this grant (‘extension of findings from other grants to this grant’), if:

(a) the beneficiary concerned is found, in other EU or Euratom grants awarded under similar conditions, to have committed systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or breach of obligations that have a material impact on this grant and

(b) those findings are formally notified to the beneficiary concerned — together with the list of grants affected by the findings — no later than two years after the payment of the balance of this grant.

The extension of findings may lead to the rejection of costs (see Article 42), reduction of the grant (see Article 43), recovery of undue amounts (see Article 44), suspension of payments (see Article 48), suspension of the action implementation (see Article 49) or termination (see Article 50).

22.5.3 Procedure

The Agency or the Commission will formally notify the beneficiary concerned the systemic or recurrent errors and its intention to extend these audit findings, together with the list of grants affected.

22.5.3.1 If the findings concern eligibility of costs: the formal notification will include:

(a) an invitation to submit observations on the list of grants affected by the findings;
(b) the request to submit **revised financial statements** for all grants affected;

(c) the **correction rate for extrapolation** established by the *Agency or the Commission* on the basis of the systemic or recurrent errors, to calculate the amounts to be rejected if the beneficiary concerned:

(i) considers that the submission of revised financial statements is not possible or practicable or

(ii) does not submit revised financial statements.

The beneficiary concerned has 90 days from receiving notification to submit observations, revised financial statements or to propose a duly substantiated **alternative correction method**. This period may be extended by the *Agency or the Commission* in justified cases.

The amounts to be rejected will be determined on the basis of the revised financial statements, subject to their approval.

If the *Agency or the Commission* does not receive any observations or revised financial statements, does not accept the observations or the proposed alternative correction method or does not approve the revised financial statements, it will formally notify the beneficiary concerned the application of the initially notified correction rate for extrapolation.

If the *Agency or the Commission* accepts the alternative correction method proposed by the beneficiary concerned, it will formally notify the application of the accepted alternative correction method.

**22.5.3.2** If the findings concern **improper implementation** or a **breach of another obligation**: the formal notification will include:

(a) an invitation to submit observations on the list of grants affected by the findings and

(b) the flat-rate the *Agency or the Commission* intends to apply according to the principle of proportionality.

The beneficiary concerned has 90 days from receiving notification to submit observations or to propose a duly substantiated alternative flat-rate.

If the *Agency or the Commission* does not receive any observations or does not accept the observations or the proposed alternative flat-rate, it will formally notify the beneficiary concerned the application of the initially notified flat-rate.

If the *Agency or the Commission* accepts the alternative flat-rate proposed by the beneficiary concerned, it will formally notify the application of the accepted alternative flat-rate.

**22.6 Consequences of non-compliance**

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, any insufficiently substantiated costs will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.
ARTICLE 23 — EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE ACTION

23.1 Right to evaluate the impact of the action

The Agency or the Commission may carry out interim and final evaluations of the impact of the action measured against the objective of the EU programme.

Evaluations may be started during implementation of the action and up to five years after the payment of the balance. The evaluation is considered to start on the date of the formal notification to the coordinator or beneficiaries.

The Agency or the Commission may make these evaluations directly (using its own staff) or indirectly (using external bodies or persons it has authorised to do so).

The coordinator or beneficiaries must provide any information relevant to evaluate the impact of the action, including information in electronic format.

23.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply the measures described in Chapter 6.

SECTION 3 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO BACKGROUND AND RESULTS

SUBSECTION 1 GENERAL

ARTICLE 23a — MANAGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

23a.1 Obligation to take measures to implement the Commission Recommendation on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities

Beneficiaries that are universities or other public research organisations must take measures to implement the principles set out in Points 1 and 2 of the Code of Practice annexed to the Commission Recommendation on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities. This does not change the obligations set out in Subsections 2 and 3 of this Section.

The beneficiaries must ensure that researchers and third parties involved in the action are aware of them.

23a.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply any of the measures described in Chapter 6.

18 Commission Recommendation C (2008) 1329 of 10.4.2008 on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and the Code of Practice for universities and other public research institutions attached to this recommendation.
SUBSECTION 2 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO BACKGROUND

ARTICLE 24 — AGREEMENT ON BACKGROUND

24.1 Agreement on background

The beneficiaries must identify and agree (in writing) on the background for the action (‘agreement on background’).

‘Background’ means any data, know-how or information — whatever its form or nature (tangible or intangible), including any rights such as intellectual property rights — that:

(a) is held by the beneficiaries before they acceded to the Agreement, and

(b) is needed to implement the action or exploit the results.

24.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 25 — ACCESS RIGHTS TO BACKGROUND

25.1 Exercise of access rights — Waiving of access rights — No sub-licensing

To exercise access rights, this must first be requested in writing (‘request for access’).

‘Access rights’ means rights to use results or background under the terms and conditions laid down in this Agreement.

Waivers of access rights are not valid unless in writing.

Unless agreed otherwise, access rights do not include the right to sub-license.

25.2 Access rights for other beneficiaries, for implementing their own tasks under the action

The beneficiaries must give each other access — on a royalty-free basis — to background needed to implement their own tasks under the action, unless the beneficiary that holds the background has — before acceding to the Agreement —:

(a) informed the other beneficiaries that access to its background is subject to legal restrictions or limits, including those imposed by the rights of third parties (including personnel), or

(b) agreed with the other beneficiaries that access would not be on a royalty-free basis.

25.3 Access rights for other beneficiaries, for exploiting their own results

The beneficiaries must give each other access — under fair and reasonable conditions — to background needed for exploiting their own results, unless the beneficiary that holds the background has — before acceding to the Agreement — informed the other beneficiaries that access to its
background is subject to legal restrictions or limits, including those imposed by the rights of third parties (including personnel).

‘Fair and reasonable conditions’ means appropriate conditions, including possible financial terms or royalty-free conditions, taking into account the specific circumstances of the request for access, for example the actual or potential value of the results or background to which access is requested and/or the scope, duration or other characteristics of the exploitation envisaged.

Requests for access may be made — unless agreed otherwise — up to one year after the period set out in Article 3.

25.4 Access rights for affiliated entities

Unless otherwise agreed in the consortium agreement, access to background must also be given — under fair and reasonable conditions (see above; Article 25.3) and unless it is subject to legal restrictions or limits, including those imposed by the rights of third parties (including personnel) — to affiliated entities\(^{19}\) established in an EU Member State or ‘associated country’\(^{20}\), if this is needed to exploit the results generated by the beneficiaries to which they are affiliated.

Unless agreed otherwise (see above; Article 25.1), the affiliated entity concerned must make the request directly to the beneficiary that holds the background.

Requests for access may be made — unless agreed otherwise — up to one year after the period set out in Article 3.

25.5 Access rights for third parties

Not applicable

25.6 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

\(^{19}\) For the definition, see Article 2.1(2) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘affiliated entity' means any legal entity that is under the direct or indirect control of a participant, or under the same direct or indirect control as the participant, or that is directly or indirectly controlling a participant.

‘Control’ may take any of the following forms:

(a) the direct or indirect holding of more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital in the legal entity concerned, or of a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of that entity;

(b) the direct or indirect holding, in fact or in law, of decision-making powers in the legal entity concerned.

However the following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:

(a) the same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates;

(b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.

\(^{20}\) For the definition, see Article 2.1(3) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘associated country’ means a third country which is party to an international agreement with the Union, as identified in Article 7 of Horizon 2020 Framework Programme Regulation No 1291/2013. Article 7 sets out the conditions for association of non-EU countries to Horizon 2020.
SUBSECTION 3  RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO RESULTS

ARTICLE 26 — OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS

26.1 Ownership by the beneficiary that generates the results

Results are owned by the beneficiary that generates them.

‘Results’ means any (tangible or intangible) output of the action such as data, knowledge or information — whatever its form or nature, whether it can be protected or not — that is generated in the action, as well as any rights attached to it, including intellectual property rights.

26.2 Joint ownership by several beneficiaries

Two or more beneficiaries own results jointly if:

(a) they have jointly generated them and
(b) it is not possible to:

(i) establish the respective contribution of each beneficiary, or

(ii) separate them for the purpose of applying for, obtaining or maintaining their protection (see Article 27).

The joint owners must agree (in writing) on the allocation and terms of exercise of their joint ownership (‘joint ownership agreement’), to ensure compliance with their obligations under this Agreement.

Unless otherwise agreed in the joint ownership agreement, each joint owner may grant non-exclusive licences to third parties to exploit jointly-owned results (without any right to sub-license), if the other joint owners are given:

(a) at least 45 days advance notice and

(b) fair and reasonable compensation.

Once the results have been generated, joint owners may agree (in writing) to apply another regime than joint ownership (such as, for instance, transfer to a single owner (see Article 30) with access rights for the others).

26.3 Rights of third parties (including personnel)

If third parties (including personnel) may claim rights to the results, the beneficiary concerned must ensure that it complies with its obligations under the Agreement.

If a third party generates results, the beneficiary concerned must obtain all necessary rights (transfer, licences or other) from the third party, in order to be able to respect its obligations as if those results were generated by the beneficiary itself.

If obtaining the rights is impossible, the beneficiary must refrain from using the third party to generate the results.
26.4 **Agency ownership, to protect results**

26.4.1 The Agency may — with the consent of the beneficiary concerned — assume ownership of results to protect them, if a beneficiary intends — up to four years after the period set out in Article 3 — to disseminate its results without protecting them, except in any of the following cases:

(a) the lack of protection is because protecting the results is not possible, reasonable or justified (given the circumstances);

(b) the lack of protection is because there is a lack of potential for commercial or industrial exploitation, or

(c) the beneficiary intends to transfer the results to another beneficiary or third party established in an EU Member State or associated country, which will protect them.

Before the results are disseminated and unless any of the cases above under Points (a), (b) or (c) applies, the beneficiary must formally notify the Agency and at the same time inform it of any reasons for refusing consent. The beneficiary may refuse consent only if it can show that its legitimate interests would suffer significant harm.

If the Agency decides to assume ownership, it will formally notify the beneficiary concerned within 45 days of receiving notification.

No dissemination relating to these results may before the end of this period or, if the Agency takes a positive decision, until it has taken the necessary steps to protect the results.

26.4.2 The Agency may — with the consent of the beneficiary concerned — assume ownership of results to protect them, if a beneficiary intends — up to four years after the period set out in Article 3 — to stop protecting them or not to seek an extension of protection, except in any of the following cases:

(a) the protection is stopped because of a lack of potential for commercial or industrial exploitation;

(b) an extension would not be justified given the circumstances.

A beneficiary that intends to stop protecting results or not seek an extension must — unless any of the cases above under Points (a) or (b) applies — formally notify the Agency at least 60 days before the protection lapses or its extension is no longer possible and at the same time inform it of any reasons for refusing consent. The beneficiary may refuse consent only if it can show that its legitimate interests would suffer significant harm.

If the Agency decides to assume ownership, it will formally notify the beneficiary concerned within 45 days of receiving notification.

26.5 **Consequences of non-compliance**

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to the any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.
ARTICLE 27 — PROTECTION OF RESULTS — VISIBILITY OF EU FUNDING

27.1 Obligation to protect the results

Each beneficiary must examine the possibility of protecting its results and must adequately protect them — for an appropriate period and with appropriate territorial coverage — if:

(a) the results can reasonably be expected to be commercially or industrially exploited and

(b) protecting them is possible, reasonable and justified (given the circumstances).

When deciding on protection, the beneficiary must consider its own legitimate interests and the legitimate interests (especially commercial) of the other beneficiaries.

27.2 Agency ownership, to protect the results

If a beneficiary intends not to protect its results, to stop protecting them or not seek an extension of protection, The Agency may — under certain conditions (see Article 26.4) — assume ownership to ensure their (continued) protection.

27.3 Information on EU funding

Applications for protection of results (including patent applications) filed by or on behalf of a beneficiary must — unless the Agency requests or agrees otherwise or unless it is impossible — include the following:

“The project leading to this application has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665759”.

27.4 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such a breach may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 28 — EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

28.1 Obligation to exploit the results

Each beneficiary must — up to four years after the period set out in Article 3 — take measures aiming to ensure ‘exploitation’ of its results (either directly or indirectly, in particular through transfer or licensing; see Article 30) by:

(a) using them in further research activities (outside the action);

(b) developing, creating or marketing a product or process;

(c) creating and providing a service, or

(d) using them in standardisation activities.
This does not change the security obligations in Article 37, which still apply.

28.2 Results that could contribute to European or international standards — Information on EU funding

If results are incorporated in a standard, the beneficiary concerned must — unless the Agency requests or agrees otherwise or unless it is impossible — ask the standardisation body to include the following statement in (information related to) the standard:

“Results incorporated in this standard received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665759”.

28.3 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced in accordance with Article 43.

Such a breach may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 29 — DISSEMINATION OF RESULTS — OPEN ACCESS — VISIBILITY OF EU FUNDING

29.1 Obligation to disseminate results

Unless it goes against their legitimate interests, each beneficiary must — as soon as possible — ‘disseminate’ its results by disclosing them to the public by appropriate means (other than those resulting from protecting or exploiting the results), including in scientific publications (in any medium).

This does not change the obligation to protect results in Article 27, the confidentiality obligations in Article 36, the security obligations in Article 37 or the obligations to protect personal data in Article 39, all of which still apply.

A beneficiary that intends to disseminate its results must give advance notice to the other beneficiaries of — unless agreed otherwise — at least 45 days, together with sufficient information on the results it will disseminate.

Any other beneficiary may object within — unless agreed otherwise — 30 days of receiving notification, if it can show that its legitimate interests in relation to the results or background would be significantly harmed. In such cases, the dissemination may not take place unless appropriate steps are taken to safeguard these legitimate interests.

If a beneficiary intends not to protect its results, it may — under certain conditions (see Article 26.4.1) — need to formally notify the Agency before dissemination takes place.

29.2 Open access to scientific publications

Each beneficiary must ensure open access (free of charge online access for any user) to all peer-reviewed scientific publications relating to its results.

In particular, it must:
(a) as soon as possible and at the latest on publication, deposit a machine-readable electronic copy of the published version or final peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication in a repository for scientific publications;

Moreover, the beneficiary must aim to deposit at the same time the research data needed to validate the results presented in the deposited scientific publications.

(b) ensure open access to the deposited publication — via the repository — at the latest:

(i) on publication, if an electronic version is available for free via the publisher, or

(ii) within six months of publication (twelve months for publications in the social sciences and humanities) in any other case.

(c) ensure open access — via the repository — to the bibliographic metadata that identify the deposited publication.

The bibliographic metadata must be in a standard format and must include all of the following:

- the terms “European Union (EU)” and “Horizon 2020”;
- the name of the action, acronym and grant number;
- the publication date, and length of embargo period if applicable, and
- a persistent identifier.

29.3 Open access to research data

Regarding the digital research data generated in the action (‘data’), the beneficiaries must:

(a) deposit in a research data repository and take measures to make it possible for third parties to access, mine, exploit, reproduce and disseminate — free of charge for any user — the following:

(i) the data, including associated metadata, needed to validate the results presented in scientific publications as soon as possible;

(ii) other data, including associated metadata, as specified and within the deadlines laid down in the 'data management plan' (see Annex 1);

(b) provide information — via the repository — about tools and instruments at the disposal of the beneficiaries and necessary for validating the results (and — where possible — provide the tools and instruments themselves).

This does not change the obligation to protect results in Article 27, the confidentiality obligations in Article 36, the security obligations in Article 37 or the obligations to protect personal data in Article 39, all of which still apply.

As an exception, the beneficiaries do not have to ensure open access to specific parts of their research data if the achievement of the action’s main objective, as described in Annex 1, would be jeopardised by
making those specific parts of the research data openly accessible. In this case, the data management plan must contain the reasons for not giving access.

29.4 Information on EU funding — Obligation and right to use the EU emblem

Unless the Agency requests or agrees otherwise or unless it is impossible, any dissemination of results (in any form, including electronic) must:

(a) display the EU emblem and

(b) include the following text:

“This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665759”.

When displayed together with another logo, the EU emblem must have appropriate prominence.

For the purposes of their obligations under this Article, the beneficiaries may use the EU emblem without first obtaining approval from the Agency.

This does not however give them the right to exclusive use.

Moreover, they may not appropriate the EU emblem or any similar trademark or logo, either by registration or by any other means.

29.5 Disclaimer excluding Agency responsibility

Any dissemination of results must indicate that it reflects only the author's view and that the Agency is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

29.6 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such a breach may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 30 — TRANSFER AND LICENSING OF RESULTS

30.1 Transfer of ownership

Each beneficiary may transfer ownership of its results.

It must however ensure that its obligations under Articles 26.2, 26.4, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 also apply to the new owner and that this owner has the obligation to pass them on in any subsequent transfer.

This does not change the security obligations in Article 37, which still apply.

Unless agreed otherwise (in writing) for specifically-identified third parties or unless impossible under applicable EU and national laws on mergers and acquisitions, a beneficiary that intends to transfer ownership of results must give at least 45 days advance notice (or less if agreed in writing) to the other beneficiaries that still have (or still may request) access rights to the results. This notification
must include sufficient information on the new owner to enable any beneficiary concerned to assess the effects on its access rights.

Unless agreed otherwise (in writing) for specifically-identified third parties, any other beneficiary may object within 30 days of receiving notification (or less if agreed in writing), if it can show that the transfer would adversely affect its access rights. In this case, the transfer may not take place until agreement has been reached between the beneficiaries concerned.

### 30.2 Granting licenses

Each beneficiary may grant licences to its results (or otherwise give the right to exploit them), if:

(a) this does not impede the rights under Article 31 and

(b) not applicable.

In addition to Points (a) and (b), exclusive licences for results may be granted only if all the other beneficiaries concerned have waived their access rights (see Article 31.1).

This does not change the dissemination obligations in Article 29 or security obligations in Article 37, which still apply.

### 30.3 Agency right to object to transfers or licensing

The Agency may — up to four years after the period set out in Article 3 — object to a transfer of ownership or the exclusive licensing of results, if:

(a) it is to a third party established in a non-EU country not associated with Horizon 2020 and

(b) the Agency considers that the transfer or licence is not in line with EU interests regarding competitiveness or is inconsistent with ethical principles or security considerations.

A beneficiary that intends to transfer ownership or grant an exclusive licence must formally notify the Agency before the intended transfer or licensing takes place and:

- identify the specific results concerned;

- describe in detail the new owner or licensee and the planned or potential exploitation of the results, and

- include a reasoned assessment of the likely impact of the transfer or licence on EU competitiveness and its consistency with ethical principles and security considerations.

The Agency may request additional information.

If the Agency decides to object to a transfer or exclusive licence, it must formally notify the beneficiary concerned within 60 days of receiving notification (or any additional information it has requested).

No transfer or licensing may take place in the following cases:

- pending the Agency decision, within the period set out above;
- if the Agency objects;
- until the conditions are complied with, if the Agency objection comes with conditions.

30.4 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such a breach may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 31 — ACCESS RIGHTS TO RESULTS

31.1 Exercise of access rights — Waiving of access rights — No sub-licensing

The conditions set out in Article 25.1 apply.

The obligations set out in this Article do not change the security obligations in Article 37, which still apply.

31.2 Access rights for other beneficiaries, for implementing their own tasks under the action

The beneficiaries must give each other access — on a royalty-free basis — to results needed for implementing their own tasks under the action.

31.3 Access rights for other beneficiaries, for exploiting their own results

The beneficiaries must give each other — under fair and reasonable conditions (see Article 25.3) — access to results needed for exploiting their own results.

Requests for access may be made — unless agreed otherwise — up to one year after the period set out in Article 3.

31.4 Access rights of affiliated entities

Unless agreed otherwise in the consortium agreement, access to results must also be given — under fair and reasonable conditions (Article 25.3) — to affiliated entities established in an EU Member State or associated country, if this is needed for those entities to exploit the results generated by the beneficiaries to which they are affiliated.

Unless agreed otherwise (see above; Article 31.1), the affiliated entity concerned must make any such request directly to the beneficiary that owns the results.

Requests for access may be made — unless agreed otherwise — up to one year after the period set out in Article 3.

31.5 Access rights for the EU institutions, bodies, offices or agencies and EU Member States

The beneficiaries must give access to their results — on a royalty-free basis — to EU institutions, bodies, offices or agencies, for developing, implementing or monitoring EU policies or programmes.
Such access rights are limited to non-commercial and non-competitive use.

This does not change the right to use any material, document or information received from the beneficiaries for communication and publicising activities (see Article 38.2).

31.6 Access rights for third parties

Not applicable

31.7 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

SECTION 4 OTHER RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

ARTICLE 32 — RECRUITMENT AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR RESEARCHERS

32.1 Obligation to take measures to implement the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers

The beneficiaries must take all measures to implement the principles set out in the Commission Recommendation on the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers22, in particular regarding:

- working conditions;
- transparent recruitment processes based on merit, and
- career development.

The beneficiaries must ensure that researchers and third parties involved in the action are aware of them.

32.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply any of the measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 33 — GENDER EQUALITY

33.1 Obligation to aim for gender equality

The beneficiaries must take all measures to promote equal opportunities between men and women in the implementation of the action. They must aim, to the extent possible, for a gender balance at all levels of personnel assigned to the action, including at supervisory and managerial level.

33.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply any of the measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 34 — ETHICS

34.1 Obligation to comply with ethical principles

The beneficiaries must carry out the action in compliance with:

(a) ethical principles (including the highest standards of research integrity — as set out, for instance, in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity\(^\text{23}\) — and including, in particular, avoiding fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other research misconduct) and

(b) applicable international, EU and national law.

Funding will not be granted for activities carried out outside the EU if they are prohibited in all Member States.

The beneficiaries must ensure that the activities under the action have an exclusive focus on civil applications.

The beneficiaries must ensure that the activities under the action do not:

(a) aim at human cloning for reproductive purposes;

(b) intend to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable (with the exception of research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads, which may be financed), or

(c) intend to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer.

34.2 Activities raising ethical issues

Activities raising ethical issues must comply with the ‘ethics requirements’ set out in Annex 1.

Before the beginning of an activity raising an ethical issue, the coordinator must submit (see Article 52) to the Agency copy of:

(a) any ethics committee opinion required under national law and

(b) any notification or authorisation for activities raising ethical issues required under national law.

If these documents are not in English, the coordinator must also submit an English summary of the submitted opinions, notifications and authorisations (containing, if available, the conclusions of the committee or authority concerned).

\(^{23}\) The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity of ALLEA (All European Academies) and ESF (European Science Foundation) of March 2011. [Link to the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity](http://www.esf.org/fileadmin/Public_documents/Publications/Code_Conduct_ResearchIntegrity.pdf)
If these documents are specifically requested for the action, the request must contain an explicit reference to the action title. The coordinator must submit a declaration by each beneficiary concerned that all the submitted documents cover the action tasks.

### 34.3 Activities involving human embryos or human embryonic stem cells

Activities involving research on human embryos or human embryonic stem cells may be carried out only if:

- they are set out in Annex 1 or
- the coordinator has obtained explicit approval (in writing) from the Agency (see Article 52).

### 34.4 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43) and the Agreement or participation of the beneficiary may be terminated (see Article 50).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

**ARTICLE 35 — CONFLICT OF INTERESTS**

#### 35.1 Obligation to avoid a conflict of interests

The beneficiaries must take all measures to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the action is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest (‘conflict of interests’).

They must formally notify to the Agency without delay any situation constituting or likely to lead to a conflict of interests and immediately take all the necessary steps to rectify this situation.

The Agency may verify that the measures taken are appropriate and may require additional measures to be taken by a specified deadline.

#### 35.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43) and the Agreement or participation of the beneficiary may be terminated (see Article 50).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

**ARTICLE 36 — CONFIDENTIALITY**

#### 36.1 General obligation to maintain confidentiality

During implementation of the action and for four years after the period set out in Article 3, the parties must keep confidential any data, documents or other material (in any form) that is identified as confidential at the time it is disclosed (‘confidential information’).

If a beneficiary requests, the Agency may agree to keep such information confidential for an additional period beyond the initial four years.
If information has been identified as confidential only orally, it will be considered to be confidential only if this is confirmed in writing within 15 days of the oral disclosure.

Unless otherwise agreed between the parties, they may use confidential information only to implement the Agreement.

The beneficiaries may disclose confidential information to their personnel or third parties involved in the action only if they:

(a) need to know to implement the Agreement and

(b) are bound by an obligation of confidentiality.

This does not change the security obligations in Article 37, which still apply.

The Agency may disclose confidential information to its staff, other EU institutions and bodies or third parties, if:

(a) this is necessary to implement the Agreement or safeguard the EU's financial interests and

(b) the recipients of the information are bound by an obligation of confidentiality.

Under the conditions set out in Article 4 of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/201324, the Commission must moreover make available information on the results to other EU institutions, bodies, offices or agencies as well as Member States or associated countries.

The confidentiality obligations no longer apply if:

(a) the disclosing party agrees to release the other party;

(b) the information was already known by the recipient or is given to him without obligation of confidentiality by a third party that was not bound by any obligation of confidentiality;

(c) the recipient proves that the information was developed without the use of confidential information;

(d) the information becomes generally and publicly available, without breaching any confidentiality obligation, or

(e) the disclosure of the information is required by EU or national law.

36.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 37 — SECURITY-RELATED OBLIGATIONS

37.1 Results with a security recommendation

Not applicable

37.2 Classified results

Not applicable

37.3 Activities involving dual-use goods or dangerous materials and substances

Not applicable

37.4 Consequences of non-compliance

Not applicable

ARTICLE 38 — PROMOTING THE ACTION — VISIBILITY OF EU FUNDING

38.1 Communication activities by beneficiaries

38.1.1 Obligation to promote the action and its results

The beneficiaries must promote the action and its results, by providing targeted information to multiple audiences (including the media and the public) in a strategic and effective manner.

This does not change the dissemination obligations in Article 29, the confidentiality obligations in Article 36 or the security obligations in Article 37, all of which still apply.

Before engaging in a communication activity expected to have a major media impact, the beneficiaries must inform the Agency (see Article 52).

38.1.2 Information on EU funding — Obligation and right to use the EU emblem

Unless the Agency requests or agrees otherwise or unless it is impossible, any communication activity related to the action (including in electronic form, via social media, etc.) and any infrastructure, equipment and major results funded by the grant must:

(a) display the EU emblem and

(b) include the following text:

For communication activities: “This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665759”.

For infrastructure, equipment and major results: “This [infrastructure][equipment][insert type of result] is part of a project that has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 665759”.

When displayed together with another logo, the EU emblem must have appropriate prominence.
For the purposes of their obligations under this Article, the beneficiaries may use the EU emblem without first obtaining approval from the *Agency*.

This does not, however, give them the right to exclusive use.

Moreover, they may not appropriate the EU emblem or any similar trademark or logo, either by registration or by any other means.

### 38.1.3 Disclaimer excluding the *Agency* responsibility

Any communication activity related to the action must indicate that it reflects only the author's view and that the *Agency* is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

### 38.2 Communication activities by the *Agency*

#### 38.2.1 Right to use beneficiaries’ materials, documents or information

The *Agency* may use, for its communication and publicising activities, information relating to the action, documents notably summaries for publication and public deliverables as well as any other material, such as pictures or audio-visual material that it receives from any beneficiary (including in electronic form).

This does not change the confidentiality obligations in Article 36 and the security obligations in Article 37, all of which still apply.

However, if the *Agency*’s use of these materials, documents or information would risk compromising legitimate interests, the beneficiary concerned may request the *Agency* not to use it (see Article 52).

The right to use a beneficiary’s materials, documents and information includes:

(a) **use for its own purposes** (in particular, making them available to persons working for the *Agency* or any other EU institution, body, office or agency or body or institutions in EU Member States; and copying or reproducing them in whole or in part, in unlimited numbers);

(b) **distribution to the public** (in particular, publication as hard copies and in electronic or digital format, publication on the internet, as a downloadable or non-downloadable file, broadcasting by any channel, public display or presentation, communicating through press information services, or inclusion in widely accessible databases or indexes);

(c) **editing or redrafting** for communication and publicising activities (including shortening, summarising, inserting other elements (such as meta-data, legends, other graphic, visual, audio or text elements), extracting parts (e.g. audio or video files), dividing into parts, use in a compilation);

(d) **translation**;

(e) giving **access in response to individual requests** under Regulation No 1049/2001\(^25\), without the right to reproduce or exploit;

(f) **storage** in paper, electronic or other form;

(g) **archiving**, in line with applicable document-management rules, and

(h) the right to authorise **third parties** to act on its behalf or sub-license the modes of use set out in Points (b),(c),(d) and (f) to third parties if needed for the communication and publicising activities of the **Agency**.

If the right of use is subject to rights of a third party (including personnel of the beneficiary), the beneficiary must ensure that it complies with its obligations under this Agreement (in particular, by obtaining the necessary approval from the third parties concerned).

Where applicable (and if provided by the beneficiaries), the **Agency** will insert the following information:

“© – [year] – [name of the copyright owner]. All rights reserved. Licensed to the Research Executive Agency (REA) under conditions.”

### 38.3 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

Such breaches may also lead to any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

**ARTICLE 39 — PROCESSING OF PERSONAL DATA**

#### 39.1 Processing of personal data by the **Agency and the Commission**

Any personal data under the Agreement will be processed by the **Agency or the Commission** under Regulation No 45/200126 and according to the ‘notifications of the processing operations’ to the Data Protection Officer (DPO) of the **Agency or the Commission** (publicly accessible in the DPO register).

Such data will be processed by the ‘**data controller**’ of the **Agency or the Commission** for the purposes of implementing, managing and monitoring the Agreement or protecting the financial interests of the EU or Euratom (including checks, reviews, audits and investigations; see Article 22).

The persons whose personal data are processed have the right to access and correct their own personal data. For this purpose, they must send any queries about the processing of their personal data to the data controller, via the contact point indicated in the ‘service specific privacy statement(s) (SSPS)’ that are published on the **Agency and the Commission** websites.

They also have the right to have recourse at any time to the European Data Protection Supervisor (EDPS).

---

39.2 Processing of personal data by the beneficiaries

The beneficiaries must process personal data under the Agreement in compliance with applicable EU and national law on data protection (including authorisations or notification requirements).

The beneficiaries may grant their personnel access only to data that is strictly necessary for implementing, managing and monitoring the Agreement.

The beneficiaries must inform the personnel whose personal data are collected and processed by the Agency or the Commission. For this purpose, they must provide them with the service specific privacy statement (SSPS) (see above), before transmitting their data to the Agency or the Commission.

39.3 Consequences of non-compliance

If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under Article 39.2, the Agency may apply any of the measures described in Chapter 6.

ARTICLE 40 — ASSIGNMENTS OF CLAIMS FOR PAYMENT AGAINST THE AGENCY

The beneficiaries may not assign any of their claims for payment against the Agency to any third party, except if approved by the Agency on the basis of a reasoned, written request by the coordinator (on behalf of the beneficiary concerned).

If the Agency has not accepted the assignment or the terms of it are not observed, the assignment will have no effect on it.

In no circumstances will an assignment release the beneficiaries from their obligations towards the Agency.

CHAPTER 5 DIVISION OF BENEFICIARIES’ ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

ARTICLE 41 — DIVISION OF BENEFICIARIES’ ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

41.1 Roles and responsibilities towards the Agency

The beneficiaries have full responsibility for implementing the action and complying with the Agreement.

The beneficiaries are jointly and severally liable for the technical implementation of the action as described in Annex 1. If a beneficiary fails to implement its part of the action, the other beneficiaries become responsible for implementing this part (without being entitled to any additional EU funding for doing so), unless the Agency expressly relieves them of this obligation.

The financial responsibility of each beneficiary is governed by Articles 44, 45 and 46.

41.2 Internal division of roles and responsibilities

The internal roles and responsibilities of the beneficiaries are divided as follows:

(a) Each beneficiary must:
(i) keep information stored in the 'Beneficiary Register' (via the electronic exchange system) up to date (see Article 17);

(ii) inform the coordinator immediately of any events or circumstances likely to affect significantly or delay the implementation of the action (see Article 17);

(iii) submit to the coordinator in good time:

- individual financial statements for itself and, if required, certificates on the financial statements (see Article 20);
- the data needed to draw up the technical reports (see Article 20);
- ethics committee opinions and notifications or authorisations for activities raising ethical issues (see Article 34);
- any other documents or information required by the Agency or the Commission under the Agreement, unless the Agreement requires the beneficiary to submit this information directly to the Agency or the Commission.

(b) The coordinator must:

(i) monitor that the action is implemented properly (see Article 7);

(ii) act as the intermediary for all communications between the beneficiaries and the Agency (in particular, providing the Agency with the information described in Article 17), unless the Agreement specifies otherwise;

(iii) request and review any documents or information required by the Agency and verify their completeness and correctness before passing them on to the Agency;

(iv) submit the deliverables and reports to the Agency (see Articles 19 and 20);

(v) ensure that all payments are made to the other beneficiaries without unjustified delay (see Article 21);

(vi) inform the Agency of the amounts paid to each beneficiary, when required under the Agreement (see Articles 44 and 50) or requested by the Agency.

The coordinator may not delegate the above-mentioned tasks to any other beneficiary or subcontract them to any third party.

41.3 Internal arrangements between beneficiaries — Consortium agreement

The beneficiaries must have internal arrangements regarding their operation and co-ordination to ensure that the action is implemented properly. These internal arrangements must be set out in a written ‘consortium agreement’ between the beneficiaries, which may cover:

- internal organisation of the consortium;
- management of access to the electronic exchange system;
- distribution of EU funding;
- additional rules on rights and obligations related to background and results (including whether access rights remain or not, if a beneficiary is in breach of its obligations) (see Section 3 of Chapter 4);
- settlement of internal disputes;
- liability, indemnification and confidentiality arrangements between the beneficiaries.

The consortium agreement must not contain any provision contrary to the Agreement.

41.4 Relationship with complementary beneficiaries — Collaboration agreement

Not applicable

41.5 Relationship with partners of a joint action — Coordination agreement

Not applicable

CHAPTER 6  REJECTION OF COSTS — REDUCTION OF THE GRANT — RECOVERY — PENALTIES — DAMAGES — SUSPENSION — TERMINATION — FORCE MAJEURE

SECTION 1  REJECTION OF COSTS — REDUCTION OF THE GRANT — RECOVERY — PENALTIES

ARTICLE 42 — REJECTION OF INELIGIBLE COSTS

42.1 Conditions

42.1.1 The Agency will — at the time of an interim payment, at the payment of the balance or afterwards — reject any costs which are ineligible (see Article 6), in particular following checks, reviews, audits or investigations (see Article 22).

42.1.2 The rejection may also be based on the extension of findings from other grants to this grant, under the conditions set out in Article 22.5.2.

42.2 Ineligible costs to be rejected — Calculation — Procedure

Ineligible costs will be rejected in full.

If the Agency rejects costs without reduction of the grant (see Article 43) or recovery of undue amounts (see Article 44), it will formally notify the coordinator or beneficiary concerned the rejection of costs, the amounts and the reasons why (if applicable, together with the notification of amounts due; see Article 21.5). The coordinator or beneficiary concerned may — within 30 days of receiving notification — formally notify the Agency of its disagreement and the reasons why.
If the Agency rejects costs with reduction of the grant or recovery of undue amounts, it will formally notify the rejection in the ‘pre-information letter’ on reduction or recovery set out in Articles 43 and 44.

42.3 Effects

If the Agency rejects costs at the time of an interim payment or the payment of the balance, it will deduct them from the total eligible costs declared, for the action, in the periodic or final summary financial statement (see Articles 20.3 and 20.4). It will then calculate the interim payment or payment of the balance as set out in Articles 21.3 or 21.4.

If the Agency — after an interim payment but before the payment of the balance — rejects costs declared in a periodic summary financial statement, it will deduct them from the total eligible costs declared, for the action, in the next periodic summary financial statement or in the final summary financial statement. It will then calculate the interim payment or payment of the balance as set out in Articles 21.3 or 21.4.

If the Agency rejects costs after the payment of the balance, it will deduct the amount rejected from the total eligible costs declared, by the beneficiary, in the final summary financial statement. It will then calculate the revised final grant amount as set out in Article 5.4.

ARTICLE 43 — REDUCTION OF THE GRANT

43.1 Conditions

43.1.1 The Agency may — at the payment of the balance or afterwards — reduce the maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1), if the action has not been implemented properly as described in Annex 1 or another obligation under the Agreement has been breached.

43.1.2 The Agency may also reduce the maximum grant amount on the basis of the extension of findings from other grants to this grant, under the conditions set out in Article 22.5.2.

43.2 Amount to be reduced — Calculation — Procedure

The amount of the reduction will be proportionate to the improper implementation of the action or to the seriousness of the breach.

Before reduction of the grant, the Agency will formally notify a ‘pre-information letter’ to the coordinator or beneficiary concerned:

- informing it of its intention to reduce the grant, the amount it intends to reduce and the reasons why and

- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days of receiving notification

If the Agency does not receive any observations or decides to pursue reduction despite the observations it has received, it will formally notify confirmation of the reduction (if applicable, together with the notification of amounts due; see Article 21).
43.3 Effects

If the *Agency* reduces the grant at the time of the payment of the balance, it will calculate the reduced grant amount for the action and then determine the amount due as payment of the balance (see Articles 5.3.4 and 21.4).

If the *Agency* reduces the grant after the payment of the balance, it will calculate the revised final grant amount for the beneficiary concerned (see Article 5.4). If the revised final grant amount for the beneficiary concerned is lower than its share of the final grant amount, the *Agency* will recover the difference (see Article 44).

**ARTICLE 44 — RECOVERY OF UNDUE AMOUNTS**

44.1 Amount to be recovered — Calculation — Procedure

The *Agency* will — after termination of the participation of a beneficiary, at the payment of the balance or afterwards — claim back any amount that was paid but is not due under the Agreement.

Each beneficiary’s financial responsibility in case of recovery is limited to its own debt, except for the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund (see Article 21.4).

44.1.1 Recovery after termination of a beneficiary’s participation

If recovery takes place after termination of a beneficiary’s participation (including the coordinator), the *Agency* will claim back the undue amount from the beneficiary concerned, by formally notifying it a debit note (see Article 50.2 and 50.3). This note will specify the amount to be recovered, the terms and the date for payment.

If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the *Agency or the Commission* will recover the amount:

(a) by ‘offsetting’ it — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned by the *Agency, the Commission or another* executive agency (from the EU or Euratom budget).

In exceptional circumstances, to safeguard the EU’s financial interests, the *Agency* may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

(b) *not applicable*;

(c) by taking legal action (see Article 57) or by adopting an enforceable decision under Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) and Article 79(2) of the Financial regulation No 966/2012.

If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the amount to be recovered (see above) will be increased by late-payment interest at the rate set out in Article 21.11, from the day following the payment date in the debit note, up to and including the date the *Agency or the Commission* receives full payment of the amount.

Partial payments will be first credited against expenses, charges and late-payment interest and then against the principal.
Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC applies.

44.1.2 Recovery at payment of the balance

If the payment of the balance takes the form of a recovery (see Article 21.4), the Agency will formally notify a ‘pre-information letter’ to the coordinator:

- informing it of its intention to recover, the amount due as the balance and the reasons why;
- specifying that it intends to deduct the amount to be recovered from the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund;
- requesting the coordinator to submit a report on the distribution of payments to the beneficiaries within 30 days of receiving notification, and
- inviting the coordinator to submit observations within 30 days of receiving notification.

If no observations are submitted or the Agency decides to pursue recovery despite the observations it has received, it will confirm recovery (together with the notification of amounts due; see Article 21.5) and:

- pay the difference between the amount to be recovered and the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund, if the difference is positive or
- formally notify to the coordinator a debit note for the difference between the amount to be recovered and the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund, if the difference is negative. This note will also specify the terms and the date for payment.

If the coordinator does not repay the Agency by the date in the debit note and has not submitted the report on the distribution of payments: the Agency or the Commission will recover the amount set out in the debit note from the coordinator (see below).

If the coordinator does not repay the Agency by the date in the debit note, but has submitted the report on the distribution of payments: the Agency will:

(a) identify the beneficiaries for which the amount calculated as follows is negative:

\[
\{ \{ \text{beneficiary's costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency multiplied by the reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned} \} \\
\text{divided by} \\
\text{the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1} \} \\
\text{multiplied by} \\
\text{the final grant amount (see Article 5.3)} \},
\]

minus

{pre-financing and interim payments received by the beneficiary}.  

(b) formally notify to each beneficiary identified according to point (a) a debit note specifying the terms and date for payment. The amount of the debit note is calculated as follows:

\[
\text{amount calculated according to point (a) for the beneficiary concerned divided by the sum of the amounts calculated according to point (a) for all the beneficiaries identified according to point (a)} \times \text{the amount set out in the debit note formally notified to the coordinator.}
\]

If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the Agency will recover the amount:

(a) by 'offsetting' it — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned by the Agency, the Commission or another executive agency (from the EU or Euratom budget).

In exceptional circumstances, to safeguard the EU’s financial interests, the Agency may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

(b) by drawing on the Guarantee Fund. The Agency or the Commission will formally notify the beneficiary concerned the debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund and recover the amount:

(i) not applicable;

(ii) by taking legal action (see Article 57) or by adopting an enforceable decision under Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) and Article 79(2) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012.

If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the amount to be recovered (see above) will be increased by late-payment interest at the rate set out in Article 21.11, from the day following the payment date in the debit note, up to and including the date the Agency or the Commission receives full payment of the amount.

Partial payments will be first credited against expenses, charges and late-payment interest and then against the principal.

Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC applies.

44.1.3 Recovery of amounts after payment of the balance
If, for a beneficiary, the revised final grant amount (see Article 5.4) is lower than its share of the final grant amount, it must repay the difference to the Agency.

The beneficiary’s share of the final grant amount is calculated as follows:

\[
\left\{ \frac{\{\text{beneficiary’s costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency multiplies by the reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned}\}}{\text{the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1}} \right\} \times \text{the final grant amount (see Article 5.3)}.
\]

If the coordinator has not distributed amounts received (see Article 21.7), the Agency will also recover these amounts.

The Agency will formally notify a pre-information letter to the beneficiary concerned:

- informing it of its intention to recover, the due amount and the reasons why and
- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days of receiving notification.

If no observations are submitted or the Agency decides to pursue recovery despite the observations it has received, it will confirm the amount to be recovered and formally notify to the beneficiary concerned a debit note. This note will also specify the terms and the date for payment.

If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the Agency will recover the amount:

- by ‘offsetting’ it — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned by the Agency, the Commission or another executive agency (from the EU or Euratom budget).

In exceptional circumstances, to safeguard the EU’s financial interests, the Agency may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

- by drawing on the Guarantee Fund. The Agency or the Commission will formally notify the beneficiary concerned the debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund and recover the amount:

  (i) not applicable;

  (ii) by taking legal action (see Article 57) or by adopting an enforceable decision under Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) and Article 79(2) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012.

If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the amount to be recovered (see above) will be increased by late-payment interest at the rate set out in Article 21.11, from the day following the date for payment in the debit note, up to and including the date the Agency or the Commission receives full payment of the amount.
Partial payments will be first credited against expenses, charges and late-payment interest and then against the principal.

Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC applies.

**ARTICLE 45 — ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL PENALTIES**

**45.1 Conditions**

Under Articles 109 and 131(4) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012, the Agency may impose administrative and financial penalties if a beneficiary:

(a) has committed substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or is in serious breach of its obligations under the Agreement or

(b) has made false declarations about information required under the Agreement or for the submission of the proposal (or has not supplied such information).

Each beneficiary is responsible for paying the financial penalties imposed on it.

Under Article 109(3) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012, the Agency or the Commission may — under certain conditions and limits — publish decisions imposing administrative or financial penalties.

**45.2 Duration — Amount of penalty — Calculation**

Administrative penalties exclude the beneficiary from all contracts and grants financed from the EU or Euratom budget for a maximum of five years from the date the infringement is established by the Agency.

If the beneficiary commits another infringement within five years of the date the first infringement is established, the Agency may extend the exclusion period up to 10 years.

Financial penalties will be between 2% and 10% of the maximum EU contribution indicated, for the beneficiary concerned, in the estimated budget (see Annex 2).

If the beneficiary commits another infringement within five years of the date the first infringement is established, the Agency may increase the rate of financial penalties to between 4% and 20%.

**45.3 Procedure**

Before applying a penalty, the Agency will formally notify the beneficiary concerned:

- informing it of its intention to impose a penalty, its duration or amount and the reasons why and
- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days.

If the Agency does not receive any observations or decides to impose the penalty despite of observations it has received, it will formally notify confirmation of the penalty to the beneficiary concerned and — in case of financial penalties — deduct the penalty from the payment of the balance or formally notify a debit note, specifying the amount to be recovered, the terms and the date for payment.
If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the Agency or the Commission may recover the amount:

(a) by ‘offsetting’ it — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned by the Agency, the Commission or another executive agency (from the EU or Euratom budget).

In exceptional circumstances, to safeguard the EU’s financial interests, the Agency may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

(b) by taking legal action (see Article 57) or by adopting an enforceable decision under Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) and Article 79(2) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012.

If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the amount to be recovered (see above) will be increased by late-payment interest at the rate set out in Article 21.11, from the day following the payment date in the debit note, up to and including the date the Agency or the Commission receives full payment of the amount.

Partial payments will be first credited against expenses, charges and late-payment interest and then against the principal.

Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC applies.

SECTION 2  LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES

ARTICLE 46 — LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES

46.1 Liability of the Agency

The Agency cannot be held liable for any damage caused to the beneficiaries or to third parties as a consequence of implementing the Agreement, including for gross negligence.

The Agency cannot be held liable for any damage caused by any of the beneficiaries or third parties involved in the action, as a consequence of implementing the Agreement.

46.2 Liability of the beneficiaries

46.2.1 Conditions

Except in case of force majeure (see Article 51), the beneficiaries must compensate the Agency for any damage it sustains as a result of the implementation of the action or because the action was not implemented in full compliance with the Agreement.

Each beneficiary is responsible for paying the damages claimed from it.

46.2.2 Amount of damages - Calculation

The amount the Agency can claim from a beneficiary will correspond to the damage caused by that beneficiary.
46.2.3 Procedure

Before claiming damages, the Agency will formally notify the beneficiary concerned:

- informing it of its intention to claim damages, the amount and the reasons why and
- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days.

If the Agency does not receive any observations or decides to claim damages despite the observations it has received, it will formally notify confirmation of the claim for damages and a debit note, specifying the amount to be recovered, the terms and the date for payment.

If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the Agency or the Commission may recover the amount:

(a) by ‘offsetting’ it — without the beneficiary’s consent — against any amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned by the Agency, the Commission or another executive agency (from the EU or Euratom budget).

In exceptional circumstances, to safeguard the EU’s financial interests, the Agency may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

(b) by taking legal action (see Article 57) or by adopting an enforceable decision under Article 299 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU) and Article 79(2) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012.

If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the amount to be recovered (see above) will be increased by late-payment interest at the rate set out in Article 21.11, from the day following the payment date in the debit note, up to and including the date the Agency or the Commission receives full payment of the amount.

Partial payments will be first credited against expenses, charges and late-payment interest and then against the principal.

Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC applies.

SECTION 3 SUSPENSION AND TERMINATION

ARTICLE 47 — SUSPENSION OF PAYMENT DEADLINE

47.1 Conditions

The Agency may — at any moment — suspend the payment deadline (see Article 21.2 to 21.4) if a request for payment (see Article 20) cannot be approved because:

(a) it does not comply with the provisions of the Agreement (see Article 20);

(b) the technical reports or financial reports have not been submitted or are not complete or additional information is needed, or
(c) there is doubt about the eligibility of the costs declared in the financial statements and additional checks, reviews, audits or investigations are necessary.

**47.2 Procedure**

The *Agency* will formally notify the coordinator of the suspension and the reasons why.

The suspension will **take effect** the day notification is sent by the *Agency* (see Article 52).

If the conditions for suspending the payment deadline are no longer met, the suspension will be **lifted** — and the remaining period will resume.

If the suspension exceeds two months, the coordinator may request the *Agency* if the suspension will continue.

If the payment deadline has been suspended due to the non-compliance of the technical or financial reports (see Article 20) and the revised report or statement is not submitted or was submitted but is also rejected, the *Agency* may also terminate the Agreement or the participation of the beneficiary (see Article 50.3.1(l)).

**ARTICLE 48 — SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS**

**48.1 Conditions**

The *Agency* may — at any moment — suspend, in whole or in part, the pre-financing payment and interim payments for one or more beneficiaries or the payment of the balance for all beneficiaries, if a beneficiary:

(a) has committed or is suspected of having committed substantial errors, irregularities, fraud or serious breach of obligations in the award procedure or under this Agreement or

(b) has committed — in other EU or Euratom grants awarded to it under similar conditions — systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or serious breach of obligations that have a material impact on this grant (**extension of findings from other grants to this grant**; see Article 22.5.2).

**48.2 Procedure**

Before suspending payments, the *Agency* will formally notify the coordinator:

- informing it of its intention to suspend payments and the reasons why and

- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days of receiving notification.

If the *Agency* does not receive observations or decides to pursue the procedure despite the observations it has received, it will formally notify **confirmation** of the suspension. Otherwise, it will formally notify that the suspension procedure is not continued.

The suspension will **take effect** the day the confirmation notification is sent by the *Agency*.

If the conditions for resuming payments are met, the suspension will be **lifted**. The *Agency* will formally notify the coordinator.
During the suspension, the periodic report(s) (see Article 20.3) must not contain any individual financial statements from the beneficiary concerned. When the Agency resumes payments, the coordinator may include them in the next periodic report.

The beneficiaries may suspend implementation of the action (see Article 49.1) or terminate the Agreement or the participation of the beneficiary concerned (see Article 50.1 and 50.2).

ARTICLE 49 — SUSPENSION OF THE ACTION IMPLEMENTATION

49.1 Suspension of the action implementation, by the beneficiaries

49.1.1 Conditions

The beneficiaries may suspend implementation of the action or any part of it, if exceptional circumstances — in particular force majeure (see Article 51) — make implementation impossible or excessively difficult.

49.1.2 Procedure

The coordinator must immediately formally notify to the Agency the suspension (see Article 52), stating:

- the reasons why and
- the expected date of resumption.

The suspension will take effect the day this notification is received by the Agency.

Once circumstances allow for implementation to resume, the coordinator must immediately formally notify the Agency and request an amendment of the Agreement to set the date on which the action will be resumed, extend the duration of the action and make other changes necessary to adapt the action to the new situation (see Article 55) — unless the Agreement or the participation of a beneficiary has been terminated (see Article 50).

The suspension will be lifted with effect from the resumption date set out in the amendment. This date may be before the date on which the amendment enters into force.

Costs incurred during suspension of the action implementation are not eligible (see Article 6).

49.2 Suspension of the action implementation, by the Agency

49.2.1 Conditions

The Agency may suspend implementation of the action or any part of it:

(a) if a beneficiary has committed or is suspected of having committed substantial errors, irregularities, fraud or serious breach of obligations in the award procedure or under this Agreement;

(b) if a beneficiary has committed — in other EU or Euratom grants awarded to it under similar conditions — systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or serious breach of obligations.
that have a material impact on this grant (extension of findings from other grants to this grant; see Article 22.5.2), or

(c) if the action is suspected of having lost its scientific or technological relevance.

49.2.2 Procedure

Before suspending implementation of the action, the Agency will formally notify the coordinator:

- informing it of its intention to suspend the implementation and the reasons why and
- inviting it to submit observations within 30 days of receiving notification.

If the Agency does not receive observations or decides to pursue the procedure despite the observations it has received, it will formally notify confirmation of the suspension. Otherwise, it will formally notify that the procedure is not continued.

The suspension will take effect five days after confirmation notification is received by the coordinator (or on a later date specified in the notification).

It will be lifted if the conditions for resuming implementation of the action are met.

The coordinator will be formally notified of the lifting and the Agreement will be amended to set the date on which the action will be resumed, extend the duration of the action and make other changes necessary to adapt the action to the new situation (see Article 55) — unless the Agreement has already been terminated (see Article 50).

The suspension will be lifted with effect from the resumption date set out in the amendment. This date may be before the date on which the amendment enters into force.

Costs incurred during suspension are not eligible (see Article 6).

The beneficiaries may not claim damages due to suspension by the Agency (see Article 46).

Suspension of the action implementation does not affect the Agency’s right to terminate the Agreement or participation of a beneficiary (see Article 50), reduce the grant or recover amounts unduly paid (see Articles 43 and 44).

ARTICLE 50 — TERMINATION OF THE AGREEMENT OR OF THE PARTICIPATION OF ONE OR MORE BENEFICIARIES

50.1 Termination of the Agreement by the beneficiaries

50.1.1 Conditions and procedure

The beneficiaries may terminate the Agreement.

The coordinator must formally notify termination to the Agency (see Article 52), stating:

- the reasons why and
- the date the termination will take effect. This date must be after the notification.
If no reasons are given or if the Agency considers the reasons do not justify termination, the Agreement will be considered to have been ‘terminated improperly’.

The termination will **take effect** on the day specified in the notification.

### 50.1.2 Effects

The coordinator must — within 60 days from when termination takes effect — submit:

(i) a periodic report (for the open reporting period until termination; see Article 20.3) and

(ii) the final report (see Article 20.4).

If the Agency does not receive the reports within the deadline (see above), only costs which are included in an approved periodic report will be taken into account.

The Agency will **calculate** the final grant amount (see Article 5.3) and the balance (see Article 21.4) on the basis of the reports submitted. Only costs incurred until termination are eligible (see Article 6). Costs relating to contracts due for execution only after termination are not eligible.

Improper termination may lead to a reduction of the grant (see Article 43).

After termination, the beneficiaries’ obligations (in particular Articles 20, 22, 23, Section 3 of Chapter 4, 36, 37, 38 and 40) continue to apply.

### 50.2 Termination of the participation of one or more beneficiaries, by the beneficiaries

#### 50.2.1 Conditions and procedure

The participation of one or more beneficiaries may be terminated by the coordinator, on request of the beneficiary concerned or on behalf of the other beneficiaries.

The coordinator must formally notify termination to the Agency (see Article 52) and inform the beneficiary concerned.

If the coordinator’s participation is terminated without its agreement, the formal notification must be done by another beneficiary (acting on behalf of the other beneficiaries).

The notification must include:

- the reasons why;

- the opinion of the beneficiary concerned (or proof that this opinion has been requested in writing);

- the date the termination takes effect. This date must be after the notification, and

- a request for amendment (see Article 55), with a proposal for reallocation of the tasks and the estimated budget of the beneficiary concerned (see Annexes 1 and 2) and, if necessary, the addition of one or more new beneficiaries (see Article 56). If termination takes effect after the period set out in Article 3, no request for amendment must be included unless the beneficiary
concerned is the coordinator. In this case, the request for amendment must propose a new coordinator.

If this information is not given or if the Agency considers that the reasons do not justify termination, the participation will be considered to have been terminated improperly.

The termination will take effect on the day specified in the notification.

50.2.2 Effects

The coordinator must — within 30 days from when termination takes effect — submit:

(i) a report on the distribution of payments to the beneficiary concerned and

(ii) if termination takes effect during the period set out in Article 3, a ‘termination report’ from the beneficiary concerned, for the open reporting period until termination, containing an overview of the progress of the work, an overview of the use of resources, the individual financial statement and, if applicable, the certificate on the financial statement (see Articles 20.3 and 20.4).

The information in the termination report must also be included in the periodic report for the next reporting period (see Article 20.3).

If the request for amendment is rejected by the Agency, (because it calls into question the decision awarding the grant or breaches the principle of equal treatment of applicants), the Agreement may be terminated according to Article 50.3.1(c).

If the request for amendment is accepted by the Agency, the Agreement is amended to introduce the necessary changes (see Article 55).

The Agency will calculate — on the basis of the periodic reports, the termination report and the report on the distribution of payments — if the (pre-financing and interim) payments received by the beneficiary concerned exceed the beneficiary’s EU contribution (calculated by applying the reimbursement rate(s) to the eligible costs declared by the beneficiary and approved by the Agency). Only costs incurred by the beneficiary concerned until termination takes effect are eligible (see Article 6). Costs relating to contracts due for execution only after termination are not eligible.

- If the payments received exceed the amounts due:
  - if termination takes effect during the period set out in Article 3 and the request for amendment is accepted, the beneficiary concerned must repay to the coordinator the amount unduly received. The Agency will formally notify the amount unduly received and request the beneficiary concerned to repay it to the coordinator within 30 days of receiving notification. If it does not repay the coordinator, the Agency will draw upon the Guarantee Fund to pay the coordinator and then notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the beneficiary concerned (see Article 44);
  - in all other cases (in particular if termination takes effect after the period set out in Article 3), the Agency will formally notify a debit note to the beneficiary concerned. If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the Guarantee Fund will pay to the Agency the amount due
and the Agency will notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the beneficiary concerned (see Article 44);

- if the beneficiary concerned is the former coordinator, it must repay the new coordinator according to the procedure above, unless:
  - termination is after an interim payment and
  - the former coordinator has not distributed amounts received as pre-financing or interim payments (see Article 21.7).

In this case, the Agency will formally notify a debit note to the former coordinator. If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the Guarantee Fund will pay to the Agency the amount due. The Agency will then pay the new coordinator and notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the former coordinator (see Article 44).

- If the payments received do not exceed the amounts due: amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned will be included in the next interim or final payment.

If the Agency does not receive the termination report within the deadline (see above), only costs included in an approved periodic report will be taken into account.

If the Agency does not receive the report on the distribution of payments within the deadline (see above), it will consider that:

- the coordinator did not distribute any payment to the beneficiary concerned and that
- the beneficiary concerned must not repay any amount to the coordinator.

Improper termination may lead to a reduction of the grant (see Article 43) or termination of the Agreement (see Article 50).

After termination, the concerned beneficiary’s obligations (in particular Articles 20, 22, 23, Section 3 of Chapter 4, 36, 37, 38 and 40) continue to apply.

50.3 Termination of the Agreement or the participation of one or more beneficiaries, by the Agency

50.3.1 Conditions

The Agency may terminate the Agreement or the participation of one or more beneficiaries, if:

(a) one or more beneficiaries do not accede to the Agreement (see Article 56);

(b) a change to their legal, financial, technical, organisational or ownership situation is likely to substantially affect or delay the implementation of the action or calls into question the decision to award the grant;

(c) following termination of participation for one or more beneficiaries (see above), the necessary changes to the Agreement would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants (see Article 55);
(d) implementation of the action is prevented by force majeure (see Article 51) or suspended by the coordinator (see Article 49.1) and either:

   (i) resumption is impossible, or

   (ii) the necessary changes to the Agreement would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants;

(e) a beneficiary is declared bankrupt, being wound up, having its affairs administered by the courts, has entered into an arrangement with creditors, has suspended business activities, or is subject to any other similar proceedings or procedures under national law;

(f) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has been found guilty of professional misconduct, proven by any means;

(g) a beneficiary does not comply with the applicable national law on taxes and social security;

(h) the action has lost scientific or technological relevance;

(i) not applicable;

(j) not applicable;

(k) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has committed fraud, corruption, or is involved in a criminal organisation, money laundering or any other illegal activity affecting the EU’s financial interests;

(l) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has — in the award procedure or under the Agreement — committed:

   (i) substantial errors, irregularities, fraud or

   (ii) serious breach of obligations, including improper implementation of the action, submission of false information, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles;

(m) a beneficiary has committed — in other EU or Euratom grants awarded to it under similar conditions — systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or serious breach of obligations that have a material impact on this grant (‘extension of findings from other grants to this grant’).

50.3.2 Procedure

Before terminating the Agreement or participation of one or more beneficiaries, the Agency will formally notify the coordinator:

- informing it of its intention to terminate and the reasons why and

- inviting it, within 30 days of receiving notification, to submit observations and — in case of Point (l.ii) above — to inform the Agency of the measures to ensure compliance with the obligations under the Agreement.
If the *Agency* does not receive observations or decides to pursue the procedure despite the observations it has received, it will formally notify to the coordinator **confirmation** of the termination and the date it will take effect. Otherwise, it will formally notify that the procedure is not continued.

The termination will **take effect**: 
- for terminations under Points (b), (c), (e), (g), (h), (j), and (l.ii) above: on the day specified in the notification of the confirmation (see above);
- for terminations under Points (a), (d), (f), (i), (k), (l.i) and (m) above: on the day after the notification of the confirmation is received by the coordinator.

**50.3.3 Effects**

(a) for **termination of the Agreement**:

The coordinator must — within 60 days from when termination takes effect — submit:

(i) a periodic report (for the last open reporting period until termination; see Article 20.3) and

(ii) a final report (see Article 20.4).

If the Agreement is terminated for breach of the obligation to submit the reports (see Articles 20.8 and 50.3.1(l)), the coordinator may not submit any reports after termination.

If the *Agency* does not receive the reports within the deadline (see above), only costs which are included in an approved periodic report will be taken into account.

The *Agency* will **calculate** the final grant amount (see Article 5.3) and the balance (see Article 21.4) on the basis of the reports submitted. Only costs incurred until termination takes effect are eligible (see Article 6). Costs relating to contracts due for execution only after termination are not eligible.

This does not affect the *Agency’s* right to reduce the grant (see Article 43) or to impose administrative and financial penalties (Article 45).

The beneficiaries may not claim damages due to termination by the *Agency* (see Article 46).

After termination, the beneficiaries’ obligations (in particular Articles 20, 22, 23, Section 3 of Chapter 4, 36, 37, 38 and 40) continue to apply.

(b) for **termination of the participation of one or more beneficiaries**:

The coordinator must — within 60 days from when termination takes effect — submit:

(i) a report on the distribution of payments to the beneficiary concerned;

(ii) a request for amendment (see Article 55), with a proposal for reallocation of the tasks and estimated budget of the beneficiary concerned (see Annexes 1 and 2) and, if
If termination is notified after the period set out in Article 3, no request for amendment must be submitted unless the beneficiary concerned is the coordinator. In this case the request for amendment must propose a new coordinator, and

(iii) if termination takes effect during the period set out in Article 3, a termination report from the beneficiary concerned, for the open reporting period until termination, containing an overview of the progress of the work, an overview of the use of resources, the individual financial statement and, if applicable, the certificate on the financial statement (see Article 20).

The information in the termination report must also be included in the periodic report for the next reporting period (see Article 20.3).

If the request for amendment is rejected by the Agency (because it calls into question the decision awarding the grant or breaches the principle of equal treatment of applicants), the Agreement may be terminated according to Article 50.3.1(c).

If the request for amendment is accepted by the Agency, the Agreement is amended to introduce the necessary changes (see Article 55).

The Agency will calculate — on the basis of the periodic reports, the termination report and the report on the distribution of payments — if the (pre-financing and interim) payments received by the beneficiary concerned exceed the beneficiary’s EU contribution (calculated by applying the reimbursement rate(s) to the eligible costs declared by the beneficiary and approved by the Agency). Only costs incurred by the beneficiary concerned until termination takes effect are eligible (see Article 6). Costs relating to contracts due for execution only after termination are not eligible.

- If the payments received exceed the amounts due:
  - if termination takes effect during the period set out in Article 3 and the request for amendment is accepted, the beneficiary concerned must repay to the coordinator the amount unduly received. The Agency will formally notify the amount unduly received and request the beneficiary concerned to repay it to the coordinator within 30 days of receiving notification. If it does not repay the coordinator, the Agency will draw upon the Guarantee Fund to pay the coordinator and then notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the beneficiary concerned (see Article 44);
  - in all other cases, in particular if termination takes effect after the period set out in Article 3, the Agency will formally notify a debit note to the beneficiary concerned. If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the Guarantee Fund will pay to the Agency the amount due and the Agency will notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the beneficiary concerned (see Article 44);
  - if the beneficiary concerned is the former coordinator, it must repay the new coordinator the amount unduly received, unless:
    - termination takes effect after an interim payment and
the former coordinator has not distributed amounts received as pre-financing or interim payments (see Article 21.7)

In this case, the *Agency* will formally notify a **debit note** to the former coordinator. If payment is not made by the date in the debit note, the Guarantee Fund will pay to the *Agency* the amount due. The *Agency* will then pay the new coordinator and notify a debit note on behalf of the Guarantee Fund to the former coordinator (see Article 44).

- If the payments received **do not exceed the amounts due**: amounts owed to the beneficiary concerned will be included in the next interim or final payment.

If the *Agency* does not receive the termination report within the deadline (see above), only costs included in an approved periodic report will be taken into account.

If the *Agency* does not receive the report on the distribution of payments within the deadline (see above), it will consider that:

- the coordinator did not distribute any payment to the beneficiary concerned, and that
- the beneficiary concerned must not repay any amount to the coordinator.

After termination, the concerned beneficiary’s obligations (in particular Articles 20, 22, 23, Section 3 of Chapter 4, 36, 37, 38 and 40) continue to apply.

**SECTION 4   FORCE MAJEURE**

**ARTICLE 51 — FORCE MAJEURE**

‘Force majeure’ means any situation or event that:

- prevents either party from fulfilling their obligations under the Agreement,
- was unforeseeable, exceptional situation and beyond the parties’ control,
- was not due to error or negligence on their part (or on the part of third parties involved in the action), and
- proves to be inevitable in spite of exercising all due diligence.

The following cannot be invoked as force majeure:

- any default of a service, defect in equipment or material or delays in making them available, unless they stem directly from a relevant case of force majeure,
- labour disputes or strikes, or
- financial difficulties.

Any situation constituting force majeure must be formally notified to the other party without delay, stating the nature, likely duration and foreseeable effects.
The parties must immediately take all the necessary steps to limit any damage due to force majeure and do their best to resume implementation of the action as soon as possible.

The party prevented by force majeure from fulfilling its obligations under the Agreement cannot be considered in breach of them.

CHAPTER 7   FINAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE 52 — COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES

52.1 Form and means of communication

Communication under the Agreement (information, requests, submissions, ‘formal notifications’, etc.) must:

- be made in writing and
- bear the number of the Agreement.

**Until the payment of the balance**: all communication must be made through the electronic exchange system and using the forms and templates provided there.

**After the payment of the balance**: formal notifications must be made by registered post with proof of delivery (‘formal notification on paper’).

Communications in the electronic exchange system must be made by persons authorised according to the ‘Terms and Conditions of Use of the electronic exchange system’. For naming the authorised persons, each beneficiary must have designated — before the signature of this Agreement — a ‘Legal Entity Appointed Representative (LEAR)’. The role and tasks of the LEAR are stipulated in his/her appointment letter (see Terms and Conditions of Use of the electronic exchange system).

If the electronic exchange system is temporarily unavailable, instructions will be given on the Agency and Commission websites.

52.2 Date of communication

Communications are considered to have been made when they are sent by the sending party (i.e. on the date and time they are sent through the electronic exchange system).

**Formal notifications** through the electronic exchange system are considered to have been made when they are received by the receiving party (i.e. on the date and time of acceptance by the receiving party, as indicated by the time stamp). A formal notification that has not been accepted within 10 days after sending is considered to have been accepted.

Formal notifications on paper sent by registered post with proof of delivery (only after the payment of the balance) are considered to have been made on either:

- the delivery date registered by the postal service or
- the deadline for collection at the post office.
If the electronic exchange system is temporarily unavailable, the sending party cannot be considered in breach of its obligation to send a communication within a specified deadline.

52.3 Addresses for communication

The electronic exchange system must be accessed via the following URL:


The Agency will formally notify the coordinator and beneficiaries in advance any changes to this URL.

**Formal notifications on paper** (only after the payment of the balance) addressed to the Agency must be sent to the following address:

Research Executive Agency (REA)
Spreading Excellence, Widening Participation, Science with and for Society
COV2 2/040
B-1049 Brussels Belgium

Formal notifications on paper (only after the payment of the balance) addressed to the beneficiaries must be sent to their legal address as specified in the 'Beneficiary Register'.

**ARTICLE 53 — INTERPRETATION OF THE AGREEMENT**

53.1 Precedence of the Terms and Conditions over the Annexes

The provisions in the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement take precedence over its Annexes.

Annex 2 takes precedence over Annex 1.

53.2 Privileges and immunities

*Not applicable*

**ARTICLE 54 — CALCULATION OF PERIODS, DATES AND DEADLINES**

In accordance with Regulation No 1182/71\textsuperscript{28}, periods expressed in days, months or years are calculated from the moment the triggering event occurs.

The day during which that event occurs is not considered as falling within the period.

**ARTICLE 55 — AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT**

55.1 Conditions

The Agreement may be amended, unless the amendment entails changes to the Agreement which would call into question the decision awarding the grant or breach the principle of equal treatment of applicants.

Amendments may be requested by any of the parties.

55.2 Procedure

The party requesting an amendment must submit a request for amendment signed in the electronic exchange system (see Article 52).

The coordinator submits and receives requests for amendment on behalf of the beneficiaries (see Annex 3).

If a change of coordinator is requested without its agreement, the submission must be done by another beneficiary (acting on behalf of the other beneficiaries).

The request for amendment must include:

- the reasons why;
- the appropriate supporting documents;
- for a change of coordinator without its agreement: the opinion of the coordinator (or proof that this opinion has been requested in writing).

The Agency may request additional information.

If the party receiving the request agrees, it must sign the amendment in the electronic exchange system within 45 days of receiving notification (or any additional information the Agency has requested). If it does not agree, it must formally notify its disagreement within the same deadline. The deadline may be extended, if necessary for the assessment of the request. If no notification is received within the deadline, the request is considered to have been rejected.

An amendment enters into force on the day of the signature of the receiving party.

An amendment takes effect on the date agreed by the parties or, in the absence of such an agreement, on the date on which the amendment enters into force.

ARTICLE 56 — ACCESSION TO THE AGREEMENT

56.1 Accession of the beneficiaries mentioned in the Preamble

The other beneficiaries must accede to the Agreement by signing the Accession Form (see Annex 3) in the electronic exchange system (see Article 52) within 30 days after its entry into force (see Article 58).

They will assume the rights and obligations under the Agreement with effect from the date of its entry into force (see Article 58).

If a beneficiary does not accede to the Agreement within the above deadline, the coordinator must — within 30 days — request an amendment to make any changes necessary to ensure proper implementation of the action. This does not affect the Agency’s right to terminate the Agreement (see Article 50).
56.2 Addition of new beneficiaries

In justified cases, the beneficiaries may request the addition of a new beneficiary.

For this purpose, the coordinator must submit a request for amendment in accordance with Article 55. It must include an Accession Form (see Annex 3) signed by the new beneficiary in the electronic exchange system (see Article 52).

New beneficiaries must assume the rights and obligations under the Agreement with effect from the date of their accession specified in the Accession Form (see Annex 3).

ARTICLE 57 — APPLICABLE LAW AND SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

57.1 Applicable law

The Agreement is governed by the applicable EU law, supplemented if necessary by the law of Belgium.

57.2 Dispute settlement

If a dispute concerning the interpretation, application or validity of the Agreement cannot be settled amicably, the General Court — or, on appeal, the Court of Justice of the European Union — has sole jurisdiction. Such actions must be brought under Article 272 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU (TFEU).

If a dispute concerns administrative or financial penalties, offsetting or an enforceable decision under Article 299 TFEU (see Articles 44, 45 and 46), the beneficiaries must bring action before the General Court — or, on appeal, the Court of Justice of the European Union — under Article 263 TFEU. Actions against enforceable decisions must be brought against the Commission (not against the Agency).
ARTICLE 58 — ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AGREEMENT

The Agreement will enter into force on the day of signature by the Agency or the coordinator, depending on which is later.

SIGNATURES

For the coordinator

Mylams GUSEMANS with ECAS id njpsmyr signed in the Participant Portal on 21/05/2015 at 14:03:15 (transaction id 891d-611- 85wjj8l-Jskv/mshb/bShNbcnVnqyDvzpazlO4QY1x7QgQCwENCuO3p9Hmln- nWczMps2SVP.2GFA7f/9JKdL6HD5L4Ay-Phhs/LMVSXYYCYCYYzmrRk5Mih- 6W8RhuK6FECnnsAkpzg9g632Rhw6Sze30Ym3zy0l). Timestamp by third party at Thu May 21 15:03:24 CEST 2015

For the Agency

Peter VAN DER ZANDT with ECAS id zanptpe signed in the Participant Portal on 17/06/2015 at 07:32:17 (transaction id 891d-1948- sX7/znw23YBBqPzP20CMTvKs2mLxq9PnYsVczatfW7FIISXsTMJnWZ- vAPHP7H4czWZ2QczSkPhjka2ozg20oa-PHs/LMVSXYYCyCMrR7qVqfIPwF4- gp3lN94/KXweyMGGqGm60enf7/genBuOqvmyzorfZ23V0l). Timestamp by third party at Wed Jun 17 08:32:20 CEST 2015
ANNEX 1 (part A)

Coordination and support action
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1.1. The project summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>665759</th>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>EnRRICH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration in months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call (part) identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed EC Keywords</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free keywords</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstract

The Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) project will build the capacity of staff in higher education to facilitate their students’ development of knowledge, skills and attitudes and competencies in responsible research and innovation, and respond to the research needs of society, particularly underserved civil society organisations (CSOs). It will do this by identifying, developing, testing, and disseminating resources, based on existing good practice and trials of new initiatives, to embed the five RRI keys in academic curricula across Europe, with specific reference to science and engineering. It will develop case studies which showcase examples for students, teachers, professional trainers and academic staff of HEIs. Through ongoing dialogue with academics, policymakers, and CSOs, EnRRICH will kick start debates at institutional, national and international levels to create awareness of, and enhance the policy context for, RRI in curricula and thereby produce more responsible and responsive graduates and researchers. These objectives will be achieved building on the Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society (PERARES) and RRI Tools projects. It will involve new partners as well as a core of established partners drawn from HEIs and CSOs, including from RRI tools. It will establish an advisory board drawn from relevant organisations to ensure the widest possible engagement and dissemination. Work packages will deal with project management, state of the art of good practices in introducing RRI into curriculum development, exchange and trialling of good practices at national, international and transdisciplinary levels, policy development, evaluation, dissemination and a conference. Deliverables will include case studies and policy papers, and materials and resources for academic staff to involve students in experiential learning about RRI, including projects in partnership with CSOs.
### 1.2. List of Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project entry month</th>
<th>Project exit month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL</td>
<td>VUB</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK</td>
<td>UCC</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI SASSARI</td>
<td>UNISS</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WISSENSCHAFTSLADEN BONN EV</td>
<td>WilaBonn</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DUBLIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>DIT</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE</td>
<td>UCAM</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM</td>
<td>CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UNIVERSITAET VECHTA</td>
<td>UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>FUNDACIO PRIVADA INSTITUT DE RECERCA DE LA SIDA-CAIXA</td>
<td>IRSICAIXA</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>COMUNAUTE D'UNIVERSITES ET ETABLISSEMENTS UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJI IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA</td>
<td>Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 1.3. Workplan Tables - Detailed implementation

## 1.3.1. WT1 List of work packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP Number</th>
<th>WP Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Person-months</th>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>Consortium Management</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Identifying best practice, surveying needs and developing new course material in RRI</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Piloting RRI educational materials in higher education curricula</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Strengthening RRI in curricula through science shop work – good practice exchange and pilots</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula by utilising and developing the policy context at institutional, national and international levels to encourage this work</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Evaluation: Learning, stakeholder accountability, approaches</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Conference on building RRI into curricula in HEIs</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 179.00**
## 1.3.2. WT2 list of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number(^{14})</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>WP number (^9)</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type (^{18})</th>
<th>Dissemination level (^{16})</th>
<th>Due Date (in months) (^{17})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Survey and consultation results and analysis</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Web pages of good practice and case study suggestions</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Guidelines manual</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>Resources for enhancing understanding and prompting debate</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report on trialling of RRI teaching strategies</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Framework and resources for a professional development workshop</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Report on piloting practices</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Promotional booklet for students</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Executive summary state of the art policy to reward RRI through the curriculum</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Policy brief 1 (International/national/ institutional level)</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Policy brief 2 (international/national/ institutional)</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type 15</td>
<td>Dissemination level 16</td>
<td>Due Date (in months) 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>Policy brief (European level)</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>WP3 &amp; 4 evaluation report</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Guidelines for embedding RRI in curricula</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>Project accountability report</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>EnRRICH project webpages</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Social media report</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 1</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 2</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.5</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 3</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.6</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 4</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.7</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 5</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.8</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 6</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type 18</td>
<td>Dissemination level 16</td>
<td>Due Date (in months) 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.9</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 7 WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.10</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 8 WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.11</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 9 WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.12</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 10 WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.1</td>
<td>Conference website WP8</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>conference in Dublin WP8</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>updated conference website WP8</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.3. WT3 Work package descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>1 - VUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Consortium Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

- To facilitate the internal decision making process in the consortium
- To coordinate the implementation of the work plan
- To coordinate and monitor activities, and facilitate adaptation of work plans if required
- To organize and run administrative and financial issues
- To formally represent the consortium towards the European Commission
- To coordinate the management support group and advisory board

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP1 - Consortium Management [Months: 1-30]**

**VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST**

The EnRRICH project and this management WP will be coordinated by partner 1, VUB. Partner 2, the Queen's University Belfast, will assist in the daily project coordination activities. For the overall project management, the coordinator will be supported by a Management Support Team consisting of all WP leaders and an Advisory Board of project stakeholders.

Task 1 – Consortium Meetings and Internal Communication (Months 1-30)

1.1 facilitating the decision making process by setting up a General Assembly (GA), consisting of one key person from each of the consortium participants.

1.2 coordinating the organisation of the GA meetings, face-to-face 4 times during the project (Month 1, 12, 20 and 30). These will allow to make joint decisions, to monitor the project, and if necessary, to agree upon changes and rearrangements of the working plan, and to co-ordinate future activities. The GA meetings will be part of the general consortium meetings that are there to exchange information among the partners, including preparation and follow-up for the large conference (WP8). The locations for, and host of the meetings will be agreed upon during the kick-off meeting. This first meeting will make sure there is a mutual understanding among all partners of the working plan and the philosophies behind it regarding RRI. E-mail and telephone conferences will be used for decision making between the GA meetings.

1.3 Setting up practice groups representing different WPs as a peer support mechanism. The practice group tasks are monitoring, facilitating and networking across the different WPs to enhance the reach of the project and efficient use of resources. WP leaders will report into these groups.

1.4 Introduce and set up consortium cooperative tools and mailing lists to provide convenient and appropriate mechanisms for facilitating the free flow of information across the project partners and the other related stakeholders. Archiving all management documents in a Dropbox project folder to allow a dynamic follow-up of managerial components of the project. All kind of reports (technical and administrative) and written communications between partners will be archived.

Task 2 – Management advisory board (Months 1-30)

2.1 Setting up an advisory board including

- people experienced in managing EC projects to support the management and management decisions
- stakeholders representatives group (10 members) to connect to relevant EnRRICH stakeholders and networks:

1) Omar Osman, Asia-Pacific University-Community Engagement Network, Universiti Sains Malaysia
2) Michael Cuthill, Regional Community Development, University of Southern Queensland Australia
3) Sophie Duncan, National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement, United Kingdom
4) Budd Hall/Rajesh Tandon, UNESCO chair in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education Canada/India (alternating)
5) Francesc Xavier Grau Vidal, Global University Network for Innovation, Universitat Rovira I Virgili Spain
6) Peter Levesque, Institute for Knowledge Mobilization, Canada
7) Janice McMillan, Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching, University of Cape Town, South Africa
8) Henk Mulder, Science Communication expert University of Groningen, coordinator PERARES project, The Netherlands  
9) Roser Pinto, Research center in Science and Mathematics Education, RRI Tools project, Spain  
10) Arjen Wals, UNESCO Chair Social Learning and Sustainable Development, University of Gothenburg & Wageningen University Sweden & The Netherlands  

2.2 Keeping in close touch with this advisory board, asking their advice and input by mail and phone, inviting a selection of advisory board members to consortium meetings and the Living Knowledge Conference  

Task 3 – Monitoring and Reporting on the project (Months 1-30)  
3.1 The project coordinator will perform the monitoring of the general progress of the project, and the compliance by beneficiaries with their obligations, supported by the Management Support Team. The project coordinator will safeguard the main overall project objectives and will put forward any issues to the GA.  
3.2 The coordinator will deliver 2 Reports (M12 & M30) to the Commission.  
3.3 The project coordinator is the contact point for the European Commission.  
3.4 As EnRRICH is taking part in the Pilot on Open Research Data, a data management plan (D1.1) will be delivered within the first 6 months of the project, following the template in the H2020 Online Manual. This plan will evolve during the project, presenting the status of the project's reflections on data management.  

Task 4 – Financial Administration (Months 1-30)  
4.1 The financial administration and payments will be done by VUB for the overall project. The coordinator shall ensure that all the appropriate payments are made to the other beneficiaries without unjustified delay; keep the records and financial accounts and will inform the EC of the distribution of the financial contribution and the date of transfers to the beneficiaries, when required.  
4.2 All partners are responsible for delivering sufficient information considering their activities and expenditure of their respective budgets to the coordinator. The coordinator will take action to manage risk.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP1 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 -  VUB</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 -  THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of deliverables  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1.1</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
<td>1 -  VUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables  

D1.1 Data management plan, following the Pilot on Open Research Data (M6)  
D1.1 : Data management plan [6]  
As EnRRICH is taking part in the Pilot on Open Research Data, a data management plan will be delivered within the first 6 months of the project, following the template in the H2020 Online Manual. This plan will evolve during the project, presenting the status of the project's reflections on data management.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly Meeting 1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kick-off consortium meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>Consortium/General Assembly Meeting 2</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consortium/General Assembly meeting 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>Consortium/General Assembly meeting 3</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Consortium/General Assembly meeting 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Consortium/General Assembly meeting 4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final Consortium/General Assembly meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number | WP2
---|---
Lead beneficiary | 7 - UCAM

Work package title | Identifying best practice, surveying needs and developing new course material in RRI

Objectives

- Review background information (including Dublin Descriptors, RRI Tools project) relating to RRI (including RRI keys) in curricula across different academic disciplines and at Bachelor and Master level in higher education
- Working with stakeholder groups to identify good practices that demonstrate the embedding of RRI
- Using this information to articulate student learning outcomes and competencies at Bachelor and Master levels which should contribute to the development of responsible and responsive graduates and act as a solid base for the rest of the project

Description of work and role of partners

WP2 - Identifying best practice, surveying needs and developing new course material in RRI [Months: 1-25]

UCAM, VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UCC, UNISS, WilaBonn, DIT, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, WU, IRSICAIXA, UNIVERSITE DE LYON, Vilnius technologiju ir dizaino kolegija

WP2 will be coordinated by UCAM. All EnRRICH consortium partners will participate, to provide information about how RRI keys feature, or not, in curricula at local HEIs, consult and/or survey students, lecturers, CSOs and other stakeholders.

Task 1. Exploration and state of the art review of RRI practices in higher education curricula (Months 1-6)
1.1 Review relevant frameworks (Dublin descriptors, European RRI framework) to conceptualise competences for RRI to be developed among students - building on this background for subsequent information-gathering about current practices in integrating RRI in the curriculum.
1.2 Scoping relevant information from potential stakeholder organisations relevant to specific RRI keys. Reviewing good practices in teaching and learning about RRI keys – seeking this information not only from HEIs but recognizing the wider contributions that can be made by civil society organisations and organisations in public and private sector, professional associations, science museums and other providers of informal learning, librarians specializing in open access, researchers in science and technology studies etc.
1.3 Use background research on RRI to make initial identification of desirable RRI competencies and learning outcomes among students at Bachelors and Masters level, that integrate knowledge, skills and attitudes. Produce initial scoping document (milestone 2.1, month 6).

Task 2. Survey and consultation of stakeholders to generate case studies of RRI in curricula and identify needs for development (Months 3-6)
2.1 Conducting a thorough background information and state of the art review of current practices in RRI in curricula in higher education. There will be a particular focus on how approaches like participatory research, research with and for civil society, community-based research and science shops (link with task 1 of WP4) can provide opportunities for students to learn about aspects of RRI.
2.2 Online survey and guidance for consultations and interviews to be drafted by UCAM with input from other members and consortium members will gather information from students, faculty and external contacts in their area, to understand current content in curricula relevant to RRI, including understanding supportive and hindering factors for embedding RRI in curricula at different levels. This involves interaction with RRI Tools consultation and the national RRI Hubs. Survey and interview topic guide will be milestone 2.2, month 3.
2.3 Specifically, survey and consult with students at HEIs about any experiences and/or aspirations for learning about RRI keys, to gain an understanding of where in the curriculum students learn about these topics and have the opportunity to develop competencies in these areas; and where there are gaps and opportunities in the curriculum.
2.4 Survey and consult with representatives of stakeholder organisations (CSOs as well as other organisations including public sector and businesses) on teaching on RRI issues, regarding what is considered desirable for students to learn, and relevant methodologies for societal engagement.
2.5 Survey and consult with directors of education and lecturers regarding RRI keys to ask about current teaching and aspirations for future integration of RRI keys into teaching.
2.6 Survey and consultation results will be analysed and conclusions drawn both that relate to different disciplines and cross-disciplinary competences at different levels of higher education. Distil best practices and opportunities for development. Describe the supportive and hindering factors for embedding RRI in curricula at different levels, based on results of surveys and consultation.

2.7 Project website, searchable webpages of good practice and case study suggestions in teaching RRI in curricula for different subjects, at different levels; also have this linked from RRI Tools website.

Task 3. Articulating of learning outcomes and competences to embed RRI within undergraduate and postgraduate levels of education (Months 3-6)
3.1 Use review results to update the initial guidelines that support embedding RRI in curricula at Bachelor and Masters level, including a focus on transdisciplinary learning.
3.2 Share analysis of survey and consultation results, and the draft guidelines, with project Advisory Board and relevant other project contacts. Seek further expert feedback and input.
3.3 WU leads the development of draft list of learning outcomes and competences to embed RRI within Bachelors and Masters level, including suggestions on learning and assessment methods and design of the learning environment.
3.4 Produce a first draft guidelines including a clear, distinct set of competencies and learning outcomes, providing suggestions for facilitating and monitoring students’ RRI development at Bachelors and Masters level

Task 4. Sharing information to inform pilot delivery in WP3 and WP4 (Months 6-25)
Meet with leaders and members of work packages 3 and 4, to share state of the art review and draft guidelines, to inform pilots to be carried out in WP3 and WP4.

Task 5. Producing a guidelines manual (Month 10-12)
Produce initial recommendations guidelines manual for embedding learning about RRI (D2.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner number and short name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Survey and consultation results and analysis</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Web pages of good practice and case study suggestions</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Guidelines manual</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D2.1 Survey and consultation results and analysis (M6)**
Survey and consultation of stakeholders to generate case studies of RRI in curricula and identify needs for development

**D2.2 Web pages of good practice and case study suggestions [6]**
Web resource, searchable webpages of good practice and case study suggestions in teaching and learning about RRI in curricula for different subjects, at different levels: also have this linked from RRI Tools website (M6)

**D2.3 Initial recommendations guidelines manual for embedding learning about RRI. (M12)**

### Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Scoping Document on RRI in curricula</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Use background research on RRI to make initial identification of desirable RRI competencies and learning outcomes among students at Bachelors and Masters level, that integrate knowledge, skills and attitudes to produce an initial scoping document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Survey tool and consultation/interview guidance finalized</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Online survey and guidance for consultations and interviews to be drafted by UCAM with input from other members and consortium members will gather information from students, faculty and external contacts in their area, to understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
<td>Milestone title</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Draft manual for enhancing teaching and learning about RRI keys</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Produce a first draft guidelines including a clear, distinct set of competencies and learning outcomes, providing suggestions for facilitating and monitoring students’ RRI development at Bachelors and Masters level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>current content in curricula relevant to RRI, including understanding supportive and hindering factors for embedding RRI in curricula at different levels. This involves interaction with RRI Tools consultation and the national RRI Hubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package number</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Piloting RRI educational materials in higher education curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

1. To share information, and repurpose and develop resources emerging from WP2 for trialling in particular Higher Education curricula
2. To support and develop teaching staff in higher education to integrate RRI methodologies in student programmes and modules and to sustain this practice
3. To work collaboratively with civil society organisations, professional associations, social enterprise and national bodies to renew curricula and integrate the RRI keys
4. To select existing or newly developed courses for piloting RRI methodologies across different levels, i.e. undergraduate and postgraduate, and share the case studies and teaching resources arising from these trials
5. To identify opportunities to embed and sustain RRI methodologies and teaching practices through building collaborations to share resources and practices, using targeted dissemination (via WP7) and leveraging institutional, regional, national, European and international policies (linked to WP5).

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP3 - Piloting RRI educational materials in higher education curricula** [Months: 3-30]

UCC, VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UNISS, WiLaBonn, DIT, UCAM, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, U, IRSICAIXA, UNIVERSITE DE LYON

WP3 will be coordinated by UCC and the partners include CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, DIT, IRSICAIXA, QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UCAM, UNIVERSITE DE LYON, UNISS, UNIVERSITÄT VECHTA, VUB, WiLaBonn and U. UCC will be responsible for reporting to the consortium, the dissemination of milestone reports and the collation of partner reports on local trials into the final deliverables.

**Task 1. Review of RRI teaching resources and development of teaching staff (M3-16)**

1.1 Review and repurposing of RRI tools (Months 3-6)

- Review materials and information emerging from WP2.
- Each work package member to work with at least one academic discipline at their higher education institution to tailor RRI content from WP2 and beyond for piloting in specific curricula.
- Gather together discipline-specific and generic teaching resources and identify activities and assessments that will enable students to achieve the Learning Outcomes identified in the competency framework developed in WP2.

1.2 Support and development of staff (Months 5-16)

Create a two stage staff development activity to support their integration of RRI methodologies and curriculum renewal.

(1) Host a kick-start workshop at the Living Knowledge conference (WP8) to scope opportunities for renewing or developing courses to integrate RRI (including the RRI keys), to identify effective teaching strategies that support the achievement of competencies demonstrating the integration of RRI. This event will also serve to recruit academic partners to engage in classroom based pilots and may also include community partners and social enterprise representatives.

(2) Hosting of Swap Shops at national levels to help create an understanding of RRI in the curriculum at institutional, regional and national levels, to share existing examples of good RRI practices in their area (including examples from civil society organisations, professional associations, social enterprise representatives and national bodies), to "swap"/share this information with participants from other sectors and to collaboratively develop curriculum interventions for the in-classroom pilots.

**Task 2. Local trial of RRI methodologies in HE curricula across different levels (Months 7-24)**

Based on task 1.2, coordinate in-class pilots focused on integrating RRI (including RRI Keys) to incrementally develop students’ RRI competencies and expose them to public engagement activities. Collaboration will be encouraged with community or social enterprise partners and the learning will be shared with WP4 to inform this work. Peer evaluation will take place with students, staff and other partners linked to WP6. Activities already identified include:

- First year lecture/workshop on societal issues and RRI methodologies to be delivered to students across a range of disciplines including Science and Engineering
- Community-based learning (CBL) projects within modules where degree students engage with secondary school to enhance their engagement with and interest in Science and Engineering subjects
- Early stage exposure to community-based research (CBR) projects with a focus on engaging students from Science and Engineering subjects
- Development of a postgraduate module on participatory research methods

Task 3. Embedding and sustaining good practice (Months 20-30)
- Identify opportunities for inclusion of RRI in staff continuing professional development such as staff induction, supervisor training, and accredited programmes. Devise a professional development workshop framework for educators in higher education, based on the kick start workshop. This can be used by Teaching and Learning centres, research offices, professional organisations, national bodies etc. to encourage sustained engagement and embedding of RRI in Higher Education.
- Identify institutional, regional and national policy levers and utilise these to encourage the inclusion of RRI in Higher Education curricula

Task 4. Reporting to consortium management
An overview of the trials to be put in place in the participating institutions will be shared with the consortium at a very early stage (M12). Progress reports will be given to all project participants through oral presentations and/or written reports at consortium meetings (M12 & M20 & M30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner number and short name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITY OF VECHTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report on trialling of RRI teaching strategies</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Framework and resources for a professional development workshop</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D3.1 Resources for enhancing understanding and prompting debate on societal issues in the curriculum for early stage students (M24) D3.2 Report on trialling of RRI teaching strategies including an executive summary of the completed pilots including case studies and teaching materials for widespread dissemination (M28) D3.3 Framework and resources for a professional development workshop for academic staff to support the integration of RRI in Higher Education curricula (M28)

D3.1 : Resources for enhancing understanding and prompting debate [24] Resources for enhancing understanding and prompting debate on societal issues in the curriculum for early stage students.


D3.3 : Framework and resources for a professional development workshop [28] Framework and resources for a professional development workshop for academic staff to support the integration of RRI in Higher Education curricula.

Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Report on repurposing and sharing of resources and the identification of teaching strategies for integrating RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Report on trials</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Report on trialling of RRI teaching strategies and sharing of educational sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package number</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Strengthening RRI in curricula through science shop work – good practice exchange and pilots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

1. To support incorporation of RRI in higher education curricula through science shops and other community knowledge exchange mechanisms, starting and mentoring new practices and sustaining already established practices.
2. To exchange and pilot good science shop practices in higher education curricula across different countries and share the case studies and learning arising from these pilots through a Community of Practice (CoP).
3. To gather community based knowledge on common grand societal challenges in curricular activities, in partnership with a wide variety of societal stakeholders, in order to obtain European wide data and recommendations on how to address the societal challenge.
4. To evaluate outcomes for all stakeholders, in order to test science shop projects as a mechanism to integrate RRI in HEI curricula.

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP4 - Strengthening RRI in curricula through science shop work – good practice exchange and pilots** [Months: 3-30]

**VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UCC, UNISS, DIT, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, WU, IRSICAIXA, UNIVERSITE DE LYON, Vilniaus technologijų ir dizaino kolegių**

WP4 will be coordinated by VUB and involves both partners with an experienced community knowledge exchange mechanism (VUB, QUEENS UNIVERSITY BELFAST, UCC, DIT, UNISS and WU) and with a new or starting one (UNIVERSITE DE LYON, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIIŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA and IRSICAIXA).

**Task 1:** Refocusing Science shop literature, composing a body of information on science shops as a good practice in curricula to address all RRI keys (Months 3-5)

Based on the reviews in WP2, RRI keys literature and other related projects including RRI Tools and PERARES, an easy accessible body of information on science shops as a way to stimulate RRI in HEI will be composed, to use for dissemination in Higher Education Institutes and through the Living Knowledge website (milestone M4.1).

**Task 2:** Setting up a Community of Practice (CoP) on curricular embedding of science shops (Months 5-30).

- Set up the agenda: Identify good practices, main needs and challenges in new and already established science shops related to their embedding in curricula, addressing the five RRI keys, in the following areas: stakeholder relations, research domains/topics, impact of the study work.
- Based on identified needs & challenges, include good practices in the above mentioned domains and keys, resulting from the similar science shop exchanging work being done in previous EU projects and the Living Knowledge website.
- The interaction in the CoP will be:
  1) Virtual: by e-mail, videoconferencing and an online debate platform on the EnRRICH website
  2) Face-to-face: mentoring visits of experienced science shops (potentially in the frame of an Erasmus+ staff exchange) and CoP meetings during consortium meetings and the conference

**Task 3:** Performing local science shop pilots on exchanged practices in the CoP (Months 10-26)

- Based on the CoP exchanges, all WP members will run pilot science shop projects to integrate the good practices, in the domains of the by the EC formulated grand societal challenges ‘Health, demographic change and wellbeing’ or ‘Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research, and the Bioeconomy’, potentially including a STEM focus.
- Local community partners, students and supervisors (including PhD students) will be recruited to collaborate on this research within the curriculum, piloting the selected practices. As this will be integrated in the daily way of work of the science shop, the recruitment will take place according to the rules of the involved science shops. E.g. if a particular science shop doesn't remunerate their students or supervisors, the involved students or supervisors won't get (additional) allowances in these pilots either. The supervision of this project will incorporate relevant teaching materials developed in...
WP3 to ensure that the focus of the research pilot is the development of knowledge of RRI tools among the participating students, but also that this learning is available to the supervisor and the external partner.

- The pilots will be supported through ongoing exchange in the CoP.

Task 4. Ongoing evaluation of the pilots, embedding good practice (Months 10-30)
- During consortium meetings and mentoring visits, complementary approaches in the grand societal challenges will be defined, the ongoing case studies will be discussed and adjusted, ‘critical friends’ mentoring will be continued (in the frame of WP6).
- Right before the Living Knowledge Conference, a science shop Summer School will be held, building on the PERARES summer schools, upgraded with EnRRICH material on science shops as a way to embed RRI in higher education curricula.
- After the pilots, CoP members and other stakeholders will evaluate the work for the learning on RRI, also in the frame of WP6.
- Identification of opportunities for promoting and embedding the articulated good practices in student programmes

Task 5. Reporting to consortium
An overview of the pilots to be put in place in the participating institutions, the transnational approach and gathered community-based knowledge on the two Grand Societal Challenges will be shared with the consortium. Progress reports will be given to all project participants through oral presentations and/or written reports at consortium meetings.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP4 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Report on piloting practices</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Promotional booklet for students</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables
D 4.1 Report on piloting practices at partner institutions, including case studies, findings of community based research focussed on the grand societal challenge with consideration of national and transdisciplinary contexts, the learning of members, key considerations when establishing a new science shop and getting into curricula, also making clear links with PERARES, RRI Tools work and the RRI keys. Publication of this research report will also support the Open Access RRI key (M30).

D 4.1 : Report on piloting practices [30]
Report on piloting practices at partner institutions, including case studies, findings of community based research focussed on the grand societal challenge with consideration of national and transdisciplinary contexts, the learning of members, key considerations when establishing a new science shop and getting into curricula, also making clear links with PERARES, RRI Tools work and the RRI keys. Publication of this research report will also support the Open Access RRI key.

D 4.2 : Promotional booklet for students [30]
Promotional booklet on science shops as a way of integrating RRI in higher education curricula.

### Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manual on Science Shops stimulating RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Setting up a Community of Practice on Science Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Science Shop Summer School during LK Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package number</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula by utilising and developing the policy context at institutional, national and international levels to encourage this work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

The overall aim of this work package is to stimulate dialogue on the development of policy at international, national and institutional levels to advance the uptake of responsible research and innovation in academic curricula. This will promote a policy context for academic institutions in Europe and elsewhere which promotes the uptake of course material relating to RRI in the curriculum. The objectives therefore are:

1. To examine the setting of standards of academic quality at a policy level and assess their relevance to, and value for, supporting RRI through the curriculum
2. To examine resources and assess good practices and bottlenecks from other projects, including the PERARES project and RRI Tools
3. To build on these to develop and trial resources which aim to promote policy discussion at international, national and/or institutional levels, to support RRI through the curriculum
4. To share such resources and invite comments on their use in different national contexts and thus kick start a global debate on the setting of standards at a policy level? for RRI in higher education curricula

**Description of work and role of partners**

WP5 - Advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula by utilising and developing the policy context at institutional, national and international levels to encourage this work [Months: 1-28]

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, VUB, UCC, UNISS, WilaBonn, DIT, UCAM, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, WU, IRSICAIXA

Task 1: Update the State of the Art overview of standards of academic quality which can be used to support RRI through the curriculum in a range of academic programmes within different disciplines, particularly science and engineering (where relevant linked to the Bologna process of curricula reform) including in third countries (Month 1-12)

1a: Work with other partners and other EC funded projects to gather information and exchange experiences at European, regional and transnational levels (Month 1-6)

- Collate relevant information from ongoing European Commission funded projects and other relevant national and international bodies on RRI – RRI Tools, other projects funded under SEAC, NCCPE, VITAE (Month 1-6)
- Collate information on how activities of HEIs may be measured in the field of RRI through the curriculum – EURIDYCE, Shanghai Index, (Month 1-6)
- Collate information on measures of academic quality and esteem, particularly quality enhancement and research frameworks, to examine opportunities for recognition and promotion in relation to RRI through the curriculum eg EURAXSS, ENQA, QQI, QAA (Month 1-6)
- Collate information on professional associations in relation to standard settings within the curricula, particularly in science and engineering subjects (Month 1-6)

1b: Initial reporting on phase 1 and kickstarting discussion (Month 6-9)

- Draft report written on tasks 1a drawing out models of good practice in summary form (Month 6),
- Discuss report in consortium meeting especially to develop links with WP3 and WP4 (Month 7).

- Use draft report to invite participation from organisations in a range of countries to add their experiences of embedding RRI through the curriculum at regional and institutional level – both within and external to the project - and examine blockages

1c: Final policy reporting State of the Art in policy across Europe for evaluation and recognition and promotion of RRI through the curriculum

- Final report integrating information gathered in WP2 and WP6 where relevant (Month 12, Milestone 1)
- Workshop with policymakers at conference to kick start discussions (Month 12)

Task 2: Gain a deeper understanding of policy drivers for RRI through the curriculum by reviewing and repurposing policy tools from RRI Tools and other relevant projects and trial at an operational level through carrying out at least three national level case studies (Month 12-16)
2a. Work with other partners to identify four countries where partners working in WP3 and 4 wish to examine policy in relation to RRI through the curriculum. (Month 12 consortium meeting)

2b. Provide resources to stimulate dialogue on RRI in the curriculum in at least four countries by producing an interview guide and training for identified partners to use in their local contexts (both institutional and national/regional) (Month 12 consortium meeting)

2c. Engage with key policy makers at international, national and/or institutional levels to discuss policy drivers for RRI in the curriculum and therefore stimulate dialogue (month 12-14)

2d. Based on tasks 2b and 2c, write up at least four case studies examining the policy context in national contexts and on the effectiveness of the tools used and share publicly (Month 15-16).

Task 3: Utilise information gathered in task 2 to develop a better understanding of blockages to including RRI in the curriculum and create resources to encourage dialogue with key policy makers (Month 14-22)

3a. Use information gathered in tasks 1 and 2 to examine good practice in and blockages to including RRI keys in the curriculum at national and institutional levels (Month 14-16)

3b. Hold a workshop to identify the two key areas that need addressed in relation to the RRI keys for discussion at the consortium meeting in month 19 and once identified, invite comments via the consortium website (Month 16-19)

3c. Report on task 3 (Month 22)

Task 4: Final reporting to integrate all studies and promote dialogue on RRI in the curriculum (Months 22-28)

4a. Review information gathered in tasks 1-3 and develop a two page policy brief aimed at European educational policymakers, setting out the state of the art on RRI through the curriculum

4b. Working with WP3 and WP4, produce case studies and draw out good practice lessons for policy guidelines for curriculum development for RRI and share at national level where appropriate to kick start dialogues

4c. Working with WP3 and WP4, develop two policy briefs aimed at national and institutional levels which integrate good practice on enabling RRI through the curriculum and working with other partners share at national levels where appropriate to kick start dialogues

4d. Working with all partners develop a policy brief aimed at European policymakers and projects to stimulate a discussion on the state of the art of RRI through the curriculum, including case study material where relevant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner number and short name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Executive summary state of the art policy to reward RRI through the curriculum</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Policy brief 1 (International/national/institutional level)</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Policy brief 2 (international/national/institutional)</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>Policy brief (European level)</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

D5.1 Executive summary state of the art policy to reward RRI through the curriculum (Month 12) D5.2 and D5.3 Two policy briefs aimed at international, national and/or institutional levels which examine blockages and integrate good practice on enabling RRI through the curriculum (months 26 & 28) D5.4 Policy brief (including case study material where relevant) aimed at European policymakers setting out the state of the art on RRI through the curriculum which can be brought to national levels by other partners (Month 28)

D5.1 : Executive summary state of the art policy to reward RRI through the curriculum [12]

Executive summary state of the art policy to reward RRI through the curriculum.

D5.2 : Policy brief 1 (International/national/institutional level) [26]

Issue based policy brief aimed at international, national and/or institutional levels which examines blockages and integrates good practice on enabling RRI through the curriculum. (1/2)

D5.3 : Policy brief 2 (international/national/institutional) [28]

Issue based policy brief aimed at international, national and/or institutional levels which examines blockages and integrates good practice on enabling RRI through the curriculum. (2/2)

D5.4 : Policy brief (European level) [28]

Issue based policy brief (including case study material where relevant) aimed at European policymakers setting out the state of the art on RRI through the curriculum which can be brought to national levels by other partners.

### Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Draft report examining how academics are rewarded for supporting RRI through the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
<td>Milestone title</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14</td>
<td>Interview guide and training resource</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interview guide and training resource to gather information on policy at a national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS15</td>
<td>Report on trialling</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brief report on trialling of policy templates and training materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Work package number** 9  
**WP6**  
**Lead beneficiary** 18  
4 - UNISS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

1. Peer evaluation and mutual learning from WP3 and WP4 to identify best practices and main bottlenecks in RRI curriculum embedding practices and further develop the student competencies and learning outcomes identified in WP2.
2. To learn about how ongoing processes could be improved by means of self and stakeholders’ evaluation.
3. To account for the project’s overall internal efficiency (processes) and external efficacy (results) to main stakeholders (summative evaluation of project).
4. To discuss with relevant stakeholders and experts appropriate approaches and methods for evaluation of RRI embedment in HEIs curricula.

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP6 - Evaluation: Learning, stakeholder accountability, approaches** [Months: 1-30]

**UNISS, VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, DIT, UCAM, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITE DE LYON**

The WP6 tasks will be coordinated by partner 4, UNISS. They will set up peer evaluations and mentoring visits, will ensure contacts and coordination with other WP leaders and Advisory Board. Other WP members will support the tasks, VUB will also manage the subcontracting administrative procedures involved - re evaluation subcontracting costs.

**Task 1. Formative evaluation of WP3 and WP4 (Months 2-30)**

1.1 Formative (learning) evaluation of best practices and bottlenecks in WP3 and WP4:  
1.1.1 Peer evaluation and mentoring visits to partners involved in WP 3 and WP4 by expert partners or advisory board members. Visits (months 12-18) aim at stimulating reflexive evaluation and monitoring participation in projects including by discipline and by gender. These visits will coincide as much as possible with consortium meetings, swap shops or other mentoring visits in the frame of WP3/WP4 or - if necessary- will take place through skype, online interviews and questionnaires. Therefore, travel expenses for visits will be reduced to a limited number and are foreseen in the partners travel budgets.

1.1.2 Peer evaluators will produce a short semi-structured report including observations, recommendations and metrics. Mainly partners participating in WP6 will act as "peer evaluators"; although other project participants involved in WP3/ WP4 with relevant experience and skills shall eventually be asked to act as peer evaluator/mentor. Therefore, main budgetary implications of having peer evaluators concern Direct personnel costs of partners involved in WP6. Minor personnel costs might eventually be allocated within PMs of other pax involved in WP3 and WP4. Single reports will be collated into a synthetic report that will serve as an introduction and support material for running focus groups (step 3).

1.1.3 At consortium meeting 3 WP3 and WP4 partners will participate in self-evaluation focus groups. Focus groups discussion will build upon analysis of results of Step 1 activities in order to discuss state of advancement, pros and cons and lessons learnt. At consortium meeting 1 and 2, WP6 partners will start developing a common understanding of evaluation objectives and procedures. Also, main criteria for technical instruments (report format and metrics) will be discussed.

1.2 An intermediate internal report on first results of formative evaluation activities will be shared amongst participants in order to ensure connections between WP3, WP4 and WP2 (M21). A final report on formative evaluation will be delivered (D6.1) at M26, in order to ensure connections with WP5 (converging into a wider policy brief) as well as discussion at consortium meeting 4 (M30).

Evaluation methods and learning outcomes will be presented at conferences, on the project website etc. Evaluation procedures and methodology will be presented and discussed at the conference, where advancements will be possible thanks to confrontation with a wide stakeholder’s audience.

1.3 Utilizing peer evaluation to review student competencies and learning outcomes developed in WP2 and produce brief guidelines to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competences in curricula (Months 18-30)

1.3.1 Coordinate peer evaluation to identify what competencies were shown as a result of the approaches used in WP3 and WP4 and identifying any blockages to their development.

1.3.2 Review competencies identified in WP2 in light of practical experiences and peer evaluation.
1.3.3 Further development of initial guidelines from WP2 (D2.3) to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competencies in curricula (D6.2)

Task 2. Project accountability (Months 1-30)
As the evaluation task is a specific task part of the action and in order to ensure objectivity, an external independent evaluator will be subcontracted by the project coordinator for this evaluation with D6.3 as a deliverable.

2.1 Evidence emerging from previous tasks will be used for external accountability. Given the peculiar nature of the project, accountability strategy shall not only take into consideration funders, but also stakeholders which have a specific interest in activities run, processes adopted and results obtained. The integration and monitoring of all RRI keys will be explicitly addressed. Therefore, social accountability measures will be used such as stakeholders’ scorecards, open access to project information and other bottom-up techniques such as Nominal Group Technique involving relevant stakeholders.

2.2 A final project report (D6.3) will be made publicly available (month 30). A first draft of the report will be developed and shared with the Advisory Board (month26), to collect observations and indications.

Task 3. Discussing approaches and methods for evaluating RRI embedment in HEIs curricula through stakeholder involvement (Months 8-26). Task 3 will build upon activities run under task 1 of WP5 and notably on D5.1. A workshop will be organized at the Living Knowledge conference (WP8) in order to involve relevant stakeholders in in-depth discussion of initial results of WP5’ task 1. The workshop will pursue two objectives:

3.1 sharing comments on D5.1 and new ideas generation;
3.2 discussing possible evaluation approaches and method’s feasibility and priorities

The workshop will involve 15-20 selected participants that will be identified on the basis of their geographic distribution, expertise and direct engagement in HEIs’ assessment at national and international level. Selection will be made in order to ensure both high level idea generation capacity and follow up of results in different national contexts. The workshop will make use of participatory techniques that ensure horizontal communication, co-operation, creative thinking in order to elaborate a set of possible approaches and methods concerning all five RRI issues. The results of the workshop will be synthesized and summarized and will feed into WP5 and deliverable D5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner number and short name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D6.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D6.2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>Project accountability report</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D6.1: Report on formative evaluation of WP3 and WP4 (M26) D6.2 Guidelines to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competencies in curricula (M30) D6.3: Project accountability report (M30)

D6.1 : WP3 & 4 evaluation report [26]
D6.2 : Guidelines for embedding RRI in curricula [30]
Guidelines to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competencies in curricula.
D6.3 : Project accountability report [30]
A final project report will be made. A first draft of the report will be developed and shared with the Advisory Board, to collect observations and indications.

Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS16</td>
<td>Project accountability subcontract</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project accountability subcontract with external evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS17</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Workshop at Living Knowledge Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS18</td>
<td>Peer evaluation report</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Report on peer evaluation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS19</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Self-evaluation focus groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives

- To engage stakeholders such as intermediaries, research bodies, the media, other networks, CSOs and policy makers of EnRRICH activities and results and involve them in the exchange on RRI curricula for use by HEIs
- To broadly disseminate EnRRICH outcomes, including educational resources for use by HEI and to support the incorporation into educational programmes
- To develop communication tools to support the internal network and project activities and keep partners informed about the state of the art as well as new results and progress of the WPs studies and surveys
- To link with important European networks, associations and other projects to ensure that the project outcomes and educational materials will be widely disseminated among European and Associated Countries where these networks and associations are present

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP7 - Dissemination** [Months: 1-30]

**WilaBonn**, VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UCC, UNISS, DIT, UCAM, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, WU, IRSICAIXA, UNIVERSITE DE LYON, Vilniaus technologij˚u ir dizaino kolegija

This WP will be coordinated by WiLaBonn, working closely with all other project partners, as dissemination activities are considered as an integral component of all WPs. The major focus will be to engage stakeholders with the ongoing EnRRICH project and disseminate as widely as possible, continued beyond the completion of the project.

#### Task 1. The Website (M3-30)

The Living Knowledge website will be reviewed with project developments and results, allowing interaction with all stakeholders. This will be facilitated by an editor, keeping an eye on language barriers and different access to technical means.

- The updated Living Knowledge network section offers access to already available information and other networks active in the field of RRI, Public Engagement in Research, Community Based Research etc. Conference pages will also be established, in close cooperation with the conference host (DIT). The database on actors and projects on the Living Knowledge website will be also updated.
- A new EnRRICH section with project information (contact details, background information, working papers, and events) to contribute to the curriculum related exchange and dissemination of project results. This section will be maintained after the life of the project.

#### Task 2. Networking

- All partners will identify different actors concerned with developing and implementing curricula in HEI and doing research with CSOs, such as science shop initiatives, NGOs, HEIs, foundations, research institutions, media, intermediaries, science communicators, science museums, the broader public and other stakeholders.
- All partners will use their own national, international and interdisciplinary networks to encourage broad dissemination for EnRRICH activities and the Living Knowledge network beyond the consortium.

#### Task 3. Dissemination of project output through a range of mechanisms such as (academic) publications, conferences, newsletters and social media

- Teaching and learning journals will be addressed to be used for further (academic) dissemination. Two writing workshops will be organized to identify and develop topics for publication outlets, investigate and write articles or reports, and submit completed article for review and publication.
- Dissemination of policy recommendations and policy maker oriented communication.
- Concerning social media, EnRRICH will start with a survey of tools used by partners added by an inquiry of their relevance for project and network related aims and issues. A summary report with links and description of relevance will be delivered. The most relevant social media and how to make use of them will be integrated into the dissemination action plan for all partners.
- Public relation activities such as press releases and mailings specified for the different audiences will be realized to draw attention to the public events, debates, reports, workshops and conferences.
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing 'Living Knowledge’ newsletter (D7.3-7.12).

**Participation per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP7 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number 14</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type 15</th>
<th>Dissemination level 16</th>
<th>Due Date (in months) 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>EnRRICH project webpages</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Social media report</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 1</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 2</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.5</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 3</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.6</td>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 4</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type 15</th>
<th>Dissemination level 16</th>
<th>Due Date (in months) 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 5</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 6</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 8</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 9</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Newsletter 10</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

D7.1 Project Information on the website (month 3)

D7.2 Social Media report (month 6)

D7.3 Quarterly Newsletter 1 (M3)

D7.4 Quarterly Newsletter 2 (M6)

D7.5 Quarterly Newsletter 3 (M9)

D7.6 Quarterly Newsletter 4 (M12)

D7.7 Quarterly Newsletter 5 (M15)

D7.8 Quarterly Newsletter 6 (M18)

D7.9 Quarterly Newsletter 7 (M21)

D7.10 Quarterly Newsletter 8 (M24)

D7.11 Quarterly Newsletter 9 (M27)

D7.12 Quarterly Newsletter 10 (M30)

D7.1 : EnRRICH project webpages [3]

Project Information on the Living Knowledge website.


Concerning social media, EnRRICH will start with a survey of tools used by partners added by an inquiry of their relevance for project and network related aims and issues. A summary report with links and description of relevance will be delivered. The most relevant social media and how to make use of them will be integrated into the dissemination action plan for all partners.

D7.3 : Quarterly Newsletter 1 [3]

An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.4 : Quarterly Newsletter 2 [6]

An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.5 : Quarterly Newsletter 3 [9]

An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.6 : Quarterly Newsletter 4 [12]

An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.7 : Quarterly Newsletter 5 [15]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.8 : Quarterly Newsletter 6 [18]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.9 : Quarterly Newsletter 7 [21]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.10 : Quarterly Newsletter 8 [24]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.11 : Quarterly Newsletter 9 [27]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

D7.12 : Quarterly Newsletter 10 [30]
An electronic newsletter on RRI in HEI experiences and news on EnRRICH activities will be published every three months in continuation of the existing ‘Living Knowledge’ newsletter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of relevant Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**WP8 - Conference on building RRI into curricula in HEIs** [Months: 1-16]

DIT, VUB, THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, UCC, UNISS, WiLaBonn, UCAM, CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA, WU, IRSICAIXA, UNIVERSITE DE LYON, Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija

The WP will be coordinated by DIT. All project partners will have some involvement in the planning and running of the conference (in the advisory committee, scientific committee, dissemination activities), and will submit proposals for presentations, as well as attending the conference.

**Task 1. Conference planning and delivery**

DIT will coordinate the conference planning, including the following steps for maximum inclusivity:

- Setting up of international conference advisory committee including stakeholders from HEIs, CSOs, and research organisations, as well as project partners. This committee will include EnRRICH advisory board members, but also other experts in domains as RRI, curricula, Community Based Research etc. Committee members will not be paid for their membership, but their eventual additional travel costs for this purpose will reimbursed, which is foreseen in the DIT conference budget.
- Exploring ways to design a conference format that would allow more CSOs, industry partners etc. to participate and engage, learning from the good practice of other EU projects in this regard.
- Developing conference themes (these will align with the RRI pillars, as well as including additional themes relevant to the Living Knowledge Network) and call for presentations, in collaboration with internal conference advisory committee.
- Setting up and coordinating scientific committee of EnRRICH partners to assess proposals for presentations. (Apart from travel costs, no external people will be paid to participate in this scientific committee.)
- Coordinating the schedule of presentations.
- Coordinating site visits to CSOs and others involved in RRI projects, as part of the conference schedule.
- Coordination of funders’ and policymakers’ forum (in collaboration with those involved in WP5)
- Coordination of a stakeholder group workshop to review and discuss project findings to date.
- Coordination of a public event as part of the conference.
- Running a Science shop summer school in coordination with WP4 and WP7 leaders, building on the successful PERARES summer schools and upgraded with EnRRICH materials. As summer school participants will pay a limited summer school fee and the summer school hosts are EnRRICH project consortium and advisory board members, there are no budgetary implications.
- Hosting the conference in DIT (M12)
- In order to document the conference, there will be subcontracts with camera people and/or photographers

**Task 2. Conference communications and dissemination**

DIT will liaise with partner 5 (WiLaBonn) and others involved in WP7 (Dissemination) to produce the following, to maximise dissemination opportunities from the conference:
- Conference website, including calls for papers, information on programme, information for delegates, and presentations (after the conference)
- Conference twitter account and hashtag (and possibly other relevant social media)
- Advertising and promotion of conference through all relevant networks, particularly the networks represented by the stakeholder group (e.g. –Living Knowledge, European Universities Association, Talloires Network, Campus Engage, International Consortium for Educational Development)
- Methods to ensure that the conference is accessible to as many people as possible will be explored

Task 3. – Reporting to consortium
Progress on the conference plans and programme will be submitted to the consortium for approval at the second consortium meeting. Progress reports will be given to all project participants through oral presentations and/or written reports at consortium meetings.

### Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP8 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D8.1</td>
<td>Conference website</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>conference in Dublin</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>updated conference website</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables
D 8.1 conference website (M2)  D 8.2 conference in Dublin (M12)  D 8.3 conference website updated with all relevant presentations/content (M16)

D8.1 : Conference website [2]
Conference website, including calls for papers, information on programme, information for delegates, and presentations (after the conference).

D8.2 : conference in Dublin [12]
Living Knowledge Conference In Dublin on RRI in higher education curricula.

D8.3 : updated conference website [16]
Conference website updated with all relevant presentations/content after conference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of relevant Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone title</th>
<th>WP number</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly Meeting 1</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kick-off consortium meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly Meeting 2</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly meeting 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly meeting 3</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly meeting 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Consortium / General Assembly meeting 4</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final Consortium / General Assembly meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Scoping Document on RRI in curricula</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Use background research on RRI to make initial identification of desirable RRI competencies and learning outcomes among students at Bachelor’s and Master’s level, that integrate knowledge, skills and attitudes to produce an initial scoping document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Survey tool and consultation / interview guidance finalized</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Online survey and guidance for consultations and interviews to be drafted by UCAM with input from other members and consortium members will gather information from students, faculty and external contacts in their area, to understand current content in curricula relevant to RRI, including understanding supportive and hindering factors for embedding RRI in curricula at different levels. This involves interaction with RRI Tools consultation and the national RRI Hubs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Draft manual for enhancing teaching and learning about RRI keys</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Produce a first draft guidelines including a clear, distinct set of competencies and learning outcomes, providing suggestions for facilitating and monitoring students’ RRI development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
<td>Milestone title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Report on repurposing and sharing of resources and the identification of teaching strategies for integrating RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Report on trials</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Report on trialling of RRI teaching strategies and sharing of educational sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Manual on Science Shops stimulating RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Setting up a Community of Practice on Science Shops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>Summer School</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Science Shop Summer School during LK Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>Draft report</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Draft report examining how academics are rewarded for supporting RRI through the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14</td>
<td>Interview guide and training resource</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Interview guide and training resource to gather information on policy at a national level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS15</td>
<td>Report on trialling</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Brief report on trialling of policy templates and training materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS16</td>
<td>Project accountability subcontract</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Project accountability subcontract with external evaluator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS17</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Workshop at Living Knowledge Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS18</td>
<td>Peer evaluation report</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Report on peer evaluation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS19</td>
<td>Focus groups</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Self-evaluation focus groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS20</td>
<td>Dissemination plan</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Dissemination plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS21</td>
<td>Conference committee &amp; themes</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establishment of conference committee and agreement of conference themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS22</td>
<td>Setting up scientific committee</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Establishment of scientific committee to select abstracts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.5. WT5 Critical Implementation risks and mitigation actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk number</th>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>WP Number</th>
<th>Proposed risk-mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Consortium partner leaves project</td>
<td>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8</td>
<td>Coordinator decides on shifts in responsibilities, supported by the Management Support Team. As each institution is also involved with at least two members in the consortium, replacement is reassured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Delay in project task causing other delays</td>
<td>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8</td>
<td>As most tasks in EnRRICH are done part-time over a longer period, the risk of delays is reduced. Regarding the progress of the project, any delay may be avoided by monitoring and by the reporting procedures described in the Management structure session. Every work package also has a milestone in the first 9 project months to support this. Moreover there are no crucial cross-WP interdependencies that may cause delays in other activities when not achieved, other than in WP2, on which the following work packages are build. In case this happens, a delay can be countered by the fact that all other consortium partners are included in this work package.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Consortium partner fails in project task</td>
<td>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8</td>
<td>EnRRICH is structured in such a way that failures of individual consortium members will not affect the overall outcomes, and even so that such failures would also enhance knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>New project coordinator</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>While the project coordinator has not coordinated a previous European project, she has experience of coordinating WPs in PERARES and has coordination experience in other aspects of her current role, including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk number</td>
<td>Description of risk</td>
<td>WP Number</td>
<td>Proposed risk-mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coordinating the Flemish science shops. Coordination support is delivered by experienced partner 2, QUB. Moreover, the former PERARES project coordinator, Henk Mulder, is an EnRRICH advisory board member, which guarantees the support of his project coordination and management experience. The advisory board has a wealth of coordination experience which the coordinator will draw on if needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.6. WT6 Summary of project effort in person-months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>WP2</th>
<th>WP3</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>WP8</th>
<th>Total Person/Months per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - VUB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UCC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UNISS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - WilaBonn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - DIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UCAM</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - UNIVERSITAT VECHTA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - WU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - IRSICAIXA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - Vilniaus technologijų ir dizaino kolegija</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Person/Months</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | **9** | **30.50** | **30** | **33** | **23** | **18** | **22** | **179** |
1.3.7. WT7 Tentative schedule of project reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review number</th>
<th>Tentative timing</th>
<th>Planned venue of review</th>
<th>Comments, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Review planned after RP1 (month 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Review planned after RP2 (month 30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1.4. Ethics Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethics Issue Category</th>
<th>Ethics Requirement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- Details on the procedures and criteria that will be used to identify/recurit research participants must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- Detailed information must be provided on the informed consent procedures that will be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- The applicant must clarify how and in what respect and at what point children will be included in the research. Justification for their participation must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- The applicant must clarify how consent/assent will be ensured for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- The applicant must clarify how, in what respect and at what point during the implementation of the project vulnerable individuals/groups will be involved. The applicant must clarify the context of these individuals/groups’ vulnerability. Details must be provided about the measures taken to prevent the risk of enhancing vulnerability/stigmatisation of individuals/groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- During the course of the project University students will be involved as study participants. Applicants should explain how in the case of University students genuine informed consent will be guaranteed against any undue incentive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- Copies of authorization, opinion or notification (which ever applies according to the Directive and the national law) by the competent Institutional Data Protection Officer / National Data Protection authority must be submitted to the REA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- Justification must be given in case of collection and/or processing of personal sensitive data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- Detailed information must be provided on the procedures that will be implemented for data collection, storage, protection, retention and destruction and confirmation that they comply with national and EU legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- Detailed information must be provided on the informed consent procedures that will be implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- The applicant must explicitly confirm that the existing data are publicly available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA</strong></td>
<td>- In case of data not publicly available, relevant authorisations must be provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-EU COUNTRIES</strong></td>
<td>- Should research of any kind take place in a non EU country the applicants must fully explain the kind of research. In this case all of the related issues need to be clarified and appropriate documentation must be submitted to the REA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- Similarly, a report (i.e.detailed information) on procedures and criteria for each and every group (vulnerable, patients, children etc.) to be provided after each partner's science shop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HUMANS</strong></td>
<td>- Similarly, a report (i.e.detailed information) on informed consent procedures for each and every group (vulnerable, patients, children etc) after each partner's science shop should be submitted to the REA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Project number**

   The project number has been assigned by the Commission as the unique identifier for your project. It cannot be changed. The project number **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B)** to prevent errors during its handling.

2. **Project acronym**

   Use the project acronym as given in the submitted proposal. It can generally not be changed. The same acronym **should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B)** to prevent errors during its handling.

3. **Project title**

   Use the title (preferably no longer than 200 characters) as indicated in the submitted proposal. Minor corrections are possible if agreed during the preparation of the grant agreement.

4. **Starting date**

   Unless a specific (fixed) starting date is duly justified and agreed upon during the preparation of the Grant Agreement, the project will start on the first day of the month following the entry into force of the Grant Agreement (NB: entry into force = signature by the Commission). Please note that if a fixed starting date is used, you will be required to provide a written justification.

5. **Duration**

   Insert the duration of the project in full months.
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   The Call (part) identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you were addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union. You have to use the identifier given by the Commission in the letter inviting to prepare the grant agreement.

7. **Abstract**

8. **Project Entry Month**

   The month at which the participant joined the consortium, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

9. **Work Package number**

   Work package number: WP1, WP2, WP3, ..., WPN

10. **Lead beneficiary**

    This must be one of the beneficiaries in the grant (not a third party) - Number of the beneficiary leading the work in this work package

11. **Person-months per work package**

    The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

12. **Start month**

    Relative start date for the work in the specific work packages, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

13. **End month**

    Relative end date, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

14. **Deliverable number**
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15. **Type**
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    - **PU** Public
17. Delivery date for Deliverable
Month in which the deliverables will be available, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

18. Milestone number
Milestone number: MS1, MS2, ..., MSn

19. Review number
Review number: RV1, RV2, ..., RVn
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Cost of the access provided under the project. For virtual access fill only the second column. For trans-national access fill one of the two columns or both according to the way access costs are declared. Trans-national access costs on the basis of unit cost will result from the unit cost by the quantity of access to be provided.
History of Changes

- Start date justified
- Short names participants adjusted
- Gantt chart revised (more in detail, making all text visible)

Deliverables/Milestones/work packages in SyGMA adjusted:

- WP1
  - Task 3 and deliverable list: periodic report and final report deleted
  - Coherence in WP description and deliverables
- WP2
  - D2.3 will be due at month 12 instead of M25
- WP3
  - UoV person months: 2 instead of 22
  - end date extended from M29 to M30 (for the sake of task 4, reporting on trials to consortium, during the final consortium meeting in M30)
- WP4
  - More details added on the recruitment
  - D4.2 date changed
  - extending CoP from M28 to M30
- WP5
  - D5.2 split up in D5.2. and D5.3, numbering updated
  - links deliverables fixed
- WP6
  - Commented on subcontracting under resources to be committed
  - Commented on peer mentoring travel costs
  - Task 2: Step 2: "Peer evaluators links to the project and any budgetary implications specified
  - Task 2: additional information to make sure that H2020 provisions on subcontracting will be respected; please see the annotated model grant agreement, Article 8, Article 10, and Article 13, in particular tables on pp. 115-116
  - end month extended from M28-M30
- WP7:
  - D7.3 split up in 9 individual deliverables with individual numbering and month due
- WP8:
  - Conference advisory board: links to the project and budgetary implications specified
  - Scientific committee: link to the project and budgetary implications specified
  - Summer school: budgetary implications specified
  - Hosting the conference: due month replaced, D8.2 updated

- Resources: 50€ per person per diem instead of 100€
- Other direct cost items:
  - information on participant 13 – Vilniaus provided (above the 15% ceiling)
- Section 4: members of the consortium:
  - University of Cambridge: Nicola BUCKLEY: involvement in the project is in compliance with her part-time PhD studies;
  - Dublin Institute of Technology: Dr Claire McDONNELL: 3-year secondment to DIT’s Learning Teaching and Technology Centre will end at the same time as the EnRRICH conference WP
  - Corvinus University of Budapest: Reka MATOLAY: her participation in TRANSIT is in compliance with H2020 provisions and this project.
Participant 4 UNISS: Prof Andrea VARGIU prefers using private e-mail contact (which is also the e-mail address used for other communications with Commission and used in the ECAS account). If needed or preferable, private e-mail address (larvanet@tin.it) can be replaced by institutional e-mail address (avargiu@uniss.it).

Participant 8 CORVINUS UNIVERSITY: as regards the person in charge of the proposal (Dr. Reka MATOLAY) the telephone no. stated in part A of the proposal does not match with the one on the homepage of the university (00361 482-5554); please comment on it.—working on it

- Lay-out issues fixed
  - Project advisory board
    - The advisory board members will only receive travel imbursements. (p.2)
    - WP1, task 2: board member list inserted
    - WP6, more information added on ev. peer mentoring of advisory board members
    - Budd Hall and Rajesh Tandon will alternate (explicitly mentioned)
    - See Ching Mey is replaced by Omar Osman, Vice-Chancellor of Universiti Sains Malaysia (USM). In the frame of the project content, Prof. Osman has a broader expertise and network, in the USM and beyond.
  - Ethics section: changed/elaborated more in detail following comments
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1. Excellence

1.1 Objectives

1.1.1 Overall objective

The Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher education (EnRRICH) project will improve the capacity of students and staff in higher education to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes to support the embedding of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) in curricula by responding to the research needs of society as expressed by civil society organisations (CSOs). It will do this by identifying, developing, piloting, and disseminating good practice and relevant resources to embed the 5 RRI keys in academic curricula across Europe. Through sharing learning and initiating discussion and debates at institutional, national and international levels both within the consortium and beyond it, the EnRRICH project will create a better awareness of, and enhance the policy context for, RRI in curricula and thereby produce more responsible and responsive graduates and researchers. This project will focus on the co-creation of research to enable students to acquire the broad range of skills, knowledge and experience needed for a knowledge economy and knowledge society to flourish.

1.1.2 Specific Objectives

In order to achieve the overall objective of creating a better awareness and take-up of RRI in the curriculum and therefore produce more responsible and responsive researchers and enhance the capacity of higher education to respond to societal needs, the EnRRICH consortium has identified 6 specific objectives:

1. To define and build a shared understanding of RRI in curricula by debating, collecting and evaluating good practice across the consortium and beyond; developing and making openly available case studies and guidelines demonstrating how RRI keys can be embedded and evaluated in a range of academic disciplines and at different levels in higher education

2. To develop and pilot the use of RRI teaching practices based on multi stakeholder inputs, to support academic staff to integrate RRI in a range of disciplines in higher education from early stages, and to produce useable resources to enhance the uptake of RRI in curricula

3. To test science shops and other community exchange mechanisms as methods of developing and supporting incorporation of RRI in higher education curricula, starting and mentoring new practices and upgrading already established practices through a Community of Practice (CoP)

4. To stimulate dialogue and help develop and leverage policy at international, national and institutional levels to advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula, in particular in relation to professional frameworks that influence curriculum development and encourage recognition and reward of higher education lecturers integrating aspects of RRI keys in the curriculum

5. To enable mutual learning among EnRRICH project members, their strategic partners and networks and the wider academic and CSO communities regarding best practices and bottlenecks in enhancing RRI learning in the curriculum, learning about how practices could be improved through internal and stakeholders’ evaluation, and relating these to expectations and aspirations of national and European evaluation and quality assurance agencies
6. To build partnerships and engage stakeholders including CSOs, higher education institutions (HEIs), research bodies, the media, relevant networks, and policy makers with the activities and results of EnRRICH from the outset, obtaining feedback from them and stimulating transnational exchange on RRI curricula for use by HEIs and other societal actors and disseminate newly developed educational material and curricula for use by HEIs

1.2 Relation to the work programme

This EnRRICH proposal relates to the Science With And For Society (SWAFS) call for making science education and careers attractive for young people (SEAC), more specifically the second topic, Responsible Research and Innovation in Higher Education Curricula (SEAC-2-2014).

The project will encourage debate on what the RRI keys mean in relation to academic curricula, building on the work of the RRI Tools project\(^1\). Through identifying, developing, piloting, and disseminating resources to embed the 5 RRI keys in academic curricula in Europe, EnRRICH will raise awareness of their importance and catalyse their uptake. The project will encourage and influence debates by linking to activities in Europe and beyond, using national and international networks, an advisory board and an international conference to be held with the Living Knowledge Network\(^2\). The project will examine good practice in involving the RRI keys in curricula in Europe and beyond and collect, evaluate, exchange and pilot emerging good practices. Through a comprehensive approach involving strong and transdisciplinary links and a wide variety of societal stakeholders, EnRRICH will create a better awareness of and the integration of the RRI keys in curricula, and thereby produce more responsible and responsive graduates and researchers. Strong links with the above mentioned RRI Tools project are guaranteed through the inclusion of the RRI Tools deputy coordinator and the German Hub coordinator in the consortium, and an educational expert of the RRI Tools advisory board in the EnRRICH advisory board.

Given that the concept of RRI is emergent, there is currently a lack of information on good practices on RRI in the curriculum. Currently it is better understood in Europe given the European Commission’s Horizon 2020 programme. There is a need to understand, identify and trial and test practices, and the EnRRICH Consortium believes that science shops, as long established mechanisms for science and society interactions, are well placed to kick start this debate. The consortium has also identified early good practice in this field in Canada, who will be involved in the EnRRICH advisory board since their involvement cannot be financed under EU programmes, and will seek to involve others as practices develop. The advisory board members will only receive travel reimbursements.

EnRRICH will start with an extensive exploration of the state of the art of RRI keys in higher education curricula, involving not only higher education institutions (HEIs) but also research organisations, civil society organisations (CSOs), social enterprise and public engagement actors amongst others to develop a comprehensive methodological approach. Based on this state of the art review, EnRRICH will design, pilot, and develop case studies which showcase models for students, teachers, professional trainers and academic staff of HEIs. It will kick

---

\(^1\) This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 612393, more information to be found at http://www.rri-tools.eu/

\(^2\) The international Living Knowledge Network (LK) is set up for people interested in building partnerships for public access to research. Members use the network platform and its tools for documentation and to exchange information, ideas, experiences and expertise on community-based research and science and society relations in general. More information to be found at http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/
start debates at institutional, national and international levels to create a better awareness of, and enhance the policy context for the integration of all RRI keys in curricula.
1.3 Concept and approach, quality of the coordination and support measures

1.3.1 Overall concept

As the European Commissioner for Research, Innovation and Science, Máire Geoghegan-Quinn stated during the “Science in Dialogue” conference:\(^3\): the dialogue between science and research, and the rest of society never has been more important. Responsible Research and Innovation means that all societal actors work together during the whole research and innovation process in order to better align both the process and its outcomes, with the values, needs and expectations of European society. The EnRRICH consortium will take on this ambitious challenge by consulting with a range of societal actors, including academics, students, policy makers and CSOs in an inclusive and participatory way to enhance their understanding of RRI in academic curricula. To do this it will develop practice, create opportunities, and build partnerships and mutual learning. Therefore the main concepts associated with this project are collaboration and partnership across sectors for mutual learning. These will be executed through open dialogue and transparent evaluation of pilots to develop useful materials, including case studies, curriculum pilots, policy papers and guidelines to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competencies in curricula ready for others to use. The collective expertise of our consortium is in collaboration and partnerships, our ongoing engagement with the CSO sector on behalf of our HEIs, our broad networks and our demonstrable commitment to piloting, evaluating and sharing materials for curriculum and policy development, equip us well for delivering this goal.

EnRRICH brings together academics and practitioners who have long experience of integrating the needs of society (particularly, but not exclusively CSOs) into HEIs and into academic curricula in a transdisciplinary way. Most partners are knowledge exchange/public engagement initiatives based in HEIs, this is balanced by the inclusion of a CSO partner and a research institute. Some are fledgling initiatives whilst others have longstanding experience and have worked to develop policy to support public engagement at institutional, national and international levels. The consortium has broad European coverage and extensive regional and international networks, both practitioner and academic.

To achieve better alignment of research and innovation with societal needs, a number of initiatives were undertaken by European Union Member States and the European Commission in FP7 Science In Society\(^4\). One of them was PERARES or Public Engagement with Research And Research Engagement with Society\(^5\), a four year project started in 2010. This project aimed to strengthen public engagement in research by involving researchers and CSOs in the formulation of research agendas and the research process. PERARES has achieved positive outcomes in upstreaming CSO research agendas in its 26 partner institutions and enabled valuable mutual learning. One of the key recommendations from PERARES is that there is a need to develop academic curricula to encourage students as early stage academics to acquire the skills needed to become engaged researchers. This proposal therefore addresses this recommendation in the context of RRI, developing curriculum interventions to embed the RRI keys in higher education through the piloting of innovative forms of teaching and learning.


\(^4\) http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society

including collaborative and participatory research opportunities for students, and curricular development activities.

In this context, the RRI Tools project is an important resource for the EnRRICH proposal, as it builds understanding towards empowering all societal actors to contribute to Responsible Research and Innovation. Funded under the Framework Programme FP7, the RRI Tools Community of Practice will develop a set of digital resources to advocate, train, disseminate and implement RRI under Horizon 2020. The EnRRICH project guarantees close links and minimizes any duplication of effort or activities between both projects, and provides an effective vehicle for the integration of RRI Tools into the curriculum. RRI Tools deliverables (e.g. first Toolkit materials) will be reviewed at early stages, in EnRRICH work package 2, in order to select and use those that are most relevant to the curriculum.

The RRI keys of engagement, gender equality, science education, ethics and open access will be addressed in explicit ways in this project. EnRRICH consortium members will draw on their extensive experience of delivering public engagement strategies and initiatives that link higher education with civil society, to support lecturers and students to integrate learning about public engagement into their academic studies. The public engagement sphere of work has a close relationship with the promotion of science education, so we will create further opportunities for students in higher education to gain experience by inspiring the next generation of scientists, researchers and participants in higher education. Open access and ethical approaches to working with the CSO sector are key tenets of the working practices of consortium members, and this project offers the opportunity to explore and conceptualise these core concepts in greater detail. The project will be monitored in relation to gender aspects. We will also draw on good RRI practices and subject specific expertise demonstrated by our own institutions, networks and strategic partners, e.g. civil society organisations, professional associations, social enterprise and public engagement actors, to develop appropriate curriculum interventions to foster the development of student competencies demonstrating the integration of the RRI keys.

Overall, EnRRICH will support the embedding of RRI and its five keys in higher education curricula in Europe through a state of the art review, organising staff development and support, and piloting RRI teaching methodologies in HEIs both within and outside the classroom. Opportunities to embed and sustain these activities will be identified by engaging in ongoing evaluation, developing and leveraging policy and partnerships, and broadly disseminating project outputs thereby ensuring the uptake on the emerging pedagogical approaches, producing more responsible and responsive graduates and researchers, and enhancing the capacity of higher education to respond to societal needs. As mentioned above, these objectives will be achieved by building on the FP7 projects PERARES and RRI Tools. It will establish an advisory board drawn from relevant networks, programmes and projects, and from organisations with specialist interests in all RRI keys, in Europe and beyond, through which different societal links will be assured. During the whole project, those advisory board members and the stakeholders they represent will be consulted, involved and asked for advice. They will also be invited to consortium meetings and the conference.

Work packages (WPs) will deal with project management, state of the art of good practices in introducing RRI into curriculum development, exchange and trialing of good practices, policy development, evaluation, dissemination and the organization of an international conference.

The overall approach is summarized in the figure beneath.
1.3.2 Specific concepts

The 6 specific EnRRICH objectives will be approached with the following concepts:

1. To define and build a shared understanding of RRI in curricula by debating, collecting and evaluating good practice across the consortium and beyond; developing and making openly available case studies and guidelines demonstrating how RRI keys can be embedded and evaluated in a range of academic disciplines and at different levels in higher education.

The concept of RRI is relatively new and this call aims to stimulate the discussion of how RRI concepts can be relevant in and to academic curricula, both within and beyond science shop practices. The EnRRICH project therefore starts with a state of the art review of current RRI practices in curricula as a solid project base, developing a shared understanding of the implications of the European framework for RRI among consortium members. Within work package 2, all consortium members will examine their own institution for RRI activities related to curricula which will also kickstart discussions at an institutional level and amongst consortium members, reaching out to wider networks as the discussion progresses.

EnRRICH WP2 will use background information from the RRI tools project and other relevant materials such as the Bologna process, to act as the basis for mutual learning among consortium members. The RRI Tools project has started to explore definitions of RRI, drawing attention to aspects of RRI for which existing case studies of good practice in particular curricula will be sought, and new course materials developed during the project. There are features across the spectrum of RRI and the RRI keys which are important to enable students to develop competencies in, including anticipation (envisioning the future and understanding how present dynamics may shape the future), reflexivity, inclusion (the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders, such as users, NGOs, etc. in the early development of research) and mutual responsiveness (responding to emerging knowledge, perspectives, views and norms). In addition, another three process requirements feature in the RRI Tools.
conceptualization of RRI and will be developed through the guidance for practical pilots for this project: diversity, meaningful openness and adaptive change.

According to the European Commission’s Dublin Descriptors⁶, students need to comprehend how to apply their knowledge and understanding, make judgments and interpret data, communicate conclusions to different types of audience and develop skills needed to conduct further study in an autonomous way. The priority of higher education has become teaching students how to continue to acquire new knowledge and, specifically, to filter and apply this knowledge in a societal context. The RRI keys are important components in considering how best to do this. Therefore it is extremely important to offer this type of experience through the curriculum if students are to acquire the kinds of knowledge, skills and experiences to equip them to build RRI into their research work and to play a role in helping to tackle the European Commission’s grand societal challenges which are at the heart of Horizon 2020⁷. This project will seek to build links between the RRI keys and the Dublin descriptors through development of case study examples and through peer evaluation in HEIs and linked stakeholders. Lessons will be drawn out in relation to student competencies and guidelines developed to support the embedding and implementation of RRI competencies in curricula. This work will thereby support the development of responsible and responsive graduates, who are amongst other aspects better able to frame their research in a more transdisciplinary manner.

2. To develop and pilot the use of RRI teaching practices based on multi stakeholder inputs, to support academic staff to integrate RRI in a range of disciplines in higher education from early stages, and to produce useable resources to enhance the uptake of RRI in curricula

Teachers are at the coal-face of education and it is their engagement with students and the careful scaffolding of learning which is key to students developing key competencies. Supporting academic staff to identify content, activities and assessments that constructively align with competencies demonstrating the integration of the RRI keys is a main focus of this proposal. In order to do this work package 3 will draw on good RRI practices and expertise demonstrated by stakeholders, e.g. CSOs, professional associations and social enterprises, and facilitate the collaborative development of curriculum interventions for in-classroom pilots to develop resources which can be used by the wider academic community.

Building on an initial kick-start workshop, ‘Swap Shops’ will be organized locally by consortium partners to recruit partners for in-classroom pilots and to discuss and develop teaching strategies and methodologies that integrate RRI (including the RRI Keys). A ‘Swap Shop’ is “an interactive workshop that fosters the sharing of practices, ideas and experiences about teaching, learning and assessment or a particular topic”⁸. The ‘Swap Shop’ approach allows for a rebalancing of power relationships and gives equal prominence to ideas and practices shared by the participants. A number of curricula interventions will be identified as a result of the state of the art review (WP2), the kick-start meeting, and the local ‘Swap Shop’ events, forming the pilots undertaken. This activity is based on the learning from PERARES which trialled good practice in embedding public engagement in research in higher education curricula and was coordinated by WP3 leader (Partner 3, UCC): This learning concluded that there is a

---

⁶ These qualities are identified by the European Commission as part of the Bologna Process, known as the Dublin Descriptors. See http://www.ehea.info/Uploads/Documents/QF-EHEA-May2005.pdf for more details.


need for “structured networking events to build relationships and to problem solve” as a starting point to successful collaborative projects.

Based on this work, suitable academic courses will be identified, and pilots coordinated, involving engagement of stakeholders, e.g. acting as guest lecturers, as partners on a community-based research or community-based learning project, as co-developers of case studies or scenarios for in-class use, or as reviewers of the RRI pilots. This will result in a list of proposed ‘in-class’ pilots and strategies for developing student competencies that demonstrate the integration of RRI, and the related educational resources will be added to the emerging EnRRICH dissemination resources made openly available.

Task 3 of Work package 3 is focused on identifying opportunities to embed and sustain RRI teaching strategies. This will take a three-pronged approach, identifying opportunities for inclusion of RRI in staff continuing professional development activities, creating a professional development workshop framework for academic staff to be used by institutional offices and professional associations involved in staff training and development, and utilising policy levers to support the inclusion of RRI in Higher Education curricula.

3. To test science shops and other community exchange mechanisms as methods of developing and supporting incorporation of RRI in higher education curricula, starting and mentoring new practices and upgrading already established practices through a Community of Practice (CoP)

PERARES identified that there are a variety of good practices involving students in research with CSOs in HEIs, however that this often happens in a fragmented way and is not strategically embedded within HEIs at either departmental or institutional levels. Relating to this, the concept of RRI in the curriculum is currently poorly understood. Community knowledge exchanges or science shops are one model that can be explored further as a mechanism for creating a cohesive approach to responsible research and exposing both CSOs and students to the concept of RRI at a grassroots level. This project will test how those mechanisms can model RRI principles and keys in how they work, embedding from the ground up and supporting community based research in their institutions. Therefore science shops and academics involved in supporting science shop projects play a crucial role in the EnRRICH project and their work will be strengthened, reviewed and evaluated - mainly in work package 4.

Science shops respond to civil society’s needs for expertise and knowledge and mostly are based in HEIs, where students conduct the research as part of the curriculum. Boere and Heijman conclude that the fact that Science shops are generally linked to universities makes them an ideal bridge between science and society and allows them to often bring new, innovative approaches to answer research question. Their numbers continue to grow. One of the PERARES achievements was evidence for the potential of science shops and more specifically,

---


14 More on science shops to be found at http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/science-shops
the start of 10 new European science shops\textsuperscript{15}. It is argued that one way to encourage engaged research is to start with collaborative research projects offer students real, demand driven and participatory cases to work on, helping them to develop graduate attributes and contributing to graduate employability.

In order to support and enhance the development and understanding of RRI in the curriculum, the fourth EnRRICH work package will continue and develop this science shop work by enabling existing science shop partners to widen and enrich their practice, spreading beyond their own expertise and by assisting new partners to trial science shop approaches in their own institutions. There will be a focus on developing science shop approaches in science and engineering studies.

The learning that emerges from social participation has been emphasized in the work of Etienne Wenger who coined the term ‘Community of Practice’. Wenger describes communities of practice as “groups of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly.”\textsuperscript{16} The fostering of communities of practice dedicated to particular teaching approaches is an important element in educational development and pedagogical innovation. In the EnRRICH project, a Community of Practice on embedding science shops or other community knowledge exchange mechanisms in curricula will be set up to support local pilots of good practices and in that way to strengthen both new and already established mechanisms of community based research.

4. To stimulate dialogue and help develop and leverage policy at international, national and institutional levels to advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula, in particular in relation to professional frameworks that influence curriculum development and encourage recognition and reward of higher education lecturers integrating aspects of RRI keys in the curriculum.

Competing demands within HEIs can cause difficulties to create and nurture opportunities for RRI through the curriculum\textsuperscript{17}. There is no systemic provision of support or continuing professional development in many HEIs in this field of work. Also, many academics and lecturers feel they are not sufficiently recognised for their (time intensive) work supporting community engaged learning. The prevailing selection and reward systems for university professors do not encourage them to adopt community-engaged practices\textsuperscript{18,19}. Institutional competition in the form of academic ranking values more traditional forms of research, teaching and dissemination, thus reinforcing them\textsuperscript{20}. Further elaboration is therefore needed to develop accountability criteria and forms of evaluation capable of grasping the complexity of academic work and the variety of experiences and practices. Notably, evaluation could extend beyond research and teaching, to include community service and partnership; whereas, accountability could be more intensively oriented to civil society stakeholders. Moreover, further


\textsuperscript{17} Martin, E. & McKenna, E. (2014) Embedding public engagement in the curriculum (Policy brief 2). \url{www.The Queen's University of Belfast.ac.uk/sites/ScienceShop/FileStore/Filetoupload,450660,en.pdf}

\textsuperscript{18} Hill, M., & Williamson Hill, L.-V. (2010). Faculty reward system and third mission of colleges and universities. In P. Inman & H. G. Schuette (Eds.), The community engagement and service mission of universities. Leicester: Niace
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debate on evaluation criteria for RRI and its embedment in the curriculum is needed in order to ensure that progress is made to strengthen policies in that domain\textsuperscript{22}. The EnRRICH project will address these key challenges in several ways.

Work package 5 will stimulate dialogue at institutional, national and international levels to encourage the development of policy to advance the uptake of teaching and learning about RRI through the curriculum. Whilst at an international level, the focus on RRI within Horizon 2020 will act as a stimulant for discussions about RRI through research, it is the experience of longstanding public engagement units and science shops that for RRI to become truly embedded in academic curricula (particularly in some of the harder to reach science and engineering subjects), there is a need to ensure that there are recognition and reward mechanisms at institutional level for this work. At a strategic level, it is important that individual HEIs can also see a reward for this work or a driver to encourage them to undertake it. If RRI is to truly be embedded in the HEI system it also needs to become part of the teaching curriculum and students’ experience of research at undergraduate, Masters and doctoral level, in the process exposing students at all levels to the ideas of RRI. Thus there is a need to encourage policy development at institutional, national and international levels.

In order to do this, it will focus on existing policy and how to utilise or repurpose it to begin to develop a policy context for RRI in the curriculum. Discussions will take place with policymakers in different contexts, both as part of gathering information but also as part of the conference. Opportunities will be sought to disseminate and discuss the findings of the project with policy makers. This policy work builds on the PERARES work package 7\textsuperscript{23}, which produced guidelines on how to develop policy and strategy to support publicly engaged research initiatives. EnRRICH will undertake four case studies which will test and develop this resource and will also stimulate policy discussions in four European countries.

5. To enable mutual learning among EnRRICH project members, their strategic partners and networks and the wider academic and CSO communities regarding best practices and bottlenecks in enhancing RRI learning in the curriculum, learning about how practices could be improved through internal and stakeholders’ evaluation, and relating these to expectations and aspirations of national and European evaluation and quality assurance agencies.

The EnRRICH project seeks to building learning and understanding by embedding evaluation in the heart of the project. Work package 6 will offer opportunities for formative evaluation, such as peer evaluation, sharing learning and building horizontal links across the work packages and with the stakeholder group therefore accomplishing a learning function - see Michael Scriven\textsuperscript{24}, as well as undertaking a summative evaluation, assessing whether the project results meet the stated goals.

The formative evaluation will be approached by examining methods to evaluate RRI embedding in HEIs curricula. The European Commission identifies three main aims of evaluation\textsuperscript{25}: 1) “verifying that public action replies to

uncovered or insufficiently satisfied needs”; 2) providing “an opportunity for feedback arising from actions underway”; 3) “reporting to political authorities and citizens on results obtained and on the sound use of allocated resources”. The EnRRICH evaluation activities concentrate on the last two aims and it is anticipated that the feedback evaluations in particular may support two different but connected objectives: i.e. support decision making and enhance the learning function of the actors involved in a project, programme or policy.

Evaluation can also serve a summative function, to assess whether the results of what is being evaluated meet the stated goals. This principle is generally called accountability, which is strongly linked with responsibility, liability and transparency, including the RRI keys of ethics and open access. The concept of “social accountability” arose “as an approach towards building accountability that relies on civic engagement, i.e., in which it is ordinary citizens and/or civil society organizations who participate directly or indirectly in exacting accountability” and implies wide involvement of citizens and main stakeholders in evaluation by means of participatory techniques that are built on a bottom-up approach. There will be an explicit link on the EnRRICH monitoring and integration of the 5 RRI keys, including gender aspects. As this task is a specific task, part of the action, the project accountability task will be subcontracted to an independent evaluator in order to both account to the commission as funders of the project, but also ensure social accountability to main stakeholders. This will challenge the prevailing system in HEIS where the introduction of quality standards and performance indicators served also to orient the actions of single people and institutions as it identifies what can be valued or not, it affirms what can be considered right or wrong, and thus indicates expected behaviours. The principles and practices adopted for HEI governance, generally favour vertical control, are mainly state- or market-oriented and tend to disregard civil society. EnRRICH will seek to challenge this orthodoxy by involving a broad range of stakeholders in its evaluation processes from the outset.

6. To build partnerships and engage stakeholders including CSOs, HEIs, research bodies, the media, relevant networks, and policy makers with the activities and results of EnRRICH from the outset, obtaining feedback from them and stimulating transnational exchange on RRI curricula for use by HEIs and other societal actors and disseminate newly developed educational material and curricula for use by HEIs.

EnRRICH will have a continuous dissemination activity throughout the whole duration of the project, in keeping with the RRI principle of Open Access. Early stage discussions, preliminary results and approaches will be exchanged actively, by all partners. This will ensure good embedding of the project among stakeholders and will maximize mutual learning in the networks of the partners. Therefore, all partners are included in the dissemination work package. A Dissemination Plan (M7.1) aimed at ensuring the widest dissemination of knowledge from the project and promotion of the project results will be collaboratively designed with main stakeholders by the 6th month and implemented during the entire project duration.

Educational material and curricula for use by HEIs will be disseminated to support their piloting into educational programmes. By involving stakeholders including research bodies, CSOs, policy makers, other networks and the media, we will engage them in transnational exchange on RRI curricula for use by HEIs and thereby encourage global debate amongst a range of stakeholders. This will also involve the sharing of and access to relevant knowledge, expertise and information about good practices regarding Responsible Research and Innovation and public engagement in research. The consortium and advisory board links with networks, associations and other


projects ensure that the project outcomes and educational materials will be widely disseminated among European and Associated Countries.

To support the collaborative development of publications and develop meaningful and useable dissemination of learning from EnRRICH, and the embedding of teaching methodologies and practices that support the integration of RRI in HE curricula, writing workshops will take place during the consortium meetings. There will also be a residential writing workshop towards the latter stages of the ENRRIcH project, when enough materials have been gathered. It is anticipated that these writing workshops will be used to develop academic publications which will reach an audience beyond those involved in public engagement and RRI initiatives and bring this work into the mainstream of academic practice, particularly in terms of academic curricula development. These workshops will also continue to build horizontal links across the project and stimulate cross WP discussions.

EnRRICH complements the above mentioned dissemination with the coordination of an international conference including a summer school, to bring international RRI practitioners and policy-makers together, alongside our consortium. While online dissemination, and communication by e-mail and skype, will be an essential part of our project work, evidence supports face-to-face engagement as a way to build trust, share ideas, create new partnerships and strengthen existing ones, particularly in relation to RRI type activities, such as science shops.29

This conference will be run as a Living Knowledge conference, with a special focus on RRI in the curriculum. The Living Knowledge Network has held 6 previous conferences in a range of European countries. As a network for science shops and those involved in societally-engaged research, it will guarantee an attendance of committed participants for the conference who are already focusing on most, if not all, of the RRI keys in their work. The Network has a listserv membership of over 500, over 200 followers each on Facebook and Twitter, over 400 subscribers to the Living Knowledge Newsletter, and a circulation of 1,600 for the Living Knowledge Magazine. These partners cover a wide range of countries and stakeholders. To ensure the best possible focus on RRI in the Curriculum, we will align conference themes with the RRI keys.

The conference will be a valuable opportunity not only to disseminate findings, but also to gather further emerging examples of good practice from conference participants. It will include a forum for funders and policymakers from the EU and at an international level to share learning in relation to RRI in the curriculum, to help them consider how to build RRI requirements into funding calls and structures, and into policy.


30 More information on previous Living Knowledge Conferences: www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/science-shops/conferences
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2. Impact

2.1 Expected impacts

EnRRICH will seek to develop a common and increased understanding of what RRI, and more specifically the 5 RRI keys, in curricula can mean. By this, it will kick-start the debate on RRI in higher education curricula in the 10 involved countries and beyond. This will lead to the development of a broader RRI understanding in HEIs, CSOs and other stakeholders. In the longer term, lecturers will be teaching more, and more effectively, about the principles of RRI and how to incorporate them into research; student researchers will be embedding RRI into their work; CSOs and industry partners will be better equipped to engage with and collaborate with researchers in the name of RRI. For example, with themes reflecting each of the 5 RRI keys, the EnRRICH conference will engage directly with approximately 300 stakeholders involved in building RRI into the curriculum.

EnRRICH will draw out the supporting competences relating to RRI, and examine how to develop these among students. It will identify and evaluate a range of teaching strategies and resources that support the incremental development of student competencies demonstrating the integration of the RRI keys. In this way, it will improve the capacity of students and staff in higher education (HE) to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes to support responsible research and innovation and the 5 RRI keys. In that way, it will create more opportunities for students and staff to understand and engage in experiential learning activities, from the earliest stage of students’ academic and research careers, within the consortium and beyond.

EnRRICH will kick-start debates at disciplinary and transdisciplinary, institutional, national and international level to create a better awareness of, and enhance the policy context for RRI integration into Higher Education curricula on a European level and the 10 involved European countries. Policymakers will bring increased awareness of RRI, and why and how to encourage and foster it in HEIs, to their policymaking. Policy briefs aiming at all three levels will be produced in the frame of the fifth and sixth work packages. This will impact on the development of common standards/criteria for RRI to define a high quality research process regarding RRI and also to be able to reward people that are already supporting RRI in curricula. The conference will also engage a number of key policy-makers and funders across the EU and internationally, particularly in the funders’ forum, which will encourage funders to share ideas, learning, and experiences, and thereby help to enhance the policy context for RRI in the curriculum across the EU.

EnRRICH will facilitate the inclusion of multi-stakeholder perspectives in HE curriculum development and support civil society engagement in participatory research relationships. By doing this, EnRRICH will enhance HEIs engagement with the community and encourage a research culture more aware of and responsive to the needs of society. For example, the position of 11 new and already established community knowledge exchange mechanisms or science shops – guaranteeing this civil society engagement – in curricula will be strengthened. (Learnings from previous projects as PERARES, TRAMS\(^{31}\) and INTERACTS\(^{32}\) show the benefits of running science shop pilots as a precursor to establishing science shops.) Thanks to the evaluation of involved stakeholders and the advisory board of stakeholders, their voice and input will be taken into account. As the EnRRICH consortium members are active in community engagement, dissemination of interim and final results into cooperation and professionals’ networks for comments and feedback is assured.

\(^{31}\) TRAMS project see [http://cordis.europa.eu/result/rcn/46612_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/result/rcn/46612_en.html)

EnRRICH will support reuse, repurposing and embedding of approved RRI teaching strategies and related educational resources through broad dissemination of the project outputs. Good practice in integrating RRI keys in curricula at both practical and policy levels will be widely shared through the website (including 20 case studies), disseminated through networks, conferences and social media identified in the dissemination and communications plan. In this way, project output will not only be used by the 10 EU countries directly represented in the EnRRICH consortium, but also to many further lecturers and students at HEIs in Europe and beyond. The conference will also facilitate dissemination, and provide opportunities for staff in HEIs outside the EnRRICH consortium to sign up to piloting curriculum interventions in their own HEIs as part of EnRRICH. Through this broad and accessible EnRRICH dissemination, teacher training costs will be reduced.

Potential barriers/obstacles

Processes and timelines for influencing curriculum development will vary among disciplines, from HEI to HEI, and in different national contexts. Most academic programmes only run once every year, starting in September, which means that there may only be time to run some interventions once during the lifetime of this project. This may hinder our ability to evaluate, and exchange curriculum material for piloting between the partners. Collaborative processes can be time consuming, and require time to be allocated to building relationships and trust, particularly when working across sectors.

Quality assurance processes within HEIs require time-consuming processes before new modules or programmes can be approved and delivered. Quality assurance agencies for higher education in different national contexts are responsible for various academic subject frameworks for teaching and learning in higher education. It will be important for EnRRICH members involved in all work packages and not just in work package 5, which has specific tasks about liaison with quality assurance agencies, to become familiar with national standards set for teaching and learning in higher education in relationship to the RRI keys. These standards may provide enabling opportunities as well as potential obstacles to enhancing RRI in the curriculum, and so these frameworks and standards will be explicitly addressed as part of the EnRRICH project, particularly in work package 5.

The EnRRICH project builds on the earlier work of EU funded initiatives. Consortium partners are focused on the creation of useful project outputs that can be easily repurposed in different national higher education contexts. This requires a breadth of knowledge about different education systems and strong leverage of network links to ensure the uptake of these teaching strategies. Thus the question of how to embed and sustain this activity is to fore in each of the work packages.

The EnRRICH project has been formulated with sustainability in mind, with members representing established public engagement units, science shops and community knowledge exchange mechanisms as well as members who are beginning science shop work. This means that EnRRICH members are well placed to work with and influence colleagues who are lecturers as well as CSOs, students and more, in continuing to develop learning about RRI keys beyond the timescale of the EnRRICH project. Moreover, as the EnRRICH consortium is already linked to several networks and fora, these will enhance sustainability. Activities such as the professional development of staff in the use of RRI teaching strategies and resources, multi-stakeholder curriculum design, and the collaborative trialing of teaching resources will help grow a community of practice who can enact the RRI methodologies and help sustain this activity in the future.
2.2 Measures to maximise impact

2.2.1 Dissemination, communication and exploitation of results

The consortium intends to involve a wide range of stakeholders from the outset of the project, linking to the extensive national and international networks of consortium partners to maximize the impact of the project. A major focus of the dissemination plan is the academic sphere itself since academics, students, researchers and policy makers at different levels in the higher education system will be best placed to make the systemic changes necessary for the embedding of the RRI keys in the curriculum. However this work can also be supported by other partners so societal stakeholders including CSOs, policymakers and the wider public will also be targeted as key stakeholders in this project and therefore relevant terms of dissemination.

Dissemination of information and documentation will be largely based on the following mechanisms: Development of the existing Living Knowledge website to include EnRRICH information; Networking; Dissemination of EnRRICH output via publications (including in academic fora) customized e-mail lists, discussion lists, policy briefing papers, contribution to blogs and forums and other social media; Dissemination through conferences and workshops including the 7th Living Knowledge conference; and a quarterly Living Knowledge newsletter.

EnRRICH WP7 will start with a survey of tools used by partners added by an inquiry of their relevance for project and network related aims and issue, resulting in a summary report with links and description of relevance. The most relevant social media and how to make use of them (see picture beneath\(^{33}\)) will be integrated into the dissemination action plan for all partners, eventually leading to a broader dissemination of project findings, recommendations and policy briefs. Activities here will increase skills within the consortium group.

---

\(^{33}\) http://www.fredcavazza.net/
**Key Dissemination audience** will include: existing international networks which include CSOs and other stakeholders; academics; policymakers; and the wider public via a media strategy

**Leveraging existing international networks**

The EnRRICH consortium and advisory board members have wide networks encompassing a range of partners such as CSOs, social enterprise and academics involved in research and education. They will take advantage of these links in order to create a 'multiplier effect' in spreading information. All partners and especially the management support team will make efforts to utilize their existing networks to link EnRRICH activities with international or national networks and projects, such as RRI Tools, ENGAGE, PARRISE, Sis-Catalyst, EUN (European University Network), European University Association (EUA), European Schoolnet, ESN (Erasmus Student Network) and other international networks such as APUCEN (Asian Pacific University Community Engagement Network), CCPH (Community-Campus Partnerships for Health), GUNI (Global University Network for Innovation), PASCAL observatory, ENGAGE Australia, GACER (Global Alliance on Community Engaged Research), ECSITE (European Network of Science Centres and Museums), INES (International Network for European Studies), INASP (International Network for the Availability of Scientific Publications), Canadian Knowledge Mobilization Forum/Network, PCST (Public Communication on Science and Technology), Action Research Action Learning Interest Group (ARALIG), European Society for Ecological Economics (ESEE), European Sociological Association-Environment and Society Research Network (ESA ESN), European Society for Rural Sociology (ESRS), 4S (Society for Social Studies of Science), EASST (European Association for the Study of Science and Technology), Science Café Network, UNESCO and various national networks. Networking activities will last during the whole project period.

Dissemination to networks will also make use of the blog and other tools (workshops, conferences, chats, podcasts) in Canada, UK and beyond, offered by the international recognized Institute for Knowledge Mobilization (IKM). IKM is a non-profit organization, based in Ottawa which inspired and is now partners with UK Knowledge Mobilisation Forum, London. IKM focuses on education, learning and capacity development on issues of knowledge mobilization, collaboration and community engagement, applied research and policy support, and evaluation and monitoring. The IKM president is also an EnRRICH advisory board member.

**Academic strategy**

In order to embed RRI in the curriculum beyond those current pockets of good practice, a key strategy for the project will be the engagement of academics, especially those who are focused on the teaching and learning sphere. A range of mechanisms will be used to discuss and disseminate project ideas to this audience including: use of partner networks in the teaching and learning sphere including discipline specific networks, attendance at relevant conferences nationally and internationally, and seeking to publish results in open access journals which will reach this wider audience. Mechanisms will also be used to reach out to the academic community who are already interested in public engagement with research. Writing workshops are planned to encourage reflection and writing in peer groups, with a goal of publishing in teaching and learning journals and thereby ensuring results are more widely disseminated to a larger academic community who are well placed to effect change.

**Policy-makers strategy**

Building on the PERARES policy work, EnRRICH will continue stimulating curiosity of policymakers re RRI in the curriculum. They will be interviewed to explore ideas and find points of contact and engagement at an early stage in the project. Moreover, EnRRICH will involve policymakers during the development of policy papers and exchange views formally and informally on recommendations, thereby producing policy papers which reflect shared ideas where possible. Furthermore, the Living Knowledge Conference will also involve policymakers and networks with policy influence.
Final outputs such as case studies and policy papers will be disseminated to the European Parliament and DG Research and DG Education and Culture using appropriate methods and fora. They will also be disseminated to and discussed with relevant professional associations and curriculum development bodies. It is also anticipated that they will be disseminated at national government level by partners involved in developing case studies, utilising regional, local and institutional levels policy drivers (WP5).

**Media strategy**

In order to disseminate the EnRRICH project results to a wider community of potential stakeholders including the general public, a wider media strategy is also planned. This will include traditional mechanisms such as issuing press releases working within partner institutions and countries to make project results accessible to the wider public. Educational materials and other project material will be, if applicable, produced and translated into video and radio spots, short films, posters and weblogs in Europe and abroad. These products are offers to European citizens for a dialogue about activities and best practice of RRI and its embedding in curricula.

### 2.2.2 Data management

EnRRICH will collect survey and consultation responses from students, lecturers, representatives of external organisations in public, private and civil society sectors as well as policy makers. There will also be student research projects carried out during the project, which will collect qualitative and quantitative data from members and users of civil society organisation services among others. Evaluative data from pilot participants will take the form of student, lecturer, and external partner feedback, and self-evaluation. WP6 will also identify evaluative approaches to identify whether students have achieved the desired competencies thus demonstrating the successful integration of RRI.

Data generated by the EnRRICH project will be protected with regard to the EU Data Protection Directive 95/46/EC. All databases of contact details for internal and external partner organisations on pilots, science shop projects etc. will be safeguarded as per the terms of this directive. For the survey and consultations, the principle of gaining informed consent will guarantee voluntary participation in the research, and permission to withdraw at any time. EnRRICH consortium members will be able to access data from the survey and consultations in order to generate pedagogical guidance, case studies on RRI delivery in curricula and to report on challenges to overcome, and good practice in secure file sharing and data preservation will be followed using guidance such as that available from the UK Data Centre’s ‘Managing and Sharing Data’ guide. Specific consent will be sought from any survey respondent or consultee who is willing to be identified, for example in association with a case study on RRI in the curriculum, before this is published. Once analysed, the survey and consultation findings will be published with data results in anonymised form. For science shop projects, ethical approval will be a process conducted at each HEI involved, in line with their policies, and best practice in data protection, use and sharing will be followed according to relevant disciplinary standards and the EU Data Protection Directive. The teaching evaluation data will be collected locally and will be governed by the ethical approval bodies and guidelines within each institution. Case studies may be anonymized at the request of participants.

The overall consortium agreement will include a section on data protection, to make explicit the ownership and access to key data from the project.

---


35 [http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/about/publications](http://www.data-archive.ac.uk/about/publications)
We do not anticipate commercialising any of the outcomes. EnRRich will give open access to information and materials developed, produced and adapted and will make it freely available on the public internet through the website. It will permit any users to read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts, or use them for any other lawful purpose, without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. The only constraint on reproduction and distribution, and the only role for copyright in this domain, should be to give authors control over the integrity of their work and the right to be properly acknowledged and cited.

Through EnRRICH, specific writing workshops will be provided to the consortium members. The writing workshops will contribute to the identification and development of topics for appropriate publication outlets, to the process of researching and writing the article or report, and finally to submitting completed articles for review and publication, to maximize the dissemination opportunities in this field. Student research projects conducted in partnership with external partners will also be disseminated as widely as possible, along with their anonymised datasets, through institutional digital repositories, as well as in appropriate journals, grey literature etc., with the consent of all partners involved.

For any scientific article produced by the consortium partners during the project period or after and related to the project activities, authors will self-archive their documents on the website (following the green open access model). Partners who want to have their EnRRICH related articles published in an open access journal or with an open access publisher (the golden open access model) should seek for journals where the users do not have to pay a fee. If a publication fee is required, it will be covered by the project budget.

We will facilitate collaboration between the Living Knowledge Network and the National Cooperation Center for Public Engagement (NCCPE) in the UK to develop an open access journal to disseminate research on social engagement and other aspects of RRI. We intend to use this new journal as a vehicle for disseminating our EnRRICH findings.
3. Implementation

3.1 Work plan

The EnRRICH project consists of 8 separated but inter-related work packages. As a distinct management work package, WP1 covers all these activities. Providing a continuous dissemination throughout the whole project, WP7 is also linked to all WPs in a similar way. The following charts show how the work packages inter-relate and the timing of the work packages.
EnRRICH Gantt chart

1. Consortium Management
   - internal communication
   - consortium meetings
   - management advisory board
   - project reporting to commission
   - data management plan
   - financial administration

2. Identify best practice, survey needs & develop new course material
   - Exploration and state of the art review
   - Survey and consultation of stakeholders
   - Articulating of learning outcomes and competences
   - Sharing information to inform pilots WP3 & WP4
   - Producing a guidelines manual

3. Piloting RRI educational materials in higher education curricula
   - Review teaching resources & development teaching staff
   - Local trial of RRI methodologies in HE curricula across different levels
   - Embedding and sustaining good practice
   - Reporting on trials to consortium

4. Strengthening RRI in curricula through science shop work
   - Refocusing Science shop literature on RRI
   - Setting up a Community of Practice (CoP)
   - Local science shop pilots on exchanged practices
   - Evaluation of the pilots, embedding good practice
   - Reporting on evolution to consortium

5. Advance uptake of RRI in academic curricula
   - Update State of the Art overview academic quality
   - Deeper understanding policy drivers for RRI through curricula
   - Better understanding of blockages and create resources to encourage policy dialogue
   - Final reporting to integrate all studies and promote dialogue on RRI in the curriculum

6. Evaluation: Learning, stakeholder accountability, approaches
   - Formative evaluation of WP3 and WP4
   - Project accountability
   - Discussion evaluating RRI in curricula through stakeholder involvement

7. Dissemination
   - project information on Living Knowledge website
   - ongoing outreach and dissemination
   - UK newsletter
   - Social media report
   - Dissemination plan
   - Writing workshops
   - International Events/conferences

8. Conference on building RRI into curricula
   - Conference planning and delivery
   - Conference communication and dissemination
   - Reporting on evolution to consortium
3.2 Management structure and procedures

The majority of the consortium participants are experienced in international projects and have already been collaborating in the past. However, the challenging objectives require a strong and coherent management structure and organisation. Consequently, in order to propose the most appropriate organisation and tools needed to ensure that the project is successful, the EnRRICH project management will follow the following principles and processes. This set of guidelines on management project quality will be the base line for the EnRRICH project management. The management structure has been implemented through three levels:

A. Strategic management level

The General Assembly (GA), the Management Support Team (MST) of WP leaders and the project coordinator will guarantee the availability of all required competences for a proper achievement of the EnRRICH project. This strategic management level will follow two key drivers: i) the achievement of the project objectives in terms of time, performances, costs; and ii) the assessment of the processes set-up to reach the objectives, including the achievement of milestones.

The GA will be composed of at least one representative from each contractor of the consortium, and is chaired by the project coordinator. It will ensure overall decisions and the assessment of the project. It will decide on required changes to the work plan and will assess the overall fulfilment of the project with regard to the objectives, the project progression and the budget. The main matter of discussion will be on the evaluation of the milestones and deliverables progression, the dissemination of knowledge and the budget. This will be based on the information delivered by the partners to the coordinator for the preparation of the Periodic and Final Reports, or on other matters escalated by partners or the coordinator.

The GA will be the unique body of the project having the competence to make high level decisions concerning every aspect of the project: WP activities, dissemination actions, and the administrative, legal and financial status. The GA committee meetings will take place 4 times during the project (Months 1, 12, 20 and 30). All decisions of the GA shall be formulated through written documents and reports granted by vote and disseminated to all the partners involved in the project.

B. Operational management level

The Project Coordinator (partner 1, VUB), supported by partner 2 (THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST) and an administrative staff (at partner 1), will act as the interface between the strategic management level and the WP management level. The project coordinator, Jozefien De Marrée, will manage the consortium and act as the unique intermediary between the European Commission (EC) and the consortium. In order to ensure an efficient communication with the EC, she will be responsible for the gathering of necessary information among the consortium. As a consequence, her main inter-actors in the consortium will be the WP Leaders, gathered in the Management Support Team. Monitoring the overall project progress, Jozefien De Marrée will be supported in her day-to-day management by an additional VUB R&D staff member, experienced in European project management. She will be seconded by Emma McKenna of THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST, to guarantee continuity and back-up.
C. Work packages (WP) management level

The WP leaders and the project coordinator will act as an intermediate between the operational level and the strategic level as the Management Support Team. The EnRRICH project is broken down into work packages and a leader assigned by the consortium will manage each of them. The leaders of the work packages are:

Jozefien De Marrée, VUB (Partner 1, WP1 and WP4)  
Nicola Buckley, UCAM (Partner 7, WP2)  
Catherine O’Mahony, UCC (Partner 3, WP3)  
Emma McKenna, THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST (Partner 2, WP5)  
Norbert Steinhaus, WilaBonn (Partner 5, WP7)  
Andrea Vargiu, UNISS (Partner 4, WP6)  
Catherine Bates, DIT (Partner 6, WP8)

The WP leaders will allocate responsibility for direction and coordination of the work within the respective WP. They will report to the project coordinator on the progress of deliverables and expenditure of effort and will meet “face-to-face” during the consortium meetings. They will prepare any decisions that the GA needs to make. Each leader will be responsible for:

- leading and controlling the progress of the work package he/she is responsible for in terms of technical achievement, planned deliverables and expenses;
- collecting the information needed to prepare the periodic reports and providing them to the project coordinator;
- organizing adequate sessions during consortium meetings and reporting to the coordinator on all matters related to the work package.
- ensuring a detailed communication with the coordinator and with other work packages.

Management tools and procedures

Management tools

Taken into account the amount of partners in both the project as a whole and the separated work packages, the project will pay particular attention to the internal communication and cooperation. Supporting transparency and facilitating efficient exchanges of information between the project partners, an EnRRICH Dropbox folder and mailing lists will be set up, allowing a dynamic follow-up of managerial components of the project. All reports and written communications between partners will be archived.

The Living Knowledge website will serve as a host for the EnRRICH project webpages with project information and to disseminate project results. Supporting the open access requirements, it will contain project description, technical documents and public deliverables, and open and interactive parts for discussion and debate. The webpages will also include information about EnRRICH activities including contact details, background information, working papers, and events and will link to other networks active in the field of RRI in higher education curricula.

Electronic mailing lists will be also used for internal communication and dissemination. An internal electronic mailing will be established for the EnRRICH project, as a mechanism for internal project communications. External mailing lists, will also serve for dissemination, or when it is more relevant, other specific existing mailing lists will be used to communicate to the wider community. Other communication tools such as the free software Skype for
telephone and video conferences will be integrated in the communication process between consortium management, work package leaders and project participants.

**Monitoring and progress reporting, planning**

The project coordinator will deliver the documents to the EC that are required. In order to produce reports respecting the objectives laid out in terms of time and quality, a process will be implemented to collect regular information from the work package leaders. The coordinator will distribute a Periodic Report template to the work package leaders in order to collect their information and will integrate this information to produce annual and final reports. All partners are obliged to give full information to their WP leaders. The project coordinator and the WP leaders will propose any required changes in the working plans to the steering committee for decision making.

Throughout the EnRRICH project, we will be identifying and trialling innovative approaches to enhancing RRI in the curriculum. This means that we are consciously taking the approach that the project coordinator, work package leaders and all members will be alert to the external environment as well as internal opportunities in host institutions. We will seek to draw on the creativity and developing knowledge of all EnRRICH members through sharing ideas through regular communications, brainstorming and sharing of learning. We then seek to share the innovative products of EnRRICH, including course material, openly, disseminating through tools such as the project website, conferences, publications and use of social media.

**Critical risks for project implementation**

Whilst science shops have a long track record in delivering successful European Commission projects, RRI through the curriculum is still an emergent concept and it is possible that the consortium will not have sufficient in depth expertise in all five of the RRI keys to ensure their embedding in academic curricula. However this will be monitored during the lifetime of the project, particularly through WP2 and WP6. If it is necessary to access other expertise, the consortium has broad links and would engage experts in the RRI keys within the advisory board.

We are convinced that there is enough capacity in the consortium to shift responsibilities (and financial means) to other partners if required to finish certain tasks. Moreover, the majority of consortium partners has already been collaborating in previous European projects with success and has extensive experience within HEIs and participatory research projects.
This consortium has been designed to address the core goal of this proposal which is to work towards embedding the RRI keys in academic curricula. The experience of consortium members is in working with academic partners and CSOs on research issues. A major focus for many of the partners have been finding routes to embed applied research within already existing academic curricula, and it is the experience of longstanding science shops that this happens much more successfully from within HEIs themselves. Therefore the consortium is mostly made up of knowledge exchange initiatives from 10 HEIs who have strong links to CSO sectors in their own regions, with the addition of a research institute and a CSO science shop to provide balance.

The consortium has extensive expertise in delivering RRI in the curriculum through coordinating science shop work. All consortium partners have already set up a community knowledge exchange mechanism, or are planning to do so. Some of them are among the earliest established science shops in the world, namely partner 2 (THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST), partner 5 (WiLaBonn) and partner 10 (WU), all with over 25 years of experience. Both THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST and WU operate within HEIs and have experience of working through the curriculum to meet needs of CSOs. Other partners have been operating a science shop for up to 15 years: partner 1 (VUB), partner 3 (UCC), partner 4 (UNISS), partner 6 (DIT), partner 7 (UCAM) and partner 12 (UNIVERSITE DE LYON). Together, these partners are well capable of sharing their practices with the participants that are planning to start new science shops. Moreover, the science shops in the consortium differ in their location and operational approaches, offering another opportunity to learn from each other.

These partners are also complementary in a sense that they are located in different countries and cultures, the key persons are of different age and gender (majority of women), and represent different scientific disciplines; both from the social and natural sciences. All participants are used to working in a multidisciplinary setting and most have a decade of experience at least. Each key person has his/her own relevant national and international contacts within the fields of science and society, science communication, specific RRI keys etc. Strong links with the RRI Tools project are guaranteed through two consortium members of whom the latter is the deputy coordinator of the RRI Tools project (partner 5, WiLaBonn and partner 11, IRSICAIXA) and through an educational expert of RRI Tools in our advisory board (Roser Pinto). EnRRICH also endorses gender equality. In general, participation of women in EnRRICH activities is relatively high compared to the average ratio in science and research.

Concerning their working domains, a wide range of disciplines is included. Consortium members cover most academic disciplines. Some partner institutions have specific technological expertise, namely partner 6 (DIT), partner 9 (UNIVERSITAT VECHTA), partner 10 (WU), partner 11 (IRSICAIXA) and partner 13 (Vilniaus technologijų ir dizaino kolegija), whilst others have strengths in social sciences. Moreover, partner 12 (UNIVERSITE DE LYON) is strongly linked with an engineering platform and as a business faculty, partner 8 (CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST) has strong business links. Partners also bring specific strengths in dissemination (WiLaBonn), policy and strategic development (THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST), curriculum development (UCC and VUB), evaluation (UNISS) and science communication and science festivals (VUB, UCAM and UNIVERSITE DE LYON).

Given the strict limits on what countries can be funded, partners are drawn from within Europe and the consortium has sought to involve a broad range of countries representing different parts of Europe. Third countries active and experienced in the field of RRI in HEI curricula are involved through the advisory board, namely Canada, Malaysia, South-Africa and Australia. Furthermore, the advisory board ensures links to the most relevant EnRRICH stakeholder groups. The four female and six male advisory board members are educational and curriculum development experts, experts in the domains of community based research, public engagement, science education, teacher education, science communication, Science Technology Engineering & Mathematics
(STEM), knowledge mobilization, teaching and learning, social learning & sustainable development. They all are linked to well known and extensive networks in those domains. There is also the flexibility to add other members to the advisory board where relevant. The advisory board also includes Henk Mulder, who coordinated the PERARES project and will support the management support group and the project coordinator.
3.4 Resources to be committed

The total project budget and the funding requested from the European Commission is € 1,499,396.63. The personnel costs amount to € 996,417.5. The other costs of the project are:

- Travel costs (€ 109,000) allocated to the individual consortium partners for participation in the 4 consortium meetings, for mentoring visits (WP4/5/6), policy interviews (WP5) and Swap Shops (WP3).

- Partners get €500 traveling budget per person, per meeting and are allowed to come to consortium meetings with two persons at most. The advisory board travel costs (€39,000) are included in the travel budget of partner 1 (VUB), allowing 6 European (€ 500 per person) and 4 non-European Advisory Board members (€2500 per person) to join 3 consortium meetings. Remaining travel costs in the VUB travel budget are intended to send 2 EnRRICH consortium members to two European conferences and two non-European conferences that are closely linked to our project content and will take place during the project duration.

- An other goods and services budget of € 76,500 is intended for:
  - 4 consortium meetings of 2 days for 26 consortium members, based on a €50 per diem, per member, used for meals, breaks, meeting rooms and other meeting facilities = € 10400
  - 3 consortium meetings of 2 days for 10 advisory board members based on a €50 per diem, per member, used for meals, breaks, meeting rooms and other meeting facilities = € 3000
  - 6 partners organizing a Swap Shop each get € 500 = €3000
  - a partner organizing the conference gets € 54,600 based on a cost estimation for 300 conference participants
  - The Dissemination WP leader gets € 5000, aimed for PR and printing.
  - The Policy WP leader gets an additional € 500 aimed to organize policy interviews

- A provision of € 18,000 is allocated to the project coordinator (VUB) for subcontracting an external evaluator. This budget is based on consultations and estimations of the leader of the evaluation WP (WP6), UNISS.

- In the frame of the conference organization, another € 4000 is allocated to the conference host (DIT) to subcontract photographing/filming etc. during the conference.

The following table shows the participants whose costs for ‘travel’, ‘equipment’, and ‘goods and services’ exceed 15% of the personnel costs for that participant.

Table 3.4b ‘Other direct cost’ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner 1 (VUB)</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>2 VUB persons to go to 4 consortium meetings (4000€), 10 advisory board members to 3 consortium meetings (6 Europeans = 9000€, 4 non-Europeans = 30,000€), travel for 2 people to 4 additional conferences (2 European = 2000, 2 non-European = 10,000€)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other goods and services</strong></td>
<td>13,400</td>
<td>26 consortium members to go to 4 consortium meetings, 50€ per person per diem (10.400€)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10 advisory board members to go to 3 consortium meetings, 50€ per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner 6 (DIT)</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2 persons to 4 consortium meetings (4000€), 2 peer or mentoring visits (250€ per visit) as an experienced science shop in the frame of WP3/4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>55.100</td>
<td>Estimated conference costs (based on 300 participants): 54,600€, organisation of 1 swap shop: 500€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner 13 (VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJU IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA)</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td>2 persons to 4 consortium meetings (3000€), 2 peer or mentoring visits (500€ per visit) as a new science shop in the frame of WP3/4/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 4. Members of the consortium

### 4.1 Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPANT 1: VUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of the organisation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification of the key Personnel</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Role</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Relevant skills/experiences for the role** | • The Brussels Science Shop successfully connects non-profit organisations with final-year students since 2002, resulting into more than 200 useful research reports  
• Strong involvement in the organization of science communication and science education events (e.g. science festival, summer school in science communication) and projects (aimed at youth and a broader public) thanks to its position within the |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VUB science communication unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Strongly linked with all 8 VUB faculties and their researchers, thanks to its position in the VUB Research &amp; Development department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involved for almost 10 years in international project activities, project and work package coordination and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local, regional, national and international connections, experiences and networks (including CSOs, other universities, own researchers, companies, policy makers, foundations, museums etc.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications/achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous projects/activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- As an active member of the network of Flemish and Dutch Science Shops, the Brussels Science shop hosted the biannual International (BE-NL) Science Shop award event in 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The VUB science communication unit hosts a yearly summer school in science communication, open to PhD students of all Flemish universities, <a href="http://letstalkscience.be/">http://letstalkscience.be/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The VUB science communication unit hosts a monthly science café in Brussels, named ‘Science Bar Brussel’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The VUB science communication/education unit organizes the biannual Flemisch Science Week (Vlaamse Wetenschapsweek) and annual Science Day (Dag van de Wetenschap) in Brussels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure/technical equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff for event organisation, own fully equipped seminar rooms, own organisation's website (<a href="http://www.vub.ac.be/wetenschapswinkel">www.vub.ac.be/wetenschapswinkel</a>) and science communication website (<a href="http://www.wtnschp.be">www.wtnschp.be</a>) for the dissemination of information. Networking in several regional, national and international networks: Wetenschaps- en Informatie Netwerk, network of Belgian and Dutch science shops, Living Knowledge Network. Science communication unit Twitter, Facebook, Linkedin and Youtube-accounts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PARTICIPANT 2: THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>Science Shop, Queen’s University Belfast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

The Science Shop at Queen’s University Belfast was established in 1989 and is based in the Division for Careers, Employability and Skills within the university. It works with CSOs across Northern Ireland to develop research projects suitable for students to carry out as part of their degree programmes, both undergraduate and postgraduate. It has a particular strength in social and environmental sciences, working with students across academic departments including Geography, Sociology, Engineering, Medicine, and in Social Policy and Management Science Shop projects are embedded in course descriptions. It has also worked with senior managers both in academic departments and at central administration levels to embed science shop work at a policy level within the institution. THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST Science Shop was a founding member of the Living Knowledge Network and has been involved in several previous European Commission funded projects.

**Qualification of the key Personnel**

**Dr Emma McKenna** (female) has worked in the Science Shop at Queen’s University Belfast for almost 15 years. After completing her PhD in Sociology, where she taught women’s studies and sociology at undergraduate level, she worked in research and policy for the Women’s Support Network, a network of women’s CSOs, and the Northern Ireland Council for Voluntary Action, a Northern Ireland wide policy and advocacy body for CSOs. She has researched and supported public engagement internationally, and mentored new Science Shops across the UK and Ireland and in India, Canada, France and Norway.

**Eileen Martin** (female) has been Manager of The Science Shop at Queen’s University Belfast for twelve years. More recently she has been involved in developing the Queen’s Public Engagement initiative and co-ordinated the development of the Queen’s Community Outreach Strategy. She has participated in several EU funded Science Shop projects and is a founding member of the International Science Shop Network, Living Knowledge. In addition she has worked on a voluntary basis on a number of community projects in the Glens of Antrim. She holds a Masters Degree in Applied Anthropology and previously held a research post at Queen’s.

Together they have co-written and presented a range of reports and articles examining the role of Science Shops as public engagement mechanisms, delivered training on Science Shop practice and on public engagement with research and teaching. Both are currently involved in the Public Engagement in Research and Research Engagement in Society (PERARES) European-Commission funded Science Shop project and are Research Associates for the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement in the UK.

**Role**

Queen’s University Belfast Science Shop will act as deputy coordinator for the enrich project, will lead on WP5 examining policy to advance the uptake of RRI in academic curricula and will also play a key role in the trialling and dissemination of other WPs.

**Relevant skills/experience**

Within the Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society project (PERARES), THE QUEEN’S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST Science Shop co-ordinated WP7 which examined policy development to support the embedding of engaged research.
es for the role of Science Shops in engaging in research funding organisations in the UK and Ireland examining the interest of research funding organisations in funding research with and for CSOs as part of the 8th WP in PERARES. They contributed significantly to the dissemination of the project both through written materials and through conferences and seminars therefore beginning national level dialogues in the UK and Ireland on the links between engaged research in the curriculum and the skills to develop publicly engaged research at the level of academic institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publications/achievements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Martin, E., and O Mahony, C. (2013) ‘Practical Approaches to Student Engagement through Community-Based Research and Learning’ in Dunne and Owen The Student Engagement Handbook: Practice in Higher Education Emerald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PERARES OUTCOMES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous projects/activities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 2009 PERARES (Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society) <a href="http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/perares">http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/perares</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2009 Organisation of 4th Living Knowledge conference at Queen’s University Belfast ‘Engaged Communities, Engaged Universities’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure/technical equipment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced staff, access to resources of Queen’s University Belfast including, longstanding relationships with colleagues in educational and curriculum development, rooms at preferential rates (meeting rooms and accommodation) links to networks across the UK, Ireland and Europe and internationally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Name of the organisation
Community Academic Research Links initiative (CARL) at University College Cork

### Short name
UCC

### Country
Ireland

### Website
[http://carl.ucc.ie](http://carl.ucc.ie)

### Description
The Community-Academic Research Links initiative, CARL, is located at University College Cork and invites non-profit voluntary or community organisations (CSOs) to suggest potential research topics that can be pursued by students on their behalf across a wide range of academic disciplines in UCC. CARL is based on the ‘Science Shop’ model and follows a 40 year European tradition with similar initiatives ongoing in some of the highest ranked Universities in Europe and worldwide. CARL’s mission is to provide independent, participatory research support in response to concerns experienced by civil society. CARL employs one member of staff who coordinates the CARL projects, liaises with community partners to develop project proposals and helps encourage staff and student participation across the University.

CARL is supported by an 8 member committee who advocates for University support and engagement in CARL projects, supports the CARL coordinator, recruits students onto CARL projects, conducts evaluations on the impact of CARL, and coordinates the dissemination of project outputs. CARL was a partner in the FP7 PERARES project and its committee members are also involved in a national mentoring activity to support broader student and staff engagement in community engagement activities.

### Qualification of the key Personnel

| Dr Catherine O’Mahony (female) | Chair of the CARL initiative at University College Cork and manager of the Irish National Academy for Integration of Research, Teaching and Learning (NAIRTL). NAIRTL supports students, researchers and academic staff to implement and advance effective research-informed teaching and learning practices and a large amount of this work is focused on staff professional development. All of NAIRTL’s publications and resources are made available using a Creative Commons license. Catherine has a Masters in Science Communication and her PhD research investigated innovative ways to broaden public input into science policy decision-making. This led to her involvement in the nascent Science Shop in UCC in 2006 (now called CARL). She has lengthy experience in science education having worked as a supply teacher at 2nd level teaching Science, Chemistry, Biology, Physics and Maths, and also worked as a freelance Science journalist. She received a President’s Award in 2009 for her work in establishing a Science Café in Cork and retains strong links with the local and international Science Communication community. |
| Dr Kenneth Burns (male) | Director of the Master in Social Work programme in the School of Applied Social Studies and is a founding member and active participant in the CARL committee since 2006. He is a co-chair of a national working group on community-based research and will mentor staff across the Irish Higher Education sector on community engagement activities in the coming year. Kenneth has been a lecturer in UCC since October 2001 and has extensive experience designing, developing and delivering modules and programmes. He has a strong commitment to high quality teaching and learning practice and received a President’s award for Excellence in Teaching in 2012. Kenneth is an advocate for open access usage within UCC and through social media, and has made all of his permitted papers available on the Cork Open Research Archive. |

Both were partners in the PERARES project and they specifically coordinated the trialing of
good practice in the embedding of publicly engaged research in Higher Education curricula. As part of this work they developed a postgraduate module on participatory research methods with a strong emphasis on research ethics. Both Kenneth and Catherine have conducted research, presented papers and published articles and book chapters on topics such as science communication, public engagement in science, open access and professional development of academic staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>CARL will take the lead in coordinating EnRRICH WP3 and will also provide inputs into and engage in activities organised in WP1, WP2, WP4, WP5, WP7 and WP8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevant skills/experiences for the role                           | CARL has successfully coordinated > 40 community-based research projects since 2010, working across the four colleges in UCC  
Involved in the PERARES project for the past 4 years, coordinating and managing part of WP7 as well as engaging in and supporting other WPs  
Expertise on science communication, professional development, science education, curriculum design, research ethics, participatory research, open access, as well as supporting and sustaining community engagement through the curricula. Also expertise in the design, development, delivery and evaluation of new and revised student modules and programmes  
Very strong links with national bodies focused on professional development of academic staff and on the involvement and mentoring of staff and students in community engagement activities  
Organisation of local, national and international professional development activities for academic staff |
| Previous projects/activities                                      | UCC has been a partner in the FP7 Public Engagement in Research and Researchers Engaging with Society (PERARES) project for the past four years. Catherine and Kenneth coordinated the trialing of good practice in the embedding of publicly engaged research in Higher Education curricula and collated a report on the outcomes of these pilots. |
| Infrastructure/technical equipment                                | Both Kenneth and Catherine have strong technical skills and manage the CARL website, as well as their respective departmental websites. They are both regular users of social media with LinkedIn, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube and Google+ accounts and use these to promote their various work based activities and to maintain their extensive networks. Through UCC |
they have access to institutional licenses, software and support for video capture, data streaming, videoconferencing, and web hosting. They can avail of SMART classrooms and draw on a range of institutional supports such as the Learning Technologies Unit, the Centre for Teaching and Learning and Audio-Visual Media services.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>Università degli studi di Sassari</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>UNISS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uniss.it">www.uniss.it</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The University of Sassari was founded in 1558 and today counts a total number of over 18,000 students and about 700 teachers, in 13 departments, study centres and institutes. All three undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate courses are present. Activities for the present project will be run within the FOIST Laboratory (the acronym stands in Italian for Formation, Occupation, Information, Services, Territory), which is a research centre operating within the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. It was founded in 1977 as a documentation and research centre open to both academic and non-academic users. FOIST's main activities concern promoting and running theoretical and empirical research with a strong engagement in positive social intervention. The methodology used in applied research actions builds upon background inquiring, evaluation, training, information and participation. The overall approach tends to conjugate interdisciplinary research with the promotion of civic participation, solidarity building and community empowerment. Nowadays, the connection between research, learning processes and civic engagement is reinforced thanks to strict collaboration with IntHum – Intercultural Laboratory for research and promotion of the Human condition (which is external to University and itself a CSO with structural links with civil society). IntHum is a nonprofit association created in partnership with 4 CSOs within the FP7's PERARES Project on the basis of a participated process supported by Scenario workshop strategies and external mentoring by experimented Science shops' personnel. Both FOIST and IntHum are part of the Living Knowledge network and also count on extensive research networks, notably in the Mediterranean area, South America and Asia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification of the key Personnel</td>
<td>Andrea Vargiu (male) is tenure associate professor of Methodology and Techniques of Social Research (Sociology), coordinator of the Master Course in Social Work and Social Policies. Coordinator of the Social Work and Social Policies, curriculum within the Doctoral School in Political and Social Sciences. Antonio Fadda (male) is tenure full professor of Sociology in the Department of Political Sciences, Communication and Information Engineering. Coordinator of the Doctoral School in Political and Social Sciences. Maria Antonietta Cocco (female) is a tenure researcher in cultural processes sociology in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. Stefano Chessa (male) is a researcher in cultural processes sociology in the Department of Humanities and Social Sciences. Romina Deriu (female) is researcher of Sociology in the Department of Political Sciences, Communication and Information Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>- Coordination of WP6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Involvement in WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP7 and WP8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relevant skills/experiences for the role                  | • International project activities, taking tasks of project and work package coordination and management.  
|                                                     | • Expertise in public engagement in science and research and policy making for civil society's needs for research and access to research resources.  
|                                                     | • Local, regional, national and international connections, experiences and networks (CSOs, universities and researchers, companies, policy makers, foundations etc.)  
|                                                     | • Higher education course curricula development and management.  
|                                                     | • Chessa S., Vargiu A., Valutazione universitaria e mutamenti istituzionali in Europa, in "Studi di Sociologia", 1, 2011.  
|                                                     | • Merler A, Cocco M, Temi di Sociologia delle migrazioni. vol. 9, Università di Sassari - Quaderni DEIS, Sassari, 2009  
|                                                     | • Deriu R. (ed), Sviluppo e saperi nel Mediterraneo, FrancoAngeli, Milano 2012;  
| Previous projects/activities                        | • 2010-14: "PERARES - Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society" (FP7, grant agreement n° 244264).  
|                                                     | • 2012: “Equity & Sustainability Field Hearings”, Initiative for Equality https://www.initiativeforequality.org/  
|                                                     | • 2008: PRIN - Progetti di Ricerca di Interesse Nazionale, Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca.  
|                                                     | • Several events organised, most recently summer school on “Ricerca, formazione, società civile” (http://scuolamed2012.wordpress.com/), and the international conference on “Civil society organizations in the Mediterranean Area. Societal role, challenges, dynamics” (http://esarn27sassari2012.wordpress.com/)  
| Infrastructure/technical equipment                  | Experienced staff for event organization, own fully equipped seminar rooms, libraries, computer labs, electronic facilities for audio video conferencing. |
### Name of the organisation
Wissenschaftsladen Bonn – Bonn Science Shop

### Short name
WilaBonn

### Country
Germany

### Website
www.wilabonn.de
www.livingknowledge.org

### Description
Established in 1984 as a registered non-profit organization the WilaBonn (Bonn Science Shop) gives special emphasis to the topics of civil society & sustainability, environment & health, as well as the labour market with a strong focus on renewable energies. When appropriate, WilaBonn cooperates with local universities and other institutions, organizations, Science Shops or stakeholders in Bonn as well as in Germany or on an international level to enable multidisciplinary research, dissemination of results and education. The Bonn Science Shop has a gender balanced 30 person staff of whom 12-14 work in research and project contexts. All employees are actively involved in several networks on national or international level.

Since 2007 WilaBonn coordinates and runs the International contact point for Living Knowledge, the international Science Shop Network, [www.livingknowledge.org](http://www.livingknowledge.org). More details are at www.wilabonn.de and by a special publication “25 Jahre Wissenschaftsladen Bonn”, ([www.wilabonn.de/WILAinform_61english.pdf](http://www.wilabonn.de/WILAinform_61english.pdf)).

### Qualification of the key Personnel

**Mr Norbert Steinhaus** (male) is board member of WilaBonn since 1990. For the last 14 years he cooperated in international projects on training and mentoring Science Shops, citizen participation in science and technology or responsible research and innovation. Since the end of 2007 he is coordinator and international contact point of LIVING KNOWLEDGE, the international Science Shop network, organizing national and international workshops and conferences and being responsible editor for Living Knowledge – International Journal of Community Based Research.

**Ms Michaela Shields** (female) studied Social Geography at University of Amsterdam, and has been working in the field of sustainable development and event management in Bonn since 1998. She was co-organizer for the 5th Living Knowledge conference in Bonn 2012. She is actively involved in the RRI Tools project for stakeholder involvement and workshop organization.

### Role
WilaBonn will coordinate WP7 and liaise with WP8 for conference communication and dissemination. For other WPs WilaBonn will be the link to the RRI Tools project, support the identifying of best practice and will contribute to the development of training tools.

### Relevant skills/experiences for the role
- WilaBonn runs its own education centre and is experienced in various participatory procedures and methodologies
- involved for 15 years in international project activities, taking tasks of project and work package coordination and management.
- expertise in public engagement in science and research and policy making for civil society’s needs for research and access to research resources, local, regional, national and international connections, experiences and networks (including CSOs, universities and researchers, companies, policy makers, foundations, museums etc.)
- organisation of national and international participatory events, workshops or
in preparation: Tryon, B; Steinhaus, N (2015): Rewards and Challenges in Globally-Engaged Research, in Mary Beckman “When Community Matters - Effective Teaching and Practice in Community Based Research”.  
| Previous projects/activities | For the last 13 years and besides successful national projects and activities WilaBonn cooperated in international projects on  
Public Engagement in Research and Researchers Engaging with Society (PERARES) – FP7. [www.livingknowledge.org](http://www.livingknowledge.org)  
Training and mentoring Science Shops (TRAMS), FP6. [www.livingknowledge.org](http://www.livingknowledge.org)  
Citizen participation in science and technology (CIPAST) or, FP6, [www.cipast.org](http://www.cipast.org)  
SOUFFLEARNING 1 & 2, projects for the transfer of innovation in training staff of SMEs. LEONARDO-TOI, [www.soufflearning.eu](http://www.soufflearning.eu) |
| Infrastructure/technical equipment | Experienced staff for event organisation, own fully equipped seminar rooms, own organisation’s ([www.wilabonn.de](http://www.wilabonn.de)) and project websites ([www.livingknowledge.org](http://www.livingknowledge.org), [www.rri-tools.eu](http://www.rri-tools.eu), [www.cipast.org](http://www.cipast.org)) for the dissemination of information. Networking (besides being contact point for Living Knowledge) in Network Zukunftsforschung (Future Research), GACER, GUNI, APUCEN, Canadian and US based CBR and Knowledge Mobilization Networks, twitter, facebook, linkedin, youtube, xing accounts, |
PARTICIPANT 6: DIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>Dublin Institute of Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.dit.ie">www.dit.ie</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dublin Institute of Technology is one of Ireland’s largest and most innovative university-level institutions. As a comprehensive, doctoral-awarding institution, DIT combines the academic excellence of a traditional university with professional, career-oriented learning, preparing graduates for productive leadership roles. The core values reflected in its mission emphasize student-centred learning, useful knowledge, rigorous processes of discovery and critical enquiry, and support for entrepreneurship and diversity. There are 20,000 students registered in DIT, and over 2000 members of staff. A community of over 800 student and staff researchers is engaged in addressing 21st century challenges. DIT has a distinctive approach to teaching and learning that incorporates practice-based learning, research using real-life issues, internship in the community or industry, volunteerism, study abroad opportunities, and promotes inter-disciplinarity through modularisation.

DIT undertakes research that is strongly focused on problem-solving and social development and innovation that advances human knowledge and makes a real impact on people’s life experience. Research is conducted through two research institutes – Focas, which concentrates on new materials and technologies and the Environmental Health Sciences Institute (EHSI) - and in 16 designated centres. Close engagement locally and globally with society and the economy, and collaborative links with a range of world-class companies and academic institutions internationally are essential components in everything DIT does. As well as an Access and Civic Engagement Office and a Corporate Partnership Network, DIT has a longstanding track record of external engagement, collaboratively developing curricula and flexible delivery of programmes with both public and private organisations, not for profits etc., such as the Mozambique Eye Care Project (delivered in Mozambique), delivery of programmes in Assistive Technology with Enable Ireland; collaboration on delivery of accredited postgraduate programmes for managers with Ibec, the Irish umbrella organisation for business and employers.

Qualification of the key Personnel

Dr Catherine Bates (female) has co-ordinated DIT’s Programme for Students With Communities, which promotes curriculum-based engagement with CSOs across DIT, since 2008. From 2006-2008 she worked in an education-based CSO coordinating the adult education programme. She is involved in several Irish networks supporting community engagement in Higher Education, including one as a founding member, as well as the Living Knowledge network. Previously she lectured in design history and theory for 10 years in several Higher Education institutions. She was Principle Investigator for DIT’s involvement in the FP7 Science and Society PERARES project.

Ms Sinead McCann (female) has been project officer in DIT’s Programme for Students With Communities since 2010, and has worked in a variety of roles in DIT’s Access and Civic Engagement Office. She has also worked in an education role in several community organisations. She is involved in several Irish networks supporting community engagement in Higher Education, as well as the Living Knowledge network. She has been a key staff member in the DIT PERARES project work. She is currently in the final stages of completing her PhD.
Dr Claire McDonnell (female) is on a three-year secondment to DIT’s Learning, Teaching and Technology Centre, which will end in autumn 2016, so right after the DIT involvement in EnRRICH. From 2000 to 2013 she lectured in organic chemistry in DIT, winning several teaching awards including the Royal Society of Chemistry Higher Education Teaching Award. Several of her teaching awards related to her work in community-engaged research and learning with chemistry students. Prior to joining DIT she worked as a chemist in industry for three years. In 2010 she was the lead organiser of the 29th ChemEd Ireland conference for second level chemistry teachers, hosted in DIT.

**Role**

WP 2: participation in surveys and consultation; development of development trajectory.

WP 3: support and development of staff; local trials of RRI methodologies (in particular piloting community-based learning projects involving HEI students in promoting STEM through engagement with schools); embedding and sustaining good practice.

WP4: matching needs and good practices (mentoring); performing local science shop pilots.

WP5: involvement in national case studies repurposing RRI policy tools, and understanding blockages to incorporating RRI in curriculum, contribution to policy work activities.

WP6: contribution to evaluation work.

WP7: contribution to dissemination activities on website, social media and with networks.

WP8: coordinating and delivery of conference, and conference website.

**Relevant skills/experiences for the role**

DIT Access and Civic Engagement Office has an active contact list of over 400 people (academic staff, students and CSO partners), as well as an advisory board supporting community-based research and learning across DIT, both of which will be drawn on for the project. Bates and McCann have extensive experience of surveying and consulting with stakeholders to improve programmes and supports for curriculum interventions to include engagement with societal actors (relevant to WP2 and WP6). McDonnell and Bates both have years of experience of writing modules, defining learning outcomes and competencies for students, and were closely involved in the development of DIT’s Graduate Attributes in 2013.

All 3 participating DIT staff work in units whose primary function is to support staff in learning and teaching across DIT, and have been doing this for several years by running workshops, seminars, summer schools, acting as mentors etc. McDonnell has been engaged in CBL projects promoting STEM in schools with students for several years, and McCann and Bates have supported dozens of similar projects across DIT, and developed and delivered other curriculum interventions including training on reflection and engagement with society. All 3 staff have been involved in supporting, and delivering, a wide range of science shop projects in DIT, for many years, many of which are related to these grand societal challenges.

All 3 DIT staff are involved in policy-focused networks and committees at HEI and national level, and engaged in policy work on an ongoing basis. They also have been involved in dissemination activities related to their work on the RRI keys of engagement, ethics, and open access (see publications). McCann and Bates are responsible for the SLWC website (www.dit.ie/ace/slwc), Facebook page, and recent Twitter account, to promote these activities across DIT and externally, as well as dissemination of engaged research outputs on the website And DIT Arrow repository (http://arrow.dit.ie/comlinkoth/ And http://arrow.dit.ie/comlinkart/). All 3 are engaged in national and international networks. Bates has been involved in the organization of Living Knowledge Conferences 5 and 6, and McDonnell was the lead organizer of the DIT hosting of the 29th ChemEd Ireland conference.
for second level chemistry teachers. All 3 staff have also been involved in organizing public events, seminars, showcases and summerschools in DIT over many years.

### Publications/achievements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Volume/Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The above papers which are not in open source journals can be found on open access at [http://arrow.dit.ie/comlinkart/](http://arrow.dit.ie/comlinkart/).


### Previous projects/activities

DIT has a long history of civic engagement – in 2011 its Community Links Programme (now Access and Civic Engagement Office) won third prize in the international McJannet Prize for civic engagement. For the last 4 years DIT has been involved in an international project on Public Engagement in Research and Researchers Engaging with Society (PERARES).

In 2012, DIT staff were founder members of the Irish Network for Community-Engaged Research and Learning, as well as becoming deeply involved in the work of Campus Engage, the Irish network promoting civic engagement in Higher Education, when it opened its membership to non-universities in 2013, with DIT staff on the Steering Group and convening one of the Working Groups.

DIT staff and students have been involved for many years in organizing activities to promote STEM among children in schools, from hosting events for Science Week for children and teachers, to organizing the first Royal Society for Chemistry’s Chemistry at Work event in the Republic of Ireland in 2007. The DIT Access and Civic Engagement Office organises taster events for school children from socio economically disadvantage in a range of STEM discipline areas, among others.

### Infrastructure/technical equipment

- Relevant departments in DIT to support RRI in Curriculum Activities include: Learning, Teaching and Technology Centre; Corporate Partner Network; Access and Civic Engagement Office; Directorate of Research and Enterprise.
- Experienced staff and venues/rooms for hosting seminars/conferences.
- Online open access digital repository Arrow
- Erasmus + coordinator within DIT
- DIT website can be used for promotional purposes, supported by DIT Public Relations Office
- DIT is a member of many national and international networks, such as: the International Association of Universities; European Universities Association; Campus Engage; Talloires Network; Learning Innovation Network (Ireland).
PARTICIPANT 7: UCAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>UCAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cam.ac.uk">www.cam.ac.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

UCAM is ranked highly in the world for its research achievements in science and technology, as well as arts, humanities and social sciences. In the Shanghai Jiaotong University World Rankings 2014, Cambridge is ranked 5th in the world and 1st in Europe. In the Office of External Affairs and Communications, the Public Engagement team co-ordinates several major projects which engage the public with research, including:

- Cambridge Science Festival, the UK’s largest free science festival which offers over 200 events for all ages to generate interest in science and technology during National Science and Engineering Week each March (30,000 visitors each year).
- Cambridge Festival of Ideas, engages the public with research in the arts, humanities and social sciences. It offered 200 events including open days in departments and insights into different cultures.
- Training programmes for PhD students and researchers in engaging the public with research, including ‘Rising Stars’ and ‘Making Public Engagement Work for You’ programmes.
- Cambridge Community Knowledge Exchange, promotes the opportunity for CSOs to contact the University with possible research questions in subjects including (but not limited to) psychology, sociology, public health, geography, computer science and business and we seek students to conduct research as part of their studies for projects and dissertations. This initiative has seen 15 research projects completed by students, with academic supervisions, initiated by CSOs.

**Qualification of the key Personnel**

Nicola Buckley (female) has worked in public engagement roles for the University since 2004 and has been the head of the public engagement team since 2010. Her role includes overseeing the annual Cambridge Science Festival, Cambridge Festival of Ideas, other public events and public engagement initiatives. These include the Cambridge Community Knowledge Exchange, which matches research requests from civil society organisations with student dissertation opportunities. Nicola is studying part-time for a PhD at the Institute of Education, University of London, investigating opportunities and challenges in co-creating student social science research projects with civil society organisations.

For that reason, she will be supported in EnRRICH by a colleague of the Public engagement team. Nicola has a BA in History and an MPhil in Social Anthropology from the University of Cambridge and an MSc in Science and Society from the Open University. Prior to her current role at the University, Nicola worked in fundraising and communications roles in the UK voluntary sector, for Addiction, Fight for Sight and Breast Cancer Haven.

**Role**

As a WP2 leader, UCAM will oversee the information gathering about RRI in curricula, and the production of case studies. She will work with other WP members on the development trajectory and competence framework for RRI keys, and the production of a draft manual and toolkit.

In WP3, UCAM will help with the organisation of the UK Swap Shop, for participants to share existing examples of good RRI practices in their area, to ‘swap’/share this information with
participants from other sectors and to collaboratively develop curriculum interventions for the in-classroom pilots. She will also work on development of a professional development workshop framework for academic staff to be used by institutional offices and professional associations involved in staff training and development, with UCC and WU.

**Relevant skills/experiences for the role**

- WP leader for Online Debates (WP2 in FP7-funded PERARES project)

- Have contributed to RRI elements of curriculum delivery at University of Cambridge. For example, led session on public engagement at ‘Societal and Ethical Dimensions of Nanotechnology’ for students beginning doctoral studies in nanoscience. Also lead seminar on ‘Community Development’ for MSc students in Public Health annually. Co-organise an annual community fieldwork day for undergraduate Geography students, during their ‘Cities and Citizenship’ course, co-created with local homelessness civil society organisations and involving the students in public surveying.

- Have developed and delivered courses to help researchers develop public engagement knowledge and skills at the University of Cambridge. These include courses in the ‘Making Public Engagement Work for You’ series.

**Publications/achievements**

L Borysiewicz, N Buckley Festival Lessons, Science 343 (6174), 949-949


Buckley, N. & Hordijenko, S. ‘Science Festivals’ in Successful Science Communication eds. D. Bennett & R. Jennings (Cambridge University Press 2011)

Buckley, N., McPhee, J., Jensen, E. ‘University Engagement in Festivals: Top Tips and Case Studies’ (National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement 2011)

**Previous projects/activities**

- Was a WP leader for the Public Engagement with Research and Research Engagement with Society (PERARES) project [http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/perares](http://www.livingknowledge.org/livingknowledge/perares)

- EUSEA 2Ways: worked with scientific colleagues in Montpellier to develop computer model for informal about synthetic biology and plant science, presented in UK, France and at European science festival in Brussels

- Involved in two European Science Parliament projects, for high school students, to debate political and social aspects of science and technology developments. These were coordinated by Wissenschaft im Dialog and culminated in European final events in Brussels and at the European Science Open Forum in Copenhagen in 2014.

**Infrastructure/technical equipment**

Experienced staff for project coordination, use of rooms at university, event organisation. Colleagues at UCAM and beyond to make contributions on RRI keys, with expertise on curriculum development, public engagement, gender, science education, open access, governance, ethics etc. (invited speakers, recommendation of key references etc.). Own
organisation’s website (www.cam.ac.uk/publicengagement) Twitter, Facebook, accounts. Membership of EUSEA (European Science Events Association), Living Knowledge, British Science Association, British Arts Festivals Association, National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement and further links in Europe.
CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST defines itself as a research university oriented towards education, where the scientific performance of the academic staff measures up to the international standard and the students can obtain a competitive degree having a standard and knowledge content identical to similar-profile universities and acknowledged on the European Union’s labour market and on a global scale. The University admitting more than 14,000 students offers educational programmes in agricultural sciences, business administration, economics, and social sciences, and most of these disciplines assure it a leading position in Hungarian higher education. At the same time, its key ambition is to display the institution’s uniqueness and to exploit the synergies resulting from professional diversity and from studying multiple disciplines.

CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST is committed to institutionalising and developing an innovative teaching and learning practice. Faculty of Business Administration (FBA) the largest of the six CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST faculties, gives home to 6,800 students. FBA is a centre for education and research in all fields of managerial sciences. FBA is heavily engaged with exploring business school’s social impact, and an active member of PRME (Principles for Responsible Management Education). It puts strong emphasis on business ethics, CSR, and sustainability issues in the curriculum. Courses on Innovation Management are an integral part of the bachelor, master and postgraduate studies.

Réka Matolay, (female) PhD is an Assistant Professor who has been developing courses on Corporate Social Responsibility, Business Ethics, Social Entrepreneurship, and Decision Techniques for bachelor, master and postgraduate levels of higher education in the last decade. She has been responsible for the professional teaching methodology development of the Institute of Business Economics at CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST. Her PhD dissertation discusses responsibility challenges of contested research and innovation through the example of agri-biotechnology. She was the program leader of surveying the social and economic impacts of CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST FBA last year. As a national expert, she tested the CSR self-assessment tool for the UNDP in Hungary. Currently she is the program coordinator of one of the accreditation processes of the faculty. She is participating in TRANSIT, an FP7 research project. For that reason, Réka will be supported by two Corvinus colleagues in the EnRRICH frame.

György Pataki, (male) PhD is an Associate Professor at the Department of Environmental Economics and Technology and Director of Research at the Faculty of Business Administration. He has been involved in the Living Knowledge Network and establishing the first Hungarian science shop. He has been committed to working for and with local communities, particularly marginalised ones through participatory action research projects. For ten years, he has been involved in EU funded projects, including PERARES and TRANSIT among others, studying public engagement and transformative social innovation, and coordinated research projects such as a 4-year program on exploring CSR tendencies in Hungary financed by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund.

Richard Szántó, (male) PhD is an Associate Professor at the Department of Decision Sciences...
of Corvinus University of Budapest, where he also acts as an Associate Dean for undergraduate education of the Faculty of Business Administration. He is the author of several research articles and book chapters on various management issues; his research fields include corporate social responsibility, judgment and decision making and risk analysis. He participated in the EU funded FP6 research project NEEDS (New Energy Externalities Development for Sustainability) as a country coordinator and co-organized the 4th Knowledge Assessment Methodologies School (organized by the European Commission’s - JRC - KAM group in collaboration with the Environmental Social Science Research Group at the Szent Istvan University and the Department of Decision Sciences at Corvinus University of Hungary).

CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST is involved in WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP6 experience in public engagement, project-based, community based teaching and learning, setting up a science shop, participatory action research.

**Relevant skills/experiences for the role**

- experience in developing and testing new responsibility related topics and methodologies in teaching, higher education
- expertise in social impact measurement
- experience in program coordination: intra- and inter-organisational curriculum development programs
- experience in research on policies, policy-making

**Publications/achievements**

- Debate of Researchers in Hungary), Társadalomkutatás, 31(4):424–444

**Previous projects/activities**

Beside NEEDS, PERARES and TRANSIT - EU funded research projects where key personnel of this application has been involved - CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST FBA participated and contributed to several EU researches. The following FP7 research programs have a thematic relevance (innovation, transition and/or higher education professional development) here: CLYMBOL, Cre8tv.eu, EPIWATER, FACEPA, PACT, UbiPOL. CORVINUS UNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST FBA has also been part of Erasmus Mundus project, like CLINK and eLINK. The most recent curriculum development program took place between 2012-2014 supported by the Hungarian Social Renewal Operational Program, aiming at content development and professional development in Logistics.

**Infrastructure/technical equipment**

Fully equipped seminar rooms and lecture halls, experienced staff for event technical organisation, infrastructure for web-based teaching and learning equipment.
### Name of the organisation
University of Vechta

### Short name
UNIVERSITAT VECHTA

### Country
Germany

### Website
[www.uni-vechta.be](http://www.uni-vechta.be)

### Description
The University of Vechta is a relatively new campus university located in Lower Saxony/Germany that offers ten academic programs to approximately 3,600 students. Areas of research include: education and discipline-specific pedagogies; social sciences, social services (social work, gerontology, social services management), regional development/rural areas; landscape ecology; social, political, cultural and economic change. Its strategic plan identifies internationalization, gender equality and participatory research approaches as essential. The University of Vechta sees knowledge transfer as one of its central tasks, not “one-way” directed but multi-lateral: knowing that data and relevant findings are also “produced” outside the science system, the participatory approach is the basis of several projects and courses.

Special participative outreach projects have been realised in the Knowledge Transfer Unit and the subsidiaries in Cloppenburg and Essen/Oldenburg. Service-Learning is integrated into the curricula, and practical projects such as “InVECTra-Development of Competencies in Curricula and Study Program” and other public events (e.g. museum talks, University for children, open lectures and courses) reflect these efforts. The University of Vechta set up the Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg at the end of 2012 as a subsidiary in Cloppenburg. It provides a point of contact between community and the University and mediates between society and research. The University of Vechta has established an internal group for coordinating the regional activities on public engagement.

### Qualification of the key Personnel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prof. Dr. Marco Rieckmann (male)</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Higher Education Development (with a particular focus on competence development) at the University of Vechta. He has expertise in the cooperation with different types of stakeholders in trans-disciplinary research projects, in particular in service learning projects in the area of sustainable development. In several occasions, he has developed and implemented project-oriented and service learning courses dealing with issues of sustainable development – e.g., a course on “sustainable consumption”. Furthermore, he has been involved in several academic staff and teacher training programs. His main interests in research and teaching are: (higher) education for sustainable development, sustainable development, higher education development, and competence development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Christine Gröneweg (female), MBA</td>
<td>running the Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg, communicates about “community-based research” and organizes participatory events on knowledge transfer in Cloppenburg and Vechta. She has coordinated the project on “Web-conferences on entrepreneurial and knowledge issues” and is now working on the project “Establishing points of community-embedded research in academia in Lower Saxony”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel Ludwig (male)</td>
<td>leads the Knowledge Transfer Unit in the Department for Research Management and Transfer at the University of Vechta. He worked as a lecturer, researcher, and project manager in related fields, such as economics and economic policy, energy and environmental economics, regional development, and entrepreneurship. He has experience in establishing contact points for public engagement with science through Science Shops. In 2006, he was one of the founders of the Science Shop in Zittau (&quot;Wissenschaftsladen Zittau&quot;)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Daniel Ludwig has worked at Vechta University and is, among other tasks, responsible for the newly established Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg.

**Role**

WP2: supporting development of the document on RRI keys, review of literature etc., online survey, the consulting and involving of different stakeholders for a further integration of RRI keys in teaching will be carried out. UNIVERSITAT VECHTA will also work on the analysis of collected data and support the online supply e.g. case study writing.

WP3: supporting staff to identify the content, activities and assessment that enable student achievement of competencies and organize a ‘Swap Shop’ event. For engaging local trials to integrate the RRI keys, UNIVERSITAT VECHTA will realise an ‘in-class’ pilots in its curriculum.

WP4: contributing to the manual on science shops stimulating RRI in curricula, be part of the overview of needs & matching good practices and evaluating the processes. Realising a local science shop pilot either on ‘Health, demographic change and wellbeing’ or on ‘Food security. WP5: stimulating the dialogue in the field. UNIVERSITAT VECHTA is also part of the dissemination (WP7) and involved in the conference (WP 8).

**Relevant skills/experiences for the role**

- University of Vechta has run its own Science Shop since 2012 and has experience in participatory projects and workshops regarding CBR or better expressed community-embedded research and public engagement in science and research.

- Expertise in the cooperation with different types of stakeholders in trans-disciplinary research projects, in particular in the area of sustainable development and in several academic staff and teacher training programs

- Expertise in developing and implementing project-oriented and service learning courses dealing with issues of sustainable development – e.g., the summer term 2014 summer school on “sustainable consumption”

- University of Vechta has been involved in several international project activities, taking on tasks of project and work package coordination and management

- Local, regional, national and international connections, experiences and networks especially in the field of Science Shops

**Publications/achievements**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous projects/activities</th>
<th>“Web-conferences on entrepreneurial and knowledge issues” – Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg (2013/2014), funded by the Ministry for Science and culture of Lower Saxony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Establishing points of community-embedded research in academia in Lower Saxony” – Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg (2014/2015), funded by the Ministry for Science and Culture of Lower Saxony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Effective Gender Equality in Research and the Academia (EGERA)” – <a href="http://www.egera.eu">www.egera.eu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizing of Web-Conferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure/technical equipment</th>
<th>Experience in workshop and event organization on participatory research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experience in organizing and performing web-conferences for exchange and knowledge transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg is a part of WissNet (Network of north and east-German Science Shops) and Living Knowledge (International Network of science Shops)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg is located next to the Media Centre Cloppenburg: newest technical equipment for presentations (lecture rooms with smart-boards), cutting and recording devices (audio, video, web-conference system), Audio-visual software applications, stage equipment...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Shop Vechta/Cloppenburg and Knowledge Transfer Unit are widely connected to the Stakeholders of the University in the regional and local field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of the organisation</strong></td>
<td>Wageningen University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short name</strong></td>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.wageningenur.nl/">http://www.wageningenur.nl/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description</strong></td>
<td>WU is part of Wageningen University and Research Centre (WUR), which is a leading international knowledge institute in the fields of nutritional health, sustainable agricultural systems and environmental quality. WUR consists of Wageningen University, eight research institutes, two applied research institutes and a training and advisory centre. WU has 6,500 employees and over 6,000 students. The research institutes carry out strategic, applied and practical research for businesses, governments and stakeholder groups. The research institutes and university work together closely in five areas of expertise: Social-, Plant-, Environmental-, Animal- and Agrotechnology &amp; Food Sciences. The department of Social Sciences is one of the five departments within WU and Education and Competence Studies is one of the Studies groups within this department. The Education and Competence Studies Group provides academic education and conducts scientific research on the identification of competence needs within the agri-food complex and the societal context of that, the design of innovative education to prepare students/other participants (e.g. teachers, entrepreneurs) for their (future) professional life, and the analysis of effects of regional, social, sustainable and/or transdisciplinary learning for pupils, students, citizens, consumers, workers, managers, entrepreneurs, organizations and the agri-food complex as a whole. Current research topics at ECS include: social learning towards a more sustainable world, making sustainability meaningful through education, communication &amp; citizen participation; competence development and knowledge arrangements; designing hybrid learning configurations for developing professional and sustainability competence; innovation and entrepreneurship; the collection and description of good practices in the field of learning in higher education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Qualification of the key Personnel** | Carla Oonk (female) combines her background in Environmental Planning with Educational Science. She is involved in the design of authentic “regional learning environments” in which students from different educational levels and from different disciplines work together with various external stakeholders aiming at sustainable transition on a (sub)local or regional scale. She also explores the effectivety of these learning environments in relation to their design characteristics. Dr. R. Wesselink (female) is assistant professor in the chair group Education and Competence Studies of Wageningen University. She did her PhD on competence-based education and her interests are in the fields of competence development, human resource development, competence-based education, vocational education and sustainable development. She is involved in curriculum development programmes in the Netherlands and in several other countries, projects to strengthen the linkages between vocational schools and relevant regional parties, projects to empower teachers to deal with new developments in schools and projects to increase the level of awareness of sustainability (both in schools and professional organisations). Besides she teaches several courses in the field of human resource development and sustainability. |

Associated with document Ref. Ares(2015)2128095 - 21/05/2015
Hansje Eppink (female) is working on several projects focusing on competence-based learning and capacity building in both Western and non-Western settings. She is involved in the design of different learning processes regarding competence education and facilitates interactive processes using creative learning methods.

### Role

Study and design a competency framework and development trajectory supporting the development of responsible and responsive professionals/researchers, who are better capable in framing their research in a more transdisciplinary manner embedded at undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate level. This will be done by defining RRI, develop a competence framework and development trajectory to embed RRI within undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate levels, including advise and suggestions on learning outcomes, learning and assessment methods and the learning environment.

We will collect good RRI practices in curricula at Wageningen University at undergraduate, graduate and postgraduate level, and integrate RRI methodologies by curriculum renewal. Furthermore we are supporting the process of identifying opportunities for inclusion of RRI in staff continuing professional development and co-designing a staff development activity to support the integration of RRI methodologies and curriculum renewal.

### Relevant skills/experiences for the role

- Design of authentic, hybrid learning environments
- Effectivity measurement of authentic, hybrid learning environments in sense of student learning (i.e. competence development) related to design characteristics of the learning environment
- Design of effective learning arrangements (workshops) for student-teacher-external stakeholder collaboration
- Roles and tasks of teachers in authentic, hybrid learning environments
- Skills: project management and coordination, teaching in HE

### Publications/achievements


### Previous projects/activities

- 2011 – 2013: The Regional Learning Environment: methods and effects Wageningen UR-Knowledge Sharing I (WURKS-I)
- 2010 – 2013: Teaching in the Regional Learning Environment Part of the Program
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure/technical equipment</th>
<th>Wageningen University has many facilities such as experimental facilities and laboratories and offers many products and services, such as databases, computational models and areal maps.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Professional Development (ProDo) as financed by the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs</td>
<td>1997 – till date Designing and teaching in Regional Learning Environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRSICAIXA is an internationally recognised institute of research on health, founded in 1995 by the Foundation “La Caixa” and the Department of Health of the autonomous Catalan government. IRSICAIXA incorporates over 50 investigators who focus their research on developing new therapies, vaccines and clinical studies and on basic research. IRSICAIXA is located within the Hospital Germans Trias I Pujol, where more than 2,000 professionals from different institutions work in the advancement of biomedical sciences, and works alongside the most prestigious international research centres. Its publications are among those with the most impact in their field.

The Unit of Public Engagement on Health Research was designed to support research institutions working on biomedical sciences in the development of their R&D+I following the guidelines established by the European Commission for what it defined as Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). The Public Engagement Unit focuses on:

1. Public engagement: to inform, facilitate dialogue, consultation and collaboration, through the organisation of outreach events and reflective workshops, and the creation of a Community Advisory Board, among other activities.
2. Science Education: to decrease the gap between research and education, and to promote RRI among the younger population. We develop educational portals on health research in collaboration with research institutions in Europe, offering innovative multimedia educational resources and hands-on activities to be run in schools and science museums (serious games, virtual experiments, videos, lesson plans, dialogue games, etc.). Together with our partners, we organise workshops of experiments, educational, dialogue events and courses for teachers at different science museums and research institutions around Europe.
3. Science communication of the R&I developed in IRSICAIXA, and of the projects we develop: social media management, web development and management, public and mass media relations, etc.
4. Training of scientists on RRI aspects: the Unit offers courses for undergraduate and post-graduate courses on RRI, public engagement and science communication.

Rosina Malagrida (female) graduated as a chemist from the University of Barcelona, she holds an MSc in Science Communication from Imperial College London and completed the programme for Strategic Communication at the ESADE Business School. Ms Malagrida is currently the Head of the Unit for Public Engagement on Health Research at the Institute for AIDS Research IRSICAIXA. She has extensive experience in science communication and public engagement, having coordinated the EU project Xplore Health (FP7 project) and being now the deputy coordinator of the RRI Tools project. She has also participated in other EU projects as PI, such as NANODIALOGUE (FP6 project), NANOYOU (FP7 project) and NANOPINION (FP7 project), in addition to more than 20 national projects. She has been responsible for outreach activities with different formats such as: exhibitions, experimental workshops, fairs, debates, etc. In the past she was the Director for Public Engagement at the Barcelona Science Park and she also worked at the Science Museums of Barcelona and
London.

Josep Coll (male) is the Clinical Cohorts Coordinator of HIVACAT, the project for the development of a HIV vaccine in Catalonia, since 2008. He shares research and clinical practice since he works as a researcher in IRSICAIXA and as a MD in the HIV Unit of the Hospital Germans Trias i Pujol of Badalona. He also collaborates with a Community Organization for the detection of HIV and other STI among MSM in Barcelona (BCN Checkpoint), where he is implementing a cohort study of MSM at higher risk of HIV infection. He has promoted the creation of the Community Advisory Board of HIVACAT, where he actively participates. Before his current job, he has been working with the NGO Doctors of the World in several HIV projects in Africa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role and Relevant skills/experiences for the role</th>
<th>IRSICAIXA will facilitate reflection and engage different stakeholders to promote RRI within the higher education curricula. IRSICAIXA will also contribute to the development of new RRI resources for education and will also implement some of them in HE and through a pilot Science Shop. Finally, as deputy coordinator of RRI Tools, IRSICAIXA will act as a link to make sure that both consortiums and also their communities of practice are informed and engaged to collaborate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Publications/achievements | • Science communication of the research institution IRSICAIXA and social media campaigns of the different national and EU projects where we have participated. Training of scientists on science communication  
• Funding and leading the Community Advisory Board of IRSICAIXA  
• Organisation of reflective workshops with scientists and different stakeholders, with different aims such as to analyse what Europeans think about nanotechnologies and what are the needs and constrains to implement RRI (within the projects NanOpinion and RRI Tools),  
• Implementation of educational campaigns at national and international level. Organisation of outreach activities in museums and research centres: fairs, workshops of experiments, dialogue events, etc.  
• Development of multimedia tools to disseminate current research: videos, lesson plans, card games to promote dialogue, online games, virtual experiments. Web development and management: The Unit has developed And been in charge of managing the content of the websites: www.nanopinion.eu, www.xplorehelath.eu, www.IRSICAIXA.es/outreach |
| Previous projects/activities | • RRI Tools, Deputy Coordination of this project, which aims to foster Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe (funded by FP-7) (www.rri-tools.eu). Also training and advocacy on RRI in IRSICAIXA.  
• NanOpinion, a European project monitoring public opinion in Europe (funded by FP-7) (www.nanopinion.eu).  
• Xplore Health, a European educational portal to decrease the gap between biomedical research and education (originally funded by FP-7, currently funded by Foundation “la Caixa” and Amgen) (www.xplorehelath.eu.)  
• IRSICAIXA outreach, a programme on science communication and prevention of AIDS (www.IRSICAIXA.es/divulgacio).  
• Responsible for communication at IRSICAIXA, including web and social media management and PR (www.IRSICAIXA.es). |
| Infrastructure/technical equipment | Fully equipped seminar rooms and auditorium within the Hospital where the institution is located. Websites: www.IRSICAIXA.es, www.rri-tools.eu with their social media channels, for the dissemination of information. Also member of the Catalan and Spanish Associations of Science Communication, where there are distribution lists to disseminate the information. |
### PARTICIPANT 12: UNIVERSITE DE LYON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>Université de Lyon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>UNIVERSITE DE LYON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.universite-lyon.fr/science-societe/">http://www.universite-lyon.fr/science-societe/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**
The Université de Lyon gathers in its new framework 11 universities and engineering or business schools. This federation of research and higher education institutions located within the Lyon-Saint-Étienne region is home to up to 130,000 students, 11,500 researchers and 6,000 PhD students. Among its main missions is the Science and Society department. Created in 2007, its role is to act as a cultural bridge between the researchers and civil society. 6 females & 2 males work with as main focus the direct impact that scientific activity has on the life of citizens, for example issues related to health, environment and new technologies. As a CCSTI (Centre for Scientific, Technical and Industrial Culture), the department is a place of experimentation and modelling of new forms of science communication, enhancing the dialogue between all the actors of society. Today, the main goal of this department is to become a forum for the experimentation and the modelling of new forms of cultural mediation involving the different actors of society: Cultural events and activities like National Science festival, European Researchers Night; Science and society debates and dialogues: Workshops, Professional seminar, Public Debate, Valorization; Access to research with our science shops; Research thinking platform: animation of a Science and Society commission, focus groups, trainings, organize interdisciplinary meetings...

**Qualification of the key Personnel**
- Dr. Florence Belaën (female), Head of the Science & Society department since 2014, PhD in information and communication studies.
- Davy Lorans (male), Project manager. In charge since 2010 of the development of the Science shop (involved in the PERARES project) and co-responsible for its management since 2013. Also involved in the science & society courses, he initiated the “3 minutes thesis” course for PhD students and the “intercultural communication” course for the Master degree students.
- Armelle Bozok (female), Administrative and financial manager of the department (since 2010), she’s been involved in European projects since 2007 (SCI CAFÉ, CASC, PLACES, PERARES, URBANBEES).

**Role**
The UNIVERSITE DE LYON role in EnRRICH is based on 3 main assets:

- The specific context of the UNIVERSITE DE LYON: the 11 HEIs that compose this federation constitutes a rich and powerful basis to investigate the current practices (WP2). Consequently, one of the first main will be to coordinate the key persons in these institutions at the different scales: laboratories, doctoral schools, curricula, teaching staff, students...
- Our experienced mediation toolbox (science festivals, society debates, participative research, training for PhDs and Masters students...) will represent a precious leverage to develop and implement locally new RRI experimentations (WP3), as well as to share the learnings with the consortium partners,
- The Boutique des sciences (science shop) of the Université de Lyon, created within the dynamic of the PERARES project will represent a decisive tool to contribute to
the WP4, by developing the international dimension of the projects, so as to enrich the RRI panel with the different local contexts.

### Relevant skills/experiences for the role

WP7 and 8 can rely on our own experience in events organization and media toolbox and the daily practiced partnerships with the other institutions.

- A research carried on in 2013 for our department gives us a comprehensive and contemporary study on Ethics: how it is addressed in the institutions that compose the UNIVERSITE DE LYON (good practices/lacks/recommendations). It represents a valuable asset by giving us an experienced methodology that can be used to address the 4 other pillars (societal engagement, gender equality and gender in research and innovation content, open access, science education), so as to obtain a local state of the art.
- The Science & Society department develops 5 cross-disciplinary courses and paths (4 for PhDs and 1 for Master students), in order to allow future scientists to step back from their research and/or teaching practices, so as to improve their self-awareness and acknowledge the full complexity of their activity, as well as to develop the dialog between science and society. Such a training offer can facilitate the EnRRICH objectives by adding-in the different RRI keys with new modules.
- Started 3 years ago with the PERARES project, the Boutique des sciences of the Université de Lyon [3] was officially launched in 2013. 8 projects have already been performed on health and environment topics and more than 10 will be performed in 2014-2015. The topics, focused in the health and environment fields, constitute an ideal and concrete playground to develop the responsible attitude for the young future researchers.

### Publications/achievements

- KORC B., BONARDI I., FABRE N. (2012): État des lieux des opérateurs et actions menées sur le territoire du Grand Lyon pour favoriser l’accès des publics «politique de la ville » à la culture scientifique et au dialogue science-société (Inventory of operators and actions on the territory of the Grand Lyon to promote access of "urban policy" public scientific culture and dialogue between science and society)

### Previous projects/activities

- 5 European projects on the last 5 years: PERARES; URBANBEES; PLACES; CASC; SCICAFE.
- 2 regional projects on the last 4 years (call for projects “Civic & inclusive University” from the Rhône-Alpes Region):
  - 2012-2013 : Des chercheurs au jardin - quand la science se met au service de la demande sociale (Researchers in a garden - when science works for the social demand), the pilot project of the Université de Lyon Science shop
  - 2010-2011: Un campus, une ville, une relation à inventer (A campus, a city, a relationship to invent)
| Infrastructure/technical equipment | Dissemination: Science & society website (http://www.universite-lyon.fr/science-societe) and projects websites (http://boutiquedessciences.universite-lyon.fr; http://etsionenparlait.hypotheses.org/); Facebook and Twitter accounts. Networking through 3 international networks: ECSITE (the European network of sciences centres and museums); EUSEA (European Science Events Association) and Living Knowledge (building partnerships for public access to research) |
**PARTICIPANT 13: Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the organisation</th>
<th>Vilnius College of Technologies and Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vtdk.lt">www.vtdk.lt</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description**

Vilnius College of Technologies and Design is a state institution of higher education, established in 1954. At present, VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJU IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA has 4 faculties, the total enrolment is over 3200 students. The College delivers 21 accredited study programmes, 15 of which are technology science-based, 2 are based on social sciences and 4 – on artistic studies. 10 study programmes of the College were accredited by German EVALAG Agency, listed in the European Quality Assurance Register for Higher Education. Applied research, artistic and consultative activities comprise an integral part of the study process, directed towards compliance with regional and national needs, as well as improvement of quality of the studies. Interested in the increase of demand of the provided services and aiming for the highest possible quality of studies, the College actively cooperates with social partners.

Results of activity of the College in 2012 were acknowledged as the highest among higher education schools of Vilnius region – the College was awarded with special prize – the Statue of Mercury, established by Vilnius Chamber of Commerce, Industry and Crafts.

**Qualification of the key Personnel**

- Prof. habil. dr. Vilija Targamadze (male):
  - over 20 years of in-depth experience in the field of Higher Education (research field - Management of Education, Didactics, Culture of Organization, Social Exclusion),
  - professor at Vilnius University, Department of Educology,
  - 4 years’ experience as Vice-rector for Development and International Relations at Klaipėda University,
  - 4 years of experience in expertise on updated curriculum of various universities at Research and Higher Education Monitoring and Analysis curriculum and external evaluation of institutions at Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education.

- Anna Aleknavičienė (female):
  - Master of Science in Applied Mathematics with a supplementary Business Administration qualification,
  - 7 years of successful experience as a project manager, 10 years’ experience as a head of department dealing with innovative solutions for teaching and institutional development,
  - 3 year experience as executive director of Lithuanian Colleges’ Directors’ Conference and member of Eurashe Council (2006-2009).

**Role**

VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJU IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA will contribute to identification of needs by consulting with students, faculty and external contacts about current content in curricula relevant to RRI (WP2). The College will run a pilot science shop project to integrate the good practices, in the domains of grand societal challenges (WP4). Based on the interest of public organizations or SMEs students supervised by teachers in the frame of science shop will perform interdisciplinary applied research, using relevant teaching materials. Career center of the College will identify RRI student’s skills enhanced by the pilot. VILNIAUS
TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA will also contribute to the Living Knowledge Conference in Dublin (WP8).

The role of the VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA is also to create a supportive environment for carrying out and to disseminate the results of the project in Lithuania (WP7). VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA considers this project an opportunity to develop activity of VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJŲ IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA science shop by using methodology and good practice of experienced partners, and to intensify cooperation in the field of applied research with partners from SMEs and public organisations.

### Relevant skills/experiences for the role

**Prof. habil. dr. Vilija Targamadze:**
- good organizational skills gained through the experience as Vice-rector for Development and International Relations and as a Chairman of Lithuanian Education Council,
- good intercultural communication and cooperation skills gained through internships abroad, through the experience in international projects.

**Anna Aleknaviciene:**
- ability to lead team with complex task requirements,
- ability to analyze and solve problems, introduce innovative solutions,
- strong communication skills, comfortable with public speaking,
- capable engaging with public and private sector stakeholders,
- experienced in project management (institutional coordinator of more than 15 projects, funded by EU structural funds).

### Publications/achievements


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous projects/activities</th>
<th>Vilija Targamadze:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2014 Tempus project „Development and Introduction of Multilingual Teacher Education Programs at Universities of Georgia and Ukraine“ (DIMTEGU). Expert of Monitoring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011–2012 Project of Research Council of Lithuania „Research Study on Project and Problem Based Learning Approach Use for the Final Thesis“. Head of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Project of Centre for Quality Assessment in Higher Education „Consolidation of External Evaluation System in Higher Education“. Member of the workgroup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Aleknaviciene:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2011 Project funded with support from the European Commission „Educating the new European professional in the Knowledge Society“ (EDUPROF). Institutional coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2011 Project funded with support from the European Commission „Level 5, the missing link“ (L5Missing). Institutional coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010 Project supported by the Lifelong Learning programme of the EU „The impact of Lifelong learning strategies on Professional Higher Education“ (FLLLEX). Institutional coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2012 Project funded with support of EU structural funds „Improvement of internal management framework of Vilnius College of Technologies and Design and Klaipeda State College“. Head of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure/technical equipment</td>
<td>During the project specific laboratories, fully equipped seminar and conference rooms can be used; technical assistance by the staff for event organisation can be provided. For the dissemination activities can be used College websites (<a href="http://www.Vilniaus">www.Vilniaus</a> technologiju ir dizaino kolegijao.lt), College Facebook page, College partners’ network (national and international)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Advisory Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nr</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Omar Osman</td>
<td>Universiti Sains Malaysia, ASIA PACIFIC Community Engagement Network</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Michael Cuthill</td>
<td>Regional Community Development, University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sophie Duncan</td>
<td>National Co-ordinating Centre for Public Engagement</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Budd Hall/Rajesh Tandon</td>
<td>UNESCO chair in Community Based Research and Social Responsibility in Higher Education</td>
<td>Canada/India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Francesc Xavier Grau Vidal</td>
<td>Global University Network for Innovation, Universitat Rovira I Virgili</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Peter Levesque</td>
<td>Institute for Knowledge Mobilization</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Janice McMillan</td>
<td>Centre for Innovation in Learning and Teaching, University of Cape Town</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Henk Mulder</td>
<td>Science Communication expert University of Groningen, coordinator PERARES project</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Roser Pinto</td>
<td>Research center in Science and Mathematics Education, RRI Tools project</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Arjen Wals</td>
<td>UNESCO Chair Social Learning and Sustainable Development, University of Gothenburg &amp; Wageningen University</td>
<td>Sweden &amp; The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Omar Osman** (male)

   Professor Dato’ Omar Osman is currently the Vice-Chancellor, Universiti Sains Malaysia since 28 September 2011. Omar was also formerly the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Student Affairs and Development) from Mac 2007 – 27 September 2011. He also served as the Director of Corporate and Sustainable Development Division, Universiti Sains Malaysia from 2005-2007. He is also currently a Professor in Project Management and sustainability at the School of Housing Building and Planning, USM and teaches and supervises students in construction project management at the postgraduate level.

   Omar Osman began his career in USM in 1989, after graduating with Ph.D. in Project Management from Heriot-Watt University, United Kingdom. He also holds B.Sc. Degree in Quantity Surveying and M.Sc. in Construction Management. He became a Professor in October 2008. He has expertise in the fields of Education for Sustainable Development, Construction Project Management, Policy and Governance Management, Policy and Governance of Management & Development and last but not least he has expertise in Knowledge Transfer Management.

   He was previously the Chairman of Malaysian University Sports Council (MASUM) [2008 – 2009], Chairman of ASEAN University Sports Council (AUSC) [2008 – 2010], Chairman on Holistic Student Development-Critical Agenda Project PSPTN of the Ministry of Higher Education, Chairman of the IMT-GT Student Carnival (2009-2011) and Deputy Chairman of the Deputy Vice Chancellors’ Student Affairs Secretariat of the Malaysian Public Universities (2010-2011). Currently, he is a member of Malaysian Examination Council (2011 onwards), 665759 EnRRICH – part B
Chairman of MOE (formerly MOHE) on Knowledge Transfer Program (KTP) supported by EPU (2011 onwards), Chairman of ASIA PACIFIC Community Engagement Network (2011 onwards), Chairman of Global Higher Education Network (2011 onwards), Board of Directors Centre for Research in Engineering Science and Technology Bhd (2012 onwards), Board of Directors Usains Holding Sdn. Bhd (2013 onwards), Board of Trustees of Yayasan USM (2013 onwards), Founding Board of Trustees for Steinbeis Malaysia Foundation (2013 onwards), Committee Member for Big Idea Governance and New University Structure (2015–2025), Committee Member of Federal Consultative Council for Penang, Implementation and Coordination Unit (Penang), Prime Minister Department (2008 onwards), Chairman of South East Asia Sustainability Networks (2013 onwards), and Chairman of Regional Sejahtera & Education Network (2014 onwards).

2. Michael Cuthill (male)

Professor Michael Cuthill was recruited to the University of Southern Queensland in 2012 with the task of consolidating institutional research strength in the broad area of regional community systems research, a designated key research area for the university. He was selected for this position based on his impressive achievements during his seven years as Director of the Community Engagement Research Centre at the University of Queensland, and his six years at the Gold Coast City Council, where he managed the Social Policy and Research Section at one of Australia’s largest local governments.

Prof Cuthill has maintained a clear vision as to the role of community based research in supporting development of evidenced based policy, informed planning processes and ‘best practice’ operational initiatives. He has clearly articulated in his extensive list of publications, and international keynote presentations, his vision for engaged research that brings together public, private and community sector stakeholders in collaborative knowledge exchange processes.

In addition to academic appointments, he has also held various senior leadership positions in professional and non-government organisations including as Vice President of the Queensland Council of Social Services, member of the Australasian Board of the International Association for Public Participation, and Vice President of the Asia Pacific University Community Engagement Network.

3. Sophie Duncan (female)

As deputy director, Sophie manages the overall work of the National Coordinating Centre for Public Engagement (NCCPE) including communications, partnerships and NCCPE projects. A physicist by training, Sophie started her career at the Science Museum in London where her work included exhibition development and public programmes. She became a programme manager with Science Year, before joining the BBC, where she managed the creation and delivery of national learning campaigns. Highlights included People’s War and Breathing Places, a campaign which led to the creation of over 1000 new community wildlife spaces. When not at work you may find her enjoying her own wildlife garden, or battling with her vegetable patch.

4. Budd Hall (male) and Rajesh Tandon (male)

Budd Hall is a Professor of Community Development in the School of Public Administration, the founding Director of the Office of Community Based Research and the former Dean of Education at the University of Victoria. He has been honoured by a Community Leadership Award from Victoria, with the International
Innovation Award from the Canadian Bureau of International Education, and is a member of the International Adult Education Hall of Fame. He was recently granted an Honorary Doctorate from St. Francis Xavier University. He has been working on issues of knowledge and democracy since 1970 and has served as the Director of Research to the National Institute of Adult Education in Tanzania, the Secretary-General of the International Council for Adult Education and the Chair of Adult Education and Community Development at the University of Toronto. He has been working with Rajesh Tandon since 1978 when they collaborated in the creation of the International Participatory Research Network. Budd Hall is a highly sought after speaker and one of the best known global scholars in areas of adult education, community-based research and community-university engagement with over 40 years of publications. His most recent book is Learning and Education for a Better World: The Role of Social Movements. He is married to UVic Professor Dr. Darlene Clover. He is also a poet.

Rajesh Tandon is the founder and President of the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA), based in New Delhi, India. Over the past 35 years, Dr. Tandon has contributed to the promotion of participatory research as a methodology of learning, knowledge and social transformation, and built a vast network of practitioners and academics who are actively engaged in such community-based research approaches. He is an internationally recognised leader who has tirelessly championed the cause of citizen participation, especially socially excluded and economically marginalised citizens around the world. He has served on the governing boards of many international NGOs and academic think tanks, and on a number of advisory committees of the World Bank, the United Nations Development Programme and the Government of India. Recently, he served on the Committee to Strengthen Community Engagement by Institutions of Higher Education, set-up by the Planning Commission of India. He serves as a Guest Editor of the forthcoming Global University Network for Information (GUNI) Report on ‘Knowledge, Engagement and Higher Education: Rethinking Social Responsibility.’ Dr. Tandon has written extensively on participatory research, citizen participation, civil society, democratic governance and social responsibility of higher education. His pioneering contributions have been recognised by the Government of India, University of Victoria, UNESCO and many others.

5. Francesc Xavier Grau Vidal (male)

Francesc Xavier Grau Vidal is professor of Fluid Mechanics at the Department of Mechanical Engineering of Universitat Rovira i Virgili (Tarragona, Spain). He holds a Ph.D. (1986) and a Licence Degree (1981) in Industrial Chemistry, both from the University of Barcelona.

His research interests focus on the physics, modeling and control of heat, mass and momentum transfer in industrial flows and in the environment. He is the author of more than 100 research papers and the supervisor of 11 Ph.D. theses. He has been a researcher at the Institute of Fluid Mechanics of the INP-Toulouse (France), at the NASA-Ames Center for Turbulence Research (USA), and at the Department of Mechanical Engineering of Stanford University (USA).

He has taken an active part in setting up programs educating and informing the general public on scientific issues, and has been involved in University-Society and Industry-Society relations, including coordinating the Dow-Tarragona Community Advisory Panel. Between 1993 and 2000, he was director of the Department of Mechanical Engineering of URV, and from 2000 to 2006 served successively as vice-rector for Infrastructure and ICT, vice-rector for Academic Affairs and Personnel, and vice-rector for Scientific Policy. He has been the rector of University Rovira i Virgili from June 2006 until June 2014; within this period he acted as President of the Association of Catalan Public Universities (October 2011-January 2013) and has been member of the Board (2010-2014) and First Vice President (2013-2014) of the Spanish Rector’s Conference (CRUE).
6. **Peter Levesque (male)**

_Peter Levesque_ is the President of the Institute for Knowledge Mobilization.

Based in Ottawa, Canada, Peter has 20 years of experience working with governments, research institutes, and professional associations on issues of knowledge mobilization, including exchange, management, social media, transfer and translation.

His career has included serving as Deputy-Director of Knowledge Products and Mobilization at the _Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada_, as Knowledge Exchange Specialist at the Centre of Excellence for Child and Youth Mental Health at the _Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario_, and as Chair of KMb at _Ontario Neurotrauma Foundation_. His early career included success as an entrepreneur and community developer. Peter is an experienced speaker, facilitator, and writer on knowledge mobilization, education, innovation, community and other complex social issues.

He holds a diploma in Pure and Applied Sciences from _Heritage College_, an Honours BSoSc in Sociology with studies in Biochemistry, a MA in Sociology, and PhD studies in Population Health from the _University of Ottawa_. It has been his pleasure to have received professional development certificates from: the Centre for Evidence-based Medicine at _theUniversity of Oxford_; the _University of Seville_; the _Canada School of the Public Service_; and other colleges and institutes in Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

Peter is a member of the Board for _Curriculum Services Canada_, _MyClassNeeds Foundation_, the SERENE-RISC Network Centre of Excellence, and the Intelligent Compassion Society. He is an advisor to the _Canadian Network for the Prevention of Elder Abuse_. He is a Fellow at the _British Columbia Law Institute_ at the University of British Columbia. He is an Associate Practitioner of Social Innovation at SIG at the _University of Waterloo_. He is a scholar at the Moniesen Centre at the Business School at _Queen's University_ at Kingston. Peter lectures at the _Centre for Continuing Education at the University of Ottawa._

Other affiliations include the management committee of the _Ontario Knowledge Transfer and Exchange Community of Practice_, an advisor to: _DIALOG_ network at the INRS in Montreal, _Conversation Works_, and reviewer for the journalCES4Health.

7. **Janice McMillan (female)**

Janice McMillan joined University of Cape Town (UCT) in 1994, first in the Department of Adult Education, and since 2000, in the Centre for Innovation in Teaching and Learning. Janice’s teaching, research and development interests centre on adult learning; higher education and social responsiveness - with particular emphasis on service learning, critical citizenship and university-community partnerships more broadly. Her theoretical interests focus on forms of pedagogy and knowledge at the interface of the university and ‘the communities out there’; qualitative research; reflective practice and the role of education in social change and development. From 2009-2014 Janice was the service learning coordinator at Stanford University's Cape Town Overseas Programme.

Since 2010, she has been convenor of the UCT global citizenship: leading for social justice programme. This is an extra curricula, cross disciplinary programme focusing on getting students to think about global debates e.g. War and peace, climate change, development and poverty; Africa in a global world, and to look critically at the politics and ethics of volunteer community service. Funded by the VC’s strategic fund in 2010 and 2011,
this programme is aimed at contributing to debates about 'graduateness' at UCT and the role of values such as social justice in higher education teaching and learning. This has led to a cross-disciplinary credit-bearing course Janice convenes in the engineering faculty called 'social infrastructures: engaging with community for change.

From 2010-2013 she was the principle investigator on the national research fund funded research project aimed at analysing and understanding university-community partnerships through the UCT Knowledge Coop. Her current projects and areas of interest include working with academic departments on service learning research and practice; developing a better understanding of social responsiveness in higher education; and forms of citizenship education, social justice and service learning higher education.

8. Henk Mulder (male)

Dr Mulder is a chemist and environmental scientist. He teaches Science Communication and co-ordinates the Science Shop, a University research-brokering service to civil society organisations and non-profits. For those, students perform research under staff supervision, without additional costs since the work is part of the degree program. Dr. Mulder leads the EU-FP7-project PERARES which advances civil society participation in research agenda setting. He is a partner in Engage2020, which collects and disseminates examples of public engagement in responsible research and innovation.

9. Roser Pintó (female)

Roser Pintó, Dr., (female). Doctor in Physics and expert researcher in Science Education, she is Tenured University Professor, the Director of CRECIM (Research center in Science and Mathematics Education) and the international and national coordinator of several EU projects, such as ECB-Ingenious or EDISTE at present. It is also the director of the Thematic Network of Research in STEM Education of Catalonia (REMIC), which includes more than 15 research groups from the 7 Catalan universities. Internationally, Dr. Pintó is well-known for her publications, talks and her role in Science Education institutions and networks, having been member of the board of the prestigious association in the Science Education field ESERA (European Science Education Research Association). She has also organized the GIREP 2000 and the ESERA 2005 International Conferences in the field, is reviewer of the IJSE and TATE journals (among other well-known publications) and has been expert evaluator of the EU in previous calls. Apart from her demonstrated management abilities in the research area and in teacher education field, she has long experience in the promotion and innovation of Computer-based learning in STEM, especially in the field in the use of ICT for conceptual understanding and knowledge construction. She has led different initiatives around the teaching and learning of energy and optics. Roser Pintó is an advisory board member of the RRI Tools project.

10. Arjen Wals (male)

Arjen Wals is a Professor of Social Learning and Sustainable Development. He also is a UNESCO Chair in the same field. He is also has an Adjunct position at the Department of Natural Resources of Cornell University (2011-2016). Since January 1st 2013 he has been appointed as the Director of Wageningen University’s Center for Sustainable Development and Food Security (www.wageningenur.nl/csdfs). His research focuses on learning processes that contribute to a more sustainable world. Wals obtained his PhD in 1991 with a Fulbright fellowship at the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor. His dissertation tackled the interface of environmental
psychology and environmental education. His recent work focuses on transformative social learning in vital coalitions of multiple stakeholders at the interface of science and society.

A central question in his work is how to create conditions that support new forms of learning that take full advantage of the diversity, creativity and resourcefulness that is all around us, but so far remains largely untapped in our search for a world that is more sustainable than the one currently in prospect.

Wals has written over 200 articles and chapters in books and has given keynotes on topics like community problem-solving, biodiversity education, sustainability in higher education, transdisciplinary research and social learning and system transformation. Popular books include: 'Higher Education and the Challenge of Sustainability (2004), Social Learning towards a Sustainable World (2007) and Learning for Sustainability in Times of Accelerating Change (2012). He is the co-editor of the AERA/Routledge International Handbook of Research on Environmental Education. He recently co-authored an article in Science about the need for linking environmental education and science education using citizen science as a bridge between them.

Wals is a co-founder of Caretakers of the Environment/International and a recipient of the environmental education research award of the North American Association for Environmental Education, and former president of the Special Interest Group on Environmental & Ecological Education of the AERA. He maintains a blog at http://www.transformativelearning.nl/.
4.2 Third parties involved in the project (including use of third party resources)

Subcontracting tasks:

In favour of an independent and objective project evaluation, a provision of € **18,000** is allocated to the project coordinator (VUB) for subcontracting an external evaluator. As the evaluation task is a specific task part of the action and in order to ensure objectivity, an external independent evaluator will be subcontracted by the project coordinator for this evaluation. VUB will have a contractual link with the subcontracting evaluator, acting as an economic operator selling their evaluation work, having as their object the evaluation. WP leader (UNISS) will support this and ensure contacts and coordination with other WP leaders, advisory board. The eligible cost is the price charged to VUB by the external evaluator (usually containing a profit margin for the subcontractor but not for VUB). VUB will award the subcontract on the basis of best value-for-money (or lowest price) and absence of conflict of interests.

In the frame of the conference organization, taken into account the dissemination purpose of the EnRRICH project, another € **4,000** is allocated to the conference host (DIT) to subcontract photographing/filming etc. during the conference, as a part of our documentation activities.
5. Ethics and security

5.1 Ethics

As EnRRICH is a Coordination and Support Action (CSA), EnRRICH ‘research’ consists of surveys and community based research done by the involved science shops or other community based research mechanisms. Science Shop projects involve responding to the expressed research needs to CSOs and other partners to develop small scale projects suitable for students to carry out as part of their curriculum. As such ethical guidelines are already in place in both the higher education institutions where the students carry out their studies and in the CSO partner organisations who host and request the studies. Science Shop partners in the project have longstanding experience of managing the ethical requirements of these small scale projects and discussion of ethics will be built into both the trialling and mentoring and the policy level discussions within the project. The project coordinator and deputy coordinator and the relevant work package leaders will undertake to ensure that all consortium members understand and comply with these requirements throughout the project.

In the main these studies will not involve dealing with vulnerable populations or sensitive research issues. For the very small number of projects which might involve dealing with such populations (we estimate less than 10%) this part of the data will be managed in line with the guidelines identified below. Attention will be drawn to ethical procedures and guidelines within mentoring and training in WP4 and within the trialling work of WP3 and ethical issues will be shared and considered amongst consortium members. Fundamental to the Science Shop concept is the sharing of learning both with CSO partners and across the partner institutions. Sharing knowledge is considered as core to this project but this sharing always takes into account ethical considerations.

1) HUMANS: Details on the procedures and criteria that will be used to identify/recruit research participants must be provided.

To test new science shops way of work (WP4), research participants will be attracted in the involved new or already existing community based research mechanisms. Students will cooperate with supervisors and external organisations, e.g. community partners, in small collaborative research projects. Research participants will be identified and recruited in cooperation with the involved local community or other partners that have delivered the research topic, following the ethical principles and legislation of the involved partner institutions.

The following methods of recruiting subjects are generally acceptable:

- Advertisements, flyers, information sheets, notices, internet postings and/or media are used to recruit subjects. Prospective participants who respond to these will contact the (student) researchers.
- Direct recruitment of potential study participants. Considerable care will be taken so that the person contacted does not feel pressured to participate.
- Recruitment letters.
- Random or other probability sampling. This includes snowball sampling, random digit dialling, or other methods used primarily in the social and behavioural sciences.
- Referrals. Referrals may be from involved Civil Society Organisations, snowball sampling, participants referring other participants.
- Participant Pool. These are pools for which potential research participants have given permission for future contact.
- Review of publicly available records.
Identification, initial contact, screening and recruitment of potential human subjects form the foundation of the informed consent process. The involved student-researcher, supervisor and higher education institution share the responsibility for creating a recruitment environment that is not only effective but is also ethical and that complies with the European regulations and guidance. These responsibilities require consideration of the appropriate procedures for the initial identification, contact, screening and recruitment of potential subjects. Both the screening and the recruitment process should demonstrate and reflect respect for the dignity and autonomy of the potential participants by avoiding any potential undue influence and by protecting both the privacy of the individual and the confidentiality of any information obtained for recruitment and/or screening purposes.

The consortium partners and involved (student) researchers and their academic supervisors will consider the following ethical questions when evaluating recruitment strategies:

- it will help ensure that selection of research participants is equitable and appropriate for the study
- it respects an individual’s reasonable expectations for privacy
- the study is introduced in a way that allows subjects ample time to consider, with no undue pressure because of timing of the request, who makes the request, how the request is made, or the offering of excessive inducements
- all information will be accurate, balanced, and free of misleading emphases that make the study excessively attractive
- We will minimize and try to avoid children participation and the involvement. In case their involvement will be necessary in the frame of the project, the ethics rules are fully complied with e.g. the informed consent procedures of the involved higher education institutions.

In preparing recruitment materials the student-researcher should consider the purpose of the research, the setting in which the research will be conducted, and be particularly cognizant of the special problems of research involving vulnerable populations in the very small numbers of projects where this might apply.

Taking into account the scope and objectives of their projects, (student) researchers will be inclusive in selecting participants. They will not exclude individuals from the opportunity to participate in research on the basis of attributes such as culture, language, religion, race, disability, sexual orientation, ethnicity, linguistic proficiency, gender or age, unless there is a valid reason for the exclusion. (Student) researchers who plan to actively exclude particular groups should clarify the grounds for the exclusion.

The focus, objective, nature of research and context in which the research is conducted inform the inclusion and exclusion criteria for a specific research project. Some research may be focused on a certain individual or a group of individuals who share a specific characteristic. Other examples include research that is focused on specific cultural traditions or languages, or on one age group. Such research should not be precluded so long as the selection criteria for those to be included in the research are germane to answering the research question.

Where a language barrier exists between the researcher and the prospective participant, various measures may be used to ensure effective communication in recruitment and consent discussions. Research participants will take part voluntarily, free from any coercion or undue influence, and their rights, dignity and (when possible) autonomy will be respected and appropriately protected. Research will be worthwhile and provide value that outweighs any risk or harm. Researchers will aim to maximise the benefit of the research and minimise potential risk of harm to participants and researchers. All potential risk and harm, e.g. during fieldwork, will be mitigated by robust precautions. Student researchers and participants will be given appropriate information about the purpose, methods and intended uses of the research, what their participation in the research entails and what risks and benefits, if any, are involved. Individual research participant and group preferences regarding anonymity will be respected and participant requirements concerning the confidential nature of information and personal data will be respected. Studies will be designed, reviewed and undertaken to ensure recognised standards of
integrity are met, and quality and transparency are assured. The independence of the studies will be clear, and any conflicts of interest or partiality will be explicit.

14) HUMANS: Similarly, a report (i.e. detailed information) on procedures and criteria for each and every group (vulnerable, patients, children etc.) to be provided after each partner’s science shop.

A report with detailed information on procedures and criteria for each and every group of vulnerable research participants will be provided by each partner by month 27.

2) HUMANS: Detailed information must be provided on the informed consent procedures that will be implemented.

Informed consents will be considered in all research taking place or carried out in the EnRRICH frame. All EnRRICH research will comply with ethical principles and applicable international, EU and national law. Where applicable and required by national legislation, potential participants will be provided with an informed consent (IC) form and detailed information sheets on the particular science shop or other research case they are involved in. They need to know enough about it to be able to decide whether to participate (or for their parent/guardian/consultee to agree). We will ensure that potential participants have fully understood the information and do not feel pressured or forced to give consent.

The EnRRICH IC and information forms will

- Be in a language and in terms fully understandable to the research participants
- Describe the aims, methods and implications of the research, the nature of the participation and any benefits, risks or discomfort that might be involved
- Explicitly state that participation is voluntary and that anyone has the right to refuse to participate and to withdraw their participation, samples or data at any time — without any consequences
- Indicate how data will be collected, protected during the project and either destroyed or reused subsequently
- Indicate what procedures will be implemented in the event of unexpected or incidental findings (in particular, if the participants have the right to know, or not to know, of any such findings).

Consent will normally be given in writing. If the consent cannot be given in writing, for example because of illiteracy, the non-written consent must be formally documented and independently witnessed.

Special care will be taken in the small number of cases where research participants are particularly vulnerable by virtue of factors such as age, disability, their physical or mental health. (Student) researchers will take into account the legal and ethical complexities involved in those circumstances where there are particular difficulties in eliciting fully informed consent. In case research involving persons unable to give consent, e.g. certain elderly populations, persons judged as lacking mental capacity — we will obtain informed consent from the legally authorised representative and ensure that they have sufficient information to enable them to provide this on behalf and in the best interests of the participants. Whenever possible, the assent of the participants will be obtained in addition to the consent of the parents or legal representatives. Dissent will be respected. Research involving persons unable to give consent will be carried out only if:

- studies with consenting adults would not be effective
- there is only a minimal risk and burden to the participants and
If research cases involve persons unable to make decisions for themselves, we will maintain an active relationship with their legal guardians and/or carers. We will not only seek their consent, but also allow them to monitor the research. It should be noted that all science shop projects are carried out in direct response to research needs expressed by CSOs and other partners whose primary concern is the wellbeing of their members.

EnRRICH TEMPLATE CONSENT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher’s Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(use block capitals)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/School/Department:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be completed by the:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject/patient/volunteer/informant/interviewee/parent/guardian <em>(delete as necessary)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Have you been fully informed/read the information sheet about this study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Have you received enough information about this study and any associated health and safety implications if applicable?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at any time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• without giving a reason for withdrawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• without affecting your future relationship with the Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7 Have you been informed that this consent form shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed_______________________________ Date ____________________

Name in Block Letters _____________________________________________________________

Signature of Researcher __________________________________ Date ___________________
EnRRICH INFORMATION FORM

At the start of each research case, in collaboration with CSO partners and academic supervisors, information forms will be drawn up and delivered to the participants where appropriate, containing:

| **Research title**: Official title in the participant’s mother tongue and easy understandable |
| **Research applicant**: Name and address of the organisation, SME, institution... |
| **Research institution**: Name and address |
| **If necessary - Ethical committee**: Identification of the ethical committee that has advised the study and the local ethical committee that has participated in the approval process. |
| **Local (student)researcher(s)**: Name, institution, contact details |

Necessary information for the decision to participate, which might include:

- agreed ethical principles, such as those listed on the previous page
- protocol for communications, including preferred ways of communicating (e-mail, skype, face-to-face meetings), expected frequency of communications and meetings, how to ensure that a few participants do not dominate and that people speak in plain language
- protocol for safety, including procedures for researchers working on their own
- protocol for handling difficulties and conflict, including ways to sort things out if people disagree, fall out and things go wrong
- agreed aims and objectives of the research
- methods to be used, including how these will reflect a commitment to participation
- any training required for the research partners
- when and where meetings will be held
- processes for reflection, evaluation and learning from each other and from the research throughout the process

15) **HUMANS**: Similarly, a report (i.e. detailed information) on informed consent procedures for each and every group (vulnerable, patients, children etc) after each partner’s science shop should be submitted to the REA.

A report with detailed information on informed consent procedures for each and every group of vulnerable research participants will be submitted on behalf of each partner’s science shop to the REA by month 27.

3) **HUMANS**: The applicant must clarify how and in what respect and at what point children will be included in the research. Justification for their participation must be provided.

We will minimize and try to avoid children participation. In case their involvement will be necessary in the frame of the project, the ethics rules fully comply with the informed consent procedures of the involved higher education institutions.

All research involving children under 18 years of age shall only be conducted in response to a request from a CSO and therefore when their participation is indispensable, the methodology is appropriate, and the circumstances in
which the research is conducted provides for their physical, emotional and psychological safety. The researchers will:

- explain the purpose of the interview to the children in a way in which they can understand
- use language which takes account of the children's verbal abilities.
- choose a physical setting for the interview with which the children are familiar and in which they feel comfortable.
- be sensitive in responding to the children's verbal and non-verbal communications.
- give more/less time to the interview as the children dictate.

4) HUMANS: The applicant must clarify how consent/assent will be ensured for children.

We will obtain the informed written consent from the parent or legal guardian. The assent of the child/young person will be obtained to the degree possible dependent on the age of the child/young person. Similar guidelines are required when conducting research with other 'less powerful' individuals, eg the elderly, people in care, in hospital or in prison – re beneath.

5) HUMANS: The applicant must clarify how, in what respect and at what point during the implementation of the project vulnerable individuals/groups will be involved. The applicant must clarify the context of these individuals/groups’ vulnerability. Details must be provided about the measures taken to prevent the risk of enhancing vulnerability/stigmatisation of individuals/groups.

In the frame of science shop research cases, consortium partners will involve a range of, mainly underserved, organisations. Their target groups may in a very small number of cases include vulnerable individuals/groups. As specific collaborative research projects between those organisations, their target groups and (student) researchers are developed during the course of EnRRICH, they will each follow the guidelines for ethical approval of the involved institutions and CSO partners. In case vulnerable groups or individuals will be involved in science shop cases, each involved science shop and consortium member will, in collaboration with CSO and academic partners, clarify the context of their vulnerability and will provide details to REA on a monthly basis, starting from month 9, about the measures taken to prevent the risk of enhancing vulnerability/stigmatization of individuals/groups. These issues will be managed and discussed by work package leaders and the management support group to ensure that all necessary protocols and ethical requirements of the grant agreement are followed.

(Student) researchers will take into account the legal and ethical complexities involved in those circumstances where there are particular difficulties in eliciting fully informed consent. In case research involving persons unable to give consent, e.g. certain elderly populations, persons judged as lacking mental capacity — we will obtain informed consent from the legally authorised representative and ensure that they have sufficient information to enable them to provide this on behalf and in the best interests of the participants. Whenever possible, the assent of the participants will be obtained in addition to the consent of the parents or legal representatives. Dissent will be respected.

Any risk of enhancing vulnerability/stigmatisation will be prevented, e.g. by (student) researchers
- being reflective about their research actions and research decisions;
- being aware of power relationships in research;
- seeking to minimise the potential risks to prospective participants in their research designs and, where appropriate, offering prospective participants greater choice and options;
- being aware of the risk to researchers themselves, as well as to participants, and minimising the potential risks in their research design;
• showing respect for the potential diversity of prospective participants for diversity in their research designs;
• paying attention to communications within the research process (e.g. considering language and understanding; getting the right balance around the provision of information; issues of translation and meaning);
• considering consent as an ongoing issue, cognisant of the fact that this can also add burden to the research participants

6) HUMANS: During the course of the project University students can be involved as study participants. Applicants should explain how in the case of University students genuine informed consent will be guaranteed against any undue incentive.

During the course of the project, in some science shop research cases students may be involved as study participants. At the start of each research project which is designed between the community partner and the students/researchers, informed consent – see above- is required. There will be no favourable treatment of those students being involved in the project, e.g. no additional credits will be given to students that are involved as research participants. During their involvement, students will be equally treated and fully secured – in compliance with the science shop approach and the hosting institutions guidelines.

7) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: Copies of authorization, opinion or notification (which ever applies according to the Directive and the national law) by the competent Institutional Data Protection Officer / National Data Protection authority must be submitted to the REA.

All participants will provide copies of authorization, opinion or notification (which ever applies according to the Directive and the national law) by the competent Institutional Data Protection Officer / National Data Protection authority. Compliance date: monthly, starting from month 9.

8) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: Justification must be given in case of collection and/or processing of personal sensitive data.

During the EnRRICH project, in the context of science shop (student) research in collaboration with e.g. community organisations, personal sensitive data may be collected and/or processed. If it is required in those cases, a specific authorisation by the national data protection authority will be provided. In that case, the involved partners will provide a justification why personal sensitive data is collected and/or processed. REA will be informed accordingly, compliance date: month 27.

9) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: Detailed information must be provided on the procedures that will be implemented for data collection, storage, protection, retention and destruction and confirmation that they comply with national and EU legislation.

Most of the data collected within the EnRRICH frame will not be sensitive in nature. However where sensitive data is generated it will be stored within a secure environment. If stored electronically it will be a machine or set of machines located in a physically secured environment – with controlled access – as well as technically secured: proper temperature control etc. Security processes will be adapted to the nature of the project to ensure and guarantee confidentiality of data. Access to the data will be strictly controlled to ensure that no third party can access or copy it. Duration of storage will be considered in line with the nature of the project and data will be kept
for no longer than necessary but for a maximum of 3 years after the end of the project. Data will be deleted irreversibly in line with this.

All beneficiaries have an individual responsibility to ensure that they adhere to their institution’s Data Protection Policy, their national and the EU legislation.

10) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: Detailed information must be provided on the informed consent procedures that will be implemented.

Informed consents will be considered in all research taking place or carried out in the EnRRICH frame. All EnRRICH research will comply with ethical principles and applicable international, EU and national law. Where applicable and required by national legislation, potential participants will be provided with an informed consent (IC) form and detailed information sheets on the particular science shop or other research case they are involved in. They need to know enough about it to be able to decide whether to participate (or for their parent/guardian/consultee to agree). We will ensure that potential participants have fully understood the information and do not feel pressured or forced to give consent.

The EnRRICH IC and information forms will

- Be in a language and in terms fully understandable to the research participants
- Describe the aims, methods and implications of the research, the nature of the participation and any benefits, risks or discomfort that might be involved
- Explicitly state that participation is voluntary and that anyone has the right to refuse to participate and to withdraw their participation, samples or data at any time — without any consequences
- Indicate how data will be collected, protected during the project and either destroyed or reused subsequently
- Indicate what procedures will be implemented in the event of unexpected or incidental findings (in particular, if the participants have the right to know, or not to know, of any such findings).

Consent will normally be given in writing. If the consent cannot be given in writing, for example because of illiteracy, the non-written consent must be formally documented and independently witnessed.

Special care will be taken where research participants are particularly vulnerable by virtue of factors such as age, disability, their physical or mental health. (Student) researchers will take into account the legal and ethical complexities involved in those circumstances where there are particular difficulties in eliciting fully informed consent. In case research involving persons unable to give consent, e.g. certain elderly populations, persons judged as lacking mental capacity — we will obtain informed consent from the legally authorised representative and ensure that they have sufficient information to enable them to provide this on behalf and in the best interests of the participants. Whenever possible, the assent of the participants will be obtained in addition to the consent of the parents or legal representatives. Dissent will be respected. Research involving persons unable to give consent will be carried out only if:

- studies with consenting adults would not be effective
- there is only a minimal risk and burden to the participants and
- the results of the research will benefit the individual or the group represented by the participant

If research cases involve persons unable to make decisions for themselves, we will maintain an active relationship with their legal guardians and/or carers. We will not only seek their consent, but also allow them to monitor the research.
Sensitive personal data will only be processed if the data subjects have given their explicit (written) consent to this processing.

11) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: The applicant must explicitly confirm that the existing data are publicly available.

Most of the existing data used in science shop (student) research cases will be publicly available.

12) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL DATA: In case of data not publicly available, relevant authorisations must be provided.

In case the existing data used in science shop (student) research cases is not publicly available, we will provide relevant authorisations related to existing data collection.

When secondary data in our research is used, it must originate from a public source or be authorized for use in our research. In that case, we will confirm that consent for secondary use is obtained, together with details on how this consent is obtained. In the very small numbers of projects where this applies, authorisations will be sought before the start of any student project and provided to REA on a monthly basis, starting from month 9.

13) NON EU-COUNTRIES: Should research of any kind take place in a non EU country the applicants must fully explain the kind of research. In this case all of the related issues need to be clarified and appropriate documentation must be submitted to the REA.

No third countries are involved in the consortium, thus no research will take place in third countries. Third countries are represented on the project advisory board but they will not be involved in research.
5.2 Security

EnRRICH will not involve activities or results raising security issues, neither ‘EU-classified information’ as background or results.
## ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR THE ACTION (page 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of costs[^2]</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit[^4]</th>
<th>No hours</th>
<th>Total (c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(g) = (d) + (e) + (f)</th>
<th>(j) = (g) × 25%</th>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>(l)</th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Queen's University of Belfast</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UCC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UNESS</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Wuthrwnn</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. DIT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. UCAM</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Corvinus University of Budapest</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Universitat Vicenda</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Wu</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. ISECAI</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Université de Lyon</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vilniaus technologijos ir informacijos institutas</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total consortiums</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^2]: Form of costs
[^4]: Unit

---

[^1]: Estimated eligible costs (per budget category)

[^3]: EU contribution

[^4]: Maximum grant amount

[^5]: Information for indirect costs

[^6]: Information for auditors

[^7]: Declination of costs under Point D.4

[^8]: Estimated costs of beneficiaries not linked third parties not receiving EU funding

---

Additional information:

- Grant Agreement number: 665759 — EnRRICH — H2020-SEAC-2014-2015
- No hours:
  - Grant Agreement number: 665759 — EnRRICH — H2020-SEAC-2014-2015

---

General information:

- Form of costs
  - Grant Agreement number: 665759 — EnRRICH — H2020-SEAC-2014-2015
- Total consortiums
  - Grant Agreement number: 665759 — EnRRICH — H2020-SEAC-2014-2015
(1) See Article 6 for the eligibility conditions

(2) The indirect costs covered by the operating grant (received under any EU or Euratom funding programme; see Article 6.5(b)) are ineligible under the GA. Therefore, a beneficiary that receives an operating grant during the action’s duration cannot declare indirect costs for the year(s)/reporting period(s) covered by the operating grant (see Article 6.3.E).

(3) This is the theoretical amount of EU contribution that the system calculates automatically (by multiplying all the budgeted costs by the reimbursement rate). This theoretical amount is capped by the ‘maximum grant amount’ (that the Commission/Agency decided to grant for the action) (see Article 5.1).

(4) The ‘maximum grant amount’ is the maximum grant amount decided by the Commission/Agency. It normally corresponds to the requested grant, but may be lower.

(5) Depending on its type, this specific cost category will or will not cover indirect costs. Specific unit costs that include indirect costs are: costs for energy efficiency measures in buildings, access costs for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure and costs for clinical studies.

(6) See Article 5 for the forms of costs

(7) Unit : hours worked on the action; costs per unit (hourly rate) : calculated according to beneficiary’s usual accounting practice

(8) See Annex 2a ‘Additional information on the estimated budget’ for the details (costs per hour (hourly rate)).

(9) Flat rate : 25% of eligible direct costs, from which are excluded: direct costs of subcontracting, costs of in-kind contributions not used on premises, direct costs of financial support, and unit costs declared under budget category F if they include indirect costs

(10) See Annex 2a ‘Additional information on the estimated budget’ for the details (units, costs per unit).

(11) See Annex 2a ‘Additional information on the estimated budget’ for the details (units, costs per unit, estimated number of units, etc)

(12) Only specific unit costs that do not include indirect costs

(13) See Article 9 for beneficiaries not receiving EU funding

(14) Only for linked third parties that receive EU funding
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST (THE QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY OF BELFAST), XN45384, established in UNIVERSITY ROAD LANYON BUILDING, BELFAST BT7 1NN, United Kingdom, GB254799511, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘2’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE CORK, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND, CORK (UCC), CHY1691, established in WESTERN ROAD, CORK, Ireland, IE0006286E, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘3’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Anita MAGUIRE with ECAS id nmaguian signed in the Participant Portal on 17/06/2015 at 09:43:34 (transaction Id SigId 2063:
GbJdJSW6tb62LgCQaFKkLscvPyVFFHNAJHjUgk1C3koxscvWMrn6RYj
kRwJvYpfA2cP1skgqnSYvX12ZkwNG4PHbUMW/SXYGndH7gkKqiyF-4
kPrhU2B5sAKMv9ibGiUTzh9C3w6s1KCy7cGvbr0). Timestamp by
third party at
Wed Jun 17 10:43:40 CEST 2015
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI SASSARI (UNISS), CF00196350904, established in PIAZZA UNIVERSITA 21, SASSARI 07100, Italy, IT00196350904, (**the beneficiary**), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (**‘4’**)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (**‘the Agreement’**)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (**‘the Agency’**), under the power delegated by the European Commission (**‘the Commission’**),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

WISSENSCHAFTSLADEN BONN EV (WilaBonn) EV, VR5026/CF20557831623, established in REUTERSTRASSE 157, BONN 53113, Germany, DE177825521, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘5’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

DUBLIN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY (DIT), established in RATHMINES ROAD 143-149, DUBLIN 6, Ireland, IE6517909Q, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary ('6')

in Grant Agreement No 665759 ('the Agreement')

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Brian NORTON with ECAS id nnoribri signed in the Participant Portal on 17/06/2015 at 12:38:23 (transaction id SgId 2243- on9kx2tx6XShdzymmPzeq96kccpQqbcZAFsfHx66ymT36+5VLg82F 16B25L4NnuAd7kwQPSaXzIgFmscZ4WYPhsWUMvsXYCwh7GvqP1yF- I0B9lqGILMwysy16Dxgy7Vmp7SxdddJm2HtmmZx0Pj). Timestamp by third party at Wed Jun 17 13:38:30 CEST 2015
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

THE CHANCELLOR, MASTERS AND SCHOLARS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE (UCAM) GB12, established in The Old Schools, Trinity Lane, CAMBRIDGE CB2 1TN, United Kingdom, GB823847609, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary ('7')

in Grant Agreement No 665759 ('the Agreement')

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (CORVINUSUNIVERSITY OF BUDAPEST), 329749, established in FOVAM TER 8, BUDAPEST 1093, Hungary, HU15329743, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary ('8')

in Grant Agreement No 665759 ('the Agreement')

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
UNIVERSITAT VECHTA (UNIVERSITAT VECHTA), established in DRIVERSTRASSE 22, VECHTA 49377, Germany, DE811339936, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned, hereby agrees to become beneficiary (‘9’) in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’) between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'), for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’. and mandates the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55. By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY (WU), 9215846, established in DROEVENDAALSESTEEG 4, WAGENINGEN 6708 PB, Netherlands, NL811383696B01, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘10’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Inge GRIMM with ECN id ngrimm in signed in the Participant Portal on
17/06/2015 at 12:34:03 (transaction id SgId 2239) 6pUQf3nM6eGwPwXbW2102N19p73RT021ph2Z11tfFzAM67WJ/6W9rHK
5Z7Qb2540559694WNo2INUQL2G7bH46M85XyCm3FZgUqg7F4-
3V2m1UXM61EICN5A25YF-wemmQgkr3RLN3802VQ(0). Timestamp by
third party at
Wed Jun 17 13:34:18 CEST 2015
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

FUNDACIO PRIVADA INSTITUT DE RECERCA DE LA SIDA-CAIXA (IRSICAIXA) ES3, 873, established in CARRETERA DE CANYET, BARCELONA 08916, Spain, ESG60813227, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary ('11')

in Grant Agreement No 665759 ('the Agreement')

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the power delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

COMUNAUTE D'UNIVERSITES ET ETABLISSEMENTS UNIVERSITE DE LYON (UNIVERSITE DE LYON), 130003767, established in 92 rue du Pasteur, Lyon 69007, France, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘12’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

VILNIAUS TECHNOLOGIJU IR DIZAINO KOLEGIJA (Vilniaus technologiju ir dizaino kolegija) LT3, 111967673, established in ANTAKALNIO G 54, VILNIUS 10303, Lithuania, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary (‘13’)

in Grant Agreement No 665759 (‘the Agreement’)

between VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the power delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education (EnRRICH) (EnRRICH)’.

and mandates

the coordinator to submit and sign in its name and on its behalf any amendments to the Agreement, in accordance with Article 55.

By signing this Accession Form, the beneficiary accepts the grant and agrees to implement the grant in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary
# MODEL ANNEX 4 FOR H2020 GENERAL MGA — MULTI

## FINANCIAL STATEMENT FOR [BENEFICIARY [name]/ LINKED THIRD PARTY [name]] FOR REPORTING PERIOD [reporting period]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of costs</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Flat-rate</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Total b</td>
<td>No hours</td>
<td>Total c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>No units</td>
<td>Total j [i2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The beneficiary/linked third party hereby confirms that:

The information provided is complete, reliable and true.

The costs declared are eligible (see Article 6).

The costs can be substantiated by adequate records and supporting documentation that will be produced upon request or in the context of checks, reviews, audits and investigations (see Articles 17, 18 and 22).

For the last reporting period: that all the receipts have been declared (see Article 5.3.3).

### Eligible costs (per budget category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Direct personnel costs</th>
<th>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</th>
<th>C. Direct costs of fn. support</th>
<th>D. Other direct costs</th>
<th>E. Indirect costs</th>
<th>[F. Costs of ...]</th>
<th>Total costs</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Reimbursement rate</th>
<th>Maximum EU contribution</th>
<th>Requested EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td>A.4 SME owners without salary</td>
<td>A.5 Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary</td>
<td>A.6 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td>0.1 Travel</td>
<td>0.2 Equipment</td>
<td>0.3 Costs of large research infrastructure</td>
<td>[F. Costs of ...]</td>
<td>Receipts of the action, to be reported in the last reporting period according to Article 5.3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Natural persons under direct contract</td>
<td>A.3 Seconded persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4 Costs of large research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.6 Personnel for providing access to research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. **Please declare all eligible costs, even if they exceed the amounts indicated in the estimated budget (see Annex 2). Only amounts that were declared in your individual financial statements can be taken into account later on, in order to replace other costs that are found to be ineligible.**

2. **The indirect costs claimed must be free of any amounts covered by an operating grant (received under any EU or Euratom funding programme; see Article 6.2.E). If you have received an operating grant during this reporting period, you cannot claim any indirect costs.**

3. **This is the theoretical amount of EU contribution that the system calculates automatically (by multiplying the reimbursement rate by the total costs declared). The amount you request (in the column ‘requested EU contribution’) may have to be less (e.g. if you and the other beneficiaries are above budget, if the 90% limit (see Article 21) is reached, etc).**

4. **See Article 5 for the form of costs**

5. **Flat rate : 25% of eligible direct costs, from which are excluded: direct costs of subcontracting, costs of in-kind contributions not used on premises, direct costs of financial support, and unit costs declared under budget category F if they include indirect costs (see Article 6.2.E)**

6. **Only specific unit costs that do not include indirect costs**
ANNEX 5

MODEL FOR THE CERTIFICATE ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

➢ For options \textit{[in italics in square brackets]}: choose the applicable option. Options not chosen should be deleted.
➢ For fields in \textit{[grey in square brackets]}: enter the appropriate data
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Terms of Reference for an Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs declared under a Grant Agreement financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

This document sets out the ‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ under which

[OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]  [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]

agrees to engage

[insert legal name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’)

to produce an independent report of factual findings (‘the Report’) concerning the Financial Statement(s)¹ drawn up by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] for the Horizon 2020 grant agreement [insert number of the grant agreement, title of the action, acronym and duration from/to] (‘the Agreement’), and

to issue a Certificate on the Financial Statements’ (‘CFS’) referred to in Article 20.4 of the Agreement based on the compulsory reporting template stipulated by the Commission.

The Agreement has been concluded under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme (H2020) between the Beneficiary and [OPTION 1: the European Union, represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)] [OPTION 2: the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom,) represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)] [OPTION 3: the [Research Executive Agency (REA)] [European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA)] [Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA)] [Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)] (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’).]

¹ By which costs under the Agreement are declared (see template ‘Model Financial Statements’ in Annex 4 to the Grant Agreement).
1.1 Subject of the engagement

The coordinator must submit to the [Commission] [Agency] the final report within 60 days following the end of the last reporting period which should include, amongst other documents, a CFS for each beneficiary and for each linked third party that requests a total contribution of EUR 325 000 or more, as reimbursement of actual costs and unit costs calculated on the basis of its usual cost accounting practices (see Article 20.4 of the Agreement). The CFS must cover all reporting periods of the beneficiary or linked third party indicated above.

The Beneficiary must submit to the coordinator the CFS for itself and for its linked third party(ies), if the CFS must be included in the final report according to Article 20.4 of the Agreement.

The CFS is composed of two separate documents:

- The Terms of Reference (‘the ToR’) to be signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor;
- The Auditor’s Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’) to be issued on the Auditor’s letterhead, dated, stamped and signed by the Auditor (or the competent public officer) which includes the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) to be performed by the Auditor, and the standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) to be confirmed by the Auditor.

If the CFS must be included in the final report according to Article 20.4 of the Agreement, the request for payment of the balance relating to the Agreement cannot be made without the CFS. However, the payment for reimbursement of costs covered by the CFS does not preclude the [Commission,] [Agency,] the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Court of Auditors from carrying out checks, reviews, audits and investigations in accordance with Article 22 of the Agreement.

1.2 Responsibilities

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]:
must draw up the Financial Statement(s) for the action financed by the Agreement in compliance with the obligations under the Agreement. The Financial Statement(s) must be drawn up according to the [Beneficiary's] [Linked Third Party's] accounting and book-keeping system and the underlying accounts and records;

- must send the Financial Statement(s) to the Auditor;
- is responsible and liable for the accuracy of the Financial Statement(s);
- is responsible for the completeness and accuracy of the information provided to enable the Auditor to carry out the Procedures. It must provide the Auditor with a written representation letter supporting these statements. The written representation letter must state the period covered by the statements and must be dated;
- accepts that the Auditor cannot carry out the Procedures unless it is given full access to the [Beneficiary's] [Linked Third Party's] staff and accounting as well as any other relevant records and documentation.

The Auditor:

- [Option 2 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party has an independent Public Officer: is a competent and independent Public Officer for which the relevant national authorities have established the legal capacity to audit the Beneficiary].
- [Option 3 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party is an international organisation: is an [internal] [external] auditor in accordance with the internal financial regulations and procedures of the international organisation].

The Auditor:

- must be independent from the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party], in particular, it must not have been involved in preparing the [Beneficiary's] [Linked Third Party's] Financial Statement(s);
- must plan work so that the Procedures may be carried out and the Findings may be assessed;
- must adhere to the Procedures laid down and the compulsory report format;
- must carry out the engagement in accordance with this ToR;
- must document matters which are important to support the Report;
- must base its Report on the evidence gathered;
- must submit the Report to the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

The Commission sets out the Procedures to be carried out by the Auditor. The Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence. As this engagement is not an assurance engagement, the Auditor does not provide an audit opinion or a statement of assurance.

1.3 Applicable Standards
The Auditor must comply with these Terms of Reference and with 2:

- the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB);
- the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA). Although ISRS 4400 states that independence is not a requirement for engagements to carry out agreed-upon procedures, the [Commission][Agency] requires that the Auditor also complies with the Code’s independence requirements.

The Auditor’s Report must state that there is no conflict of interests in establishing this Report between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party], and must specify - if the service is invoiced - the total fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report.

1.4 Reporting

The Report must be written in the language of the Agreement (see Article 20.7).

Under Article 22 of the Agreement, the [Commission] [Agency], the European Anti-Fraud Office and the Court of Auditors have the right to audit any work that is carried out under the action and for which costs are declared from [the European Union] [Euratom] budget. This includes work related to this engagement. The Auditor must provide access to all working papers (e.g. recalculation of hourly rates, verification of the time declared for the action) related to this assignment if the [Commission] [Agency], the European Anti-Fraud Office or the European Court of Auditors requests them.

1.5 Timing

The Report must be provided by [dd Month yyyy].

2 Supreme Audit Institutions applying INTOSAI-standards may carry out the Procedures according to the corresponding International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions and code of ethics issued by INTOSAI instead of the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 and the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IAASB and the IESBA.
1.6 Other terms

[The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor can use this section to agree other specific terms, such as the Auditor’s fees, liability, applicable law, etc. Those specific terms must not contradict the terms specified above.]

[legal name of the Auditor] [legal name of the [Beneficiary][Linked Third Party]]

[name & function of authorised representative] [name & function of authorised representative]

[dd Month yyyy] [dd Month yyyy]

Signature of the Auditor Signature of the [Beneficiary][Linked Third Party]
Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs declared under Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

(To be printed on the Auditor’s letterhead)

To

[ name of contact person(s)], [Position]

[Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] name

Address

[ dd Month yyyy]

Dear [Name of contact person(s)],

As agreed under the terms of reference dated [dd Month yyyy]

with [OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)] [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)],

we

[name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’),

established at

[full address/city/state/province/country],

represented by

[name and function of an authorised representative],
have carried out the procedures agreed with you regarding the costs declared in the Financial Statement(s)\(^3\) of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] concerning the grant agreement

([insert grant agreement reference: number, title of the action and acronym], ‘the Agreement’),

with a total cost declared of

[total amount] EUR,

and a total of actual costs and ‘direct personnel costs declared as unit costs calculated in accordance with the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual cost accounting practices’ declared of

[sum of total actual costs and total direct personnel costs declared as unit costs calculated in accordance with the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual cost accounting practices] EUR

and hereby provide our Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’) using the compulsory report format agreed with you.

The Report

Our engagement was carried out in accordance with the terms of reference (‘the ToR’) appended to this Report. The Report includes the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) carried out and the standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) examined.

The Procedures were carried out solely to assist the [Commission] [Agency] in evaluating whether the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] costs in the accompanying Financial Statement(s) were declared in accordance with the Agreement. The [Commission] [Agency] draws its own conclusions from the Report and any additional information it may require.

---

\(^3\) By which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement (see template ‘Model Financial Statement’ in Annex 4 to the Agreement).
The scope of the Procedures was defined by the Commission. Therefore, the Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence. Since the Procedures carried out constitute neither an audit nor a review made in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, the Auditor does not give a statement of assurance on the Financial Statements.

Had the Auditor carried out additional procedures or an audit of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statements in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, other matters might have come to its attention and would have been included in the Report.

**Not applicable Findings**

We examined the Financial Statement(s) stated above and considered the following Findings not applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation (to be removed from the Report):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a Finding was not applicable, it must be marked as ‘N.A.’ ('Not applicable') in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table and means that the Finding did not have to be corroborated by the Auditor and the related Procedure(s) did not have to be carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reasons of the non-application of a certain Finding must be obvious i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) if no cost was declared under a certain category then the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) are not applicable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) if the condition set to apply certain Procedure(s) are not met the related Finding(s) and those Procedure(s) are not applicable. For instance, if ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euro’ the Procedure and Finding related to ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in euro’ are not applicable. Similarly, if no additional remuneration is paid, the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) for additional remuneration are not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List here all Findings considered not applicable for the present engagement and explain the reasons of the non-applicability.

....

**Exceptions**

Apart from the exceptions listed below, the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] provided the Auditor all the documentation and accounting information needed by the Auditor to carry out the requested Procedures and evaluate the Findings.
Explanation (to be removed from the Report):

- If the Auditor was not able to successfully complete a procedure requested, it must be marked as ‘E’ ('Exception') in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table. The reason such as the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability of data that prevents the Auditor from carrying out the Procedure must be indicated below.
- If the Auditor cannot corroborate a standard finding after having carried out the corresponding procedure, it must also be marked as ‘E’ ('Exception') and, where possible, the reasons why the Finding was not fulfilled and its possible impact must be explained here below.

List here any exceptions and add any information on the cause and possible consequences of each exception, if known. If the exception is quantifiable, include the corresponding amount.

Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. The Beneficiary was unable to substantiate the Finding number 1 on ... because ....
2. Finding number 30 was not fulfilled because the methodology used by the Beneficiary to calculate unit costs was different from the one approved by the Commission. The differences were as follows: ...
3. After carrying out the agreed procedures to confirm the Finding number 31, the Auditor found a difference of _____________ EUR. The difference can be explained by ...

Further Remarks

In addition to reporting on the results of the specific procedures carried out, the Auditor would like to make the following general remarks:

Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. Regarding Finding number 8 the conditions for additional remuneration were considered as fulfilled because ...
2. In order to be able to confirm the Finding number 15 we carried out the following additional procedures: ....

Use of this Report

This Report may be used only for the purpose described in the above objective. It was prepared solely for the confidential use of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the [Commission] [Agency], and only to be submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] in connection with the requirements set out in Article 20.4 of the Agreement. The Report may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the [Commission] [Agency] for any other purpose, nor may it
be distributed to any other parties. The [Commission] [Agency] may only disclose the Report to authorised parties, in particular to the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.

This Report relates only to the Financial Statement(s) submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] for the Agreement. Therefore, it does not extend to any other of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statement(s).

There was no conflict of interest⁴ between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and Linked Third Party] in establishing this Report. The total fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report was EUR _______ (including EUR_______ of deductible VAT).

We look forward to discussing our Report with you and would be pleased to provide any further information or assistance.

[legal name of the Auditor]

[name and function of an authorised representative]

[dd Month yyyy]

Signature of the Auditor

---

⁴ A conflict of interest arises when the Auditor’s objectivity to establish the certificate is compromised in fact or in appearance when the Auditor for instance:
- was involved in the preparation of the Financial Statements;
- stands to benefit directly should the certificate be accepted;
- has a close relationship with any person representing the beneficiary;
- is a director, trustee or partner of the beneficiary; or
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her independence or ability to establish the certificate impartially.
Agreed-upon procedures to be performed and standard factual findings to be confirmed by the Auditor

The European Commission reserves the right to i) provide the auditor with additional guidance regarding the procedures to be followed or the facts to be ascertained and the way in which to present them (this may include sample coverage and findings) or to ii) change the procedures, by notifying the Beneficiary in writing. The procedures carried out by the auditor to confirm the standard factual finding are listed in the table below.

If this certificate relates to a Linked Third Party, any reference here below to ‘the Beneficiary’ is to be considered as a reference to ‘the Linked Third Party’.

The ‘result’ column has three different options: ‘C’, ‘E’ and ‘N.A.’:

- ‘C’ stands for ‘confirmed’ and means that the auditor can confirm the ‘standard factual finding’ and, therefore, there is no exception to be reported.
- ‘E’ stands for ‘exception’ and means that the Auditor carried out the procedures but cannot confirm the ‘standard factual finding’, or that the Auditor was not able to carry out a specific procedure (e.g. because it was impossible to reconcile key information or data were unavailable).
- ‘N.A.’ stands for ‘not applicable’ and means that the Finding did not have to be examined by the Auditor and the related Procedure(s) did not have to be carried out. The reasons of the non-application of a certain Finding must be obvious i.e. i) if no cost was declared under a certain category then the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) are not applicable; ii) if the condition set to apply certain Procedure(s) are not met then the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) are not applicable. For instance, for ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than the euro’ the Procedure related to ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in euro’ is not applicable. Similarly, if no additional remuneration is paid, the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) for additional remuneration are not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ACTUAL PERSONNEL COSTS AND UNIT COSTS CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS USUAL COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Auditor draws a sample of persons whose costs were declared in the Financial Statement(s) to carry out the procedures indicated in the consecutive points of this section A.

(The sample should be selected randomly so that it is representative. Full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 people (including employees, natural persons working under a direct contract and personnel seconded by a third party), otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 people, or 10% of the total, whichever number is the highest)

The Auditor sampled _____ people out of the total of _____ people.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td>PERSONNEL COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the persons included in the sample and working under an employment contract or equivalent act (general procedures for individual actual personnel costs and personnel costs declared as unit costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 1-5 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o a list of the persons included in the sample indicating the period(s) during which they worked for the action, their position (classification or category) and type of contract;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the payslips of the employees included in the sample;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o reconciliation of the personnel costs declared in the Financial Statement(s) with the accounting system (project accounting and general ledger) and payroll system;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o information concerning the employment status and employment conditions of personnel included in the sample, in particular their employment contracts or equivalent;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) The employees were i) directly hired by the Beneficiary in accordance with its national legislation, ii) under the Beneficiary’s sole technical supervision and responsibility and iii) remunerated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Personnel costs were recorded in the Beneficiary’s accounts/payroll system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Costs were adequately supported and reconciled with the accounts and payroll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding</td>
<td>Result (C / E / N.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the Beneficiary’s usual policy regarding payroll matters (e.g. salary policy, overtime policy, variable pay); o applicable national law on taxes, labour and social security and o any other document that supports the personnel costs declared. The Auditor also verified the eligibility of all components of the retribution (see Article 6 GA) and recalculated the personnel costs for employees included in the sample.</td>
<td>records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Personnel costs did not contain any ineligible elements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>There were no discrepancies between the personnel costs charged to the action and the costs recalculated by the Auditor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further procedures if ‘additional remuneration’ is paid</td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 6-9 listed in the next column, the Auditor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o reviewed relevant documents provided by the Beneficiary (legal form, legal/statutory obligations, the Beneficiary’s usual policy on additional remuneration, criteria used for its calculation...); o recalculated the amount of additional remuneration eligible for the action based on the supporting documents received (full-time or part-time work, exclusive or non-exclusive dedication to the action, etc.) to arrive at the applicable FTE/year and pro-rata rate (see data collected in the course of carrying out the procedures under A.2 ‘Productive hours’ and A.4 ‘Time recording system’).</td>
<td>6) The Beneficiary paying “additional remuneration” was a non-profit legal entity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7) The amount of additional remuneration paid corresponded to the Beneficiary’s usual remuneration practices and was consistently paid whenever the same kind of work or expertise was required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Grant Agreement number:** [insert number] [insert acronym] [insert call/sub-call identifier]

**H2020 Model Grant Agreements: H2020 General MGA — Multi: September 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>IF ANY PART OF THE REMUNERATION PAID TO THE EMPLOYEE IS NOT MANDATORY ACCORDING TO THE NATIONAL LAW OR THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT (&quot;ADDITIONAL REMUNERATION&quot;) AND IS ELIGIBLE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 6.2.A.1, THIS CAN BE CHARGED AS ELIGIBLE COST TO THE ACTION UP TO THE FOLLOWING AMOUNT:</strong></td>
<td>8) The criteria used to calculate the additional remuneration were objective and generally applied by the Beneficiary regardless of the source of funding used.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) IF THE PERSON WORKS FULL TIME AND EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION DURING THE FULL YEAR: UP TO EUR 8,000/YEAR;</td>
<td>9) The amount of additional remuneration included in the personnel costs charged to the action was capped at EUR 8,000 per FTE/year (up to the equivalent pro-rata amount if the person did not work on the action full-time during the year or did not work exclusively on the action).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) IF THE PERSON WORKS EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION BUT NOT FULL-TIME OR NOT FOR THE FULL YEAR: UP TO THE CORRESPONDING PRO-RATA AMOUNT OF EUR 8,000, OR</td>
<td>10) The personnel costs included in the Financial Statement were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice. This methodology was consistently used in all H2020 actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) IF THE PERSON DOES NOT WORK EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION: UP TO A PRO-RATA AMOUNT CALCULATED IN ACCORDANCE TO ARTICLE 6.2.A.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional procedures in case “unit costs calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices” is applied:

Apart from carrying out the procedures indicated above to confirm standard factual findings 1-5 and, if applicable, also 6-9, the Auditor carried out following procedures to confirm standard factual findings 10-13 listed in the next column:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o obtained a description of the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice to calculate unit costs;</td>
<td>11) The employees were charged under the correct category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o reviewed whether the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice was applied for the Financial Statements subject of the present CFS;</td>
<td>12) Total personnel costs used in calculating the unit costs were consistent with the expenses recorded in the statutory accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o verified the employees included in the sample were charged under the correct category (in accordance with the criteria used by the Beneficiary to establish personnel categories) by reviewing the contract/HR-record or analytical accounting records;</td>
<td>13) Any estimated or budgeted element used by the Beneficiary in its unit-cost calculation were relevant for calculating personnel costs and corresponded to objective and verifiable information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o verified that there is no difference between the total amount of personnel costs used in calculating the cost per unit and the total amount of personnel costs recorded in the statutory accounts;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o verified whether actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements and, if so, verified whether those elements used are actually relevant for the calculation, objective and supported by documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For natural persons included in the sample and working with the Beneficiary under a direct contract other than an employment contract, such as consultants (no subcontractors). To confirm standard factual findings 14-18 listed in the next column the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:</td>
<td>14) The natural persons reported to the Beneficiary (worked under the Beneficiary’s instructions).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the contracts, especially the cost, contract duration, work description, place of work, ownership of the results and reporting obligations to the Beneficiary;</td>
<td>15) They worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | o the employment conditions of staff in the same category to compare costs and;  
|     | o any other document that supports the costs declared and its registration (e.g. invoices,  
|     | accounting records, etc.). | 16) The results of work carried out belong to the Beneficiary. |
|     | | 17) Their costs were not significantly different from those for staff who performed similar tasks under an employment contract with the Beneficiary. |
|     | | 18) The costs were supported by audit evidence and registered in the accounts. |
|     | For personnel seconded by a third party and included in the sample (not subcontractors)  
|     | To confirm standard factual findings 19-22 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary: | 19) Seconded personnel reported to the Beneficiary and worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary). |
|     | o their secondment contract(s) notably regarding costs, duration, work description, place of work and ownership of the results;  
|     | o if there is reimbursement by the Beneficiary to the third party for the resource made available, (in-kind contribution against payment): any documentation that supports the costs declared (e.g. contract, invoice, bank payment, and proof of registration in its accounting/payroll, etc.) and reconciliation of the Financial Statement(s) with the accounting system (project accounting and general ledger) as well as any proof that the amount invoiced by the third party did not include any profit; | 20) The results of work carried out belong to the Beneficiary. |
|     | | If personnel is seconded against payment: |
|     | | 21) The costs declared were supported with documentation and recorded in the |
**Procedures**

- if there is no reimbursement by the Beneficiary to the third party for the resource made available (in-kind contribution free of charge): a proof of the actual cost borne by the Third Party for the resource made available free of charge to the Beneficiary such as a statement of costs incurred by the Third Party and proof of the registration in the Third Party's accounting/payroll;
- any other document that supports the costs declared (e.g. invoices, etc.).

**Standard factual finding**

Beneficiary’s accounts. The third party did not include any profit.

**Result (C / E / N.A.)**

If personnel is seconded free of charge:

22) The costs declared did not exceed the third party's cost as recorded in the accounts of the third party and were supported with documentation.

**PRODUCTIVE HOURS**

To confirm standard factual findings 23-28 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed relevant documents, especially national legislation, labour agreements and contracts and time records of the persons included in the sample, to verify that:

- the annual productive hours applied were calculated in accordance with one of the methods described below,
- the full-time equivalent (FTEs) ratios for employees not working full-time were correctly calculated.

23) The Beneficiary applied method [choose one option and delete the others]

- [A: 1720 hours]
- [B: the ‘total number of hours worked’]
- [C: ‘annual productive hours’ used correspond to usual accounting practices]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | If the Beneficiary applied method B, the auditor verified that the correctness in which the total number of hours worked was calculated and that the contracts specified the annual workable hours. If the Beneficiary applied method C, the auditor verified that the ‘annual productive hours’ applied when calculating the hourly rate were equivalent to at least 90% of the ‘standard annual workable hours’. The Auditor can only do this if the calculation of the standard annual workable hours can be supported by records, such as national legislation, labour agreements, and contracts. **Beneficiary’s Productive hours’ for persons working full time shall be one of the following methods:**  
      - A. 1720 Annual Productive Hours (Pro-rata for persons not working full-time)  
      - B. The total number of hours worked by the person for the Beneficiary in the year (This method is also referred to as ‘total number of hours worked’ in the next column). The calculation of the total number of hours worked was done as follows: annual workable hours of the person according to the employment contract, applicable labour agreement or national law plus overtime worked minus absences (such as sick leave or special leave). | 24) Productive hours were calculated annually.  
25) For employees not working full-time the full-time equivalent (FTE) ratio was correctly applied. |                       |
|     |                                                                           | If the Beneficiary applied method B.  
26) The calculation of the number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary. |                       |
|     |                                                                           | If the Beneficiary applied method C.  
27) The calculation of the number of ‘standard annual workable hours’ was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary. |                       |
### proCeedings
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>C. THE STANDARD NUMBER OF ANNUAL HOURS GENERALLY APPLIED BY THE BENEFICIARY FOR ITS PERSONNEL IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS USUAL COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICES (THIS METHOD IS ALSO REFERRED TO AS ‘TOTAL ANNUAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS’ IN THE NEXT COLUMN). THIS NUMBER MUST BE AT LEAST 90% OF THE STANDARD ANNUAL WORKABLE HOURS.</strong></td>
<td>28) The ‘annual productive hours’ used for calculating the hourly rate were consistent with the usual cost accounting practices of the Beneficiary and were equivalent to at least 90% of the ‘annual workable hours’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>‘ANNUAL WORKABLE HOURS’ MEANS THE PERIOD DURING WHICH THE PERSONNEL MUST BE WORKING, AT THE EMPLOYER’S DISPOSAL AND CARRYING OUT HIS/HER ACTIVITY OR DUTIES UNDER THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT, APPLICABLE COLLECTIVE LABOUR AGREEMENT OR NATIONAL WORKING TIME LEGISLATION.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td><strong>HOURLY PERSONNEL RATES</strong></td>
<td>29) The Beneficiary applied [choose one option and delete the other]: [Option I: “Unit costs (hourly rates) were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices”] [Option II: Individual hourly rates were applied]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) For unit costs calculated in accordance to the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practice (unit costs):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary has a &quot;Certificate on Methodology to calculate unit costs &quot; (CoMUC) approved by the Commission, the Beneficiary provides the Auditor with a description of the approved methodology and the Commission’s letter of acceptance. The Auditor verified that the Beneficiary has indeed used the methodology approved. If so, no further verification is necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary does not have a &quot;Certificate on Methodology&quot; (CoMUC) approved by the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ref | Procedures | Standard factual finding | Result (C / E / N.A.)
--- | --- | --- | ---

Commission, or if the methodology approved was not applied, then the Auditor:

- reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;
- recalculated the unit costs (hourly rates) of staff included in the sample following the results of the procedures carried out in A.1 and A.2.

II) For individual hourly rates:

The Auditor:

- reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;
- recalculated the hourly rates of staff included in the sample following the results of the procedures carried out in A.1 and A.2.

"UNIT COSTS CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS USUAL COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICES":

IT IS CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF PERSONNEL COSTS OF THE CATEGORY TO WHICH THE EMPLOYEE BELONGS VERIFIED IN LINE WITH PROCEDURE A.1 BY THE NUMBER OF FTE AND THE ANNUAL TOTAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS OF THE SAME CATEGORY CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE A.2.

HOURLY RATE FOR INDIVIDUAL ACTUAL PERSONAL COSTS:

IT IS CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF PERSONNEL COSTS OF AN EMPLOYEE VERIFIED IN LINE WITH FOR OPTION I CONCERNING UNIT COSTS AND IF THE BENEFICIARY APPLIES THE METHODOLOGY APPROVED BY THE COMMISSION (CoMUC):

30) The Beneficiary used the Commission-approved methodology to calculate hourly rates. It corresponded to the organisation's usual cost accounting practices and was applied consistently for all activities irrespective of the source of funding.

For option I concerning unit costs and if the Beneficiary applies a methodology not approved by the Commission:

31) The unit costs re-calculated by the Auditor were the same as the rates applied by the Beneficiary.

For option II concerning individual hourly rates:
**A.1** **PROCEDURE A.1 BY THE NUMBER OF ANNUAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS VERIFIED IN LINE WITH PROCEDURE A.2.**

32) The individual rates recalculated by the Auditor were the same as the rates applied by the Beneficiary.

---

**A.4** **TIME RECORDING SYSTEM**

To verify that the time recording system ensures the fulfilment of all minimum requirements and that the hours declared for the action were correct, accurate and properly authorised and supported by documentation, the Auditor made the following checks for the persons included in the sample that declare time as worked for the action on the basis of time records:

- **o** description of the time recording system provided by the Beneficiary (registration, authorisation, processing in the HR-system);
- **o** its actual implementation;
- **o** time records were signed at least monthly by the employees (on paper or electronically) and authorised by the project manager or another manager;
- **o** the hours declared were worked within the project period;
- **o** there were no hours declared as worked for the action if HR-records showed absence due to holidays or sickness (further cross-checks with travels are carried out in B.1 below);

33) All persons recorded their time dedicated to the action on a **daily/ weekly/ monthly** basis using a **paper/computer-based** system. *(delete the answers that are not applicable)*

34) Their time-records were authorised at least monthly by the project manager or other superior.

35) Hours declared were worked within the project period and were consistent with the presences/absences recorded in HR-records.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o  the hours charged to the action matched those in the time recording system.</td>
<td>36) There were no discrepancies between the number of hours charged to the action and the number of hours recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ONLY THE HOURS WORKED ON THE ACTION CAN BE CHARGED. ALL WORKING TIME TO BE CHARGED SHOULD BE</strong> **RECORDED THROUGHOUT THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT, ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE OF THEIR REALITY AND RELIABILITY *<strong>(SEE SPECIFIC PROVISIONS BELOW FOR PERSONS WORKING EXCLUSIVELY FOR THE ACTION WITHOUT TIME RECORDS)</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the persons are working exclusively for the action and without time records</td>
<td>37) <strong>The exclusive dedication is supported by a declaration signed by the Beneficiary's and by any other evidence gathered.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the persons selected that worked exclusively for the action without time records, the Auditor verified evidence available demonstrating that they were in reality exclusively dedicated to the action and that the Beneficiary signed a declaration confirming that they have worked exclusively for the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><strong>COSTS OF SUBCONTRACTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of subcontracting costs and sampled <strong>cost items selected randomly</strong> <em>(full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest)</em>.</td>
<td>38) <strong>The use of claimed subcontracting costs was foreseen in Annex 1 and costs were declared in the Financial Statements under the subcontracting category.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 38-42 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>following for the items included in the sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td>39) There were documents of requests to different providers, different offers and assessment of the offers before selection of the provider in line with internal procedures and procurement rules. Subcontracts were awarded in accordance with the principle of best value for money. <em>(When different offers were not collected the Auditor explains the reasons provided by the Beneficiary under the caption “Exceptions” of the Report. The Commission will analyse this information to evaluate whether these costs might be accepted as eligible)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the use of subcontractors was foreseen in Annex 1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o subcontracting costs were declared in the subcontracting category of the Financial Statement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o supporting documents on the selection and award procedure were followed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the Beneficiary ensured best value for money (key elements to appreciate the respect of this principle are the award of the subcontract to the bid offering best price-quality ratio, under conditions of transparency and equal treatment. In case an existing framework contract was used the Beneficiary ensured it was established on the basis of the principle of best value for money under conditions of transparency and equal treatment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In particular,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. if the Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC or of Directive 2004/17/EC, the Auditor verified that the applicable national law on public procurement was followed and that the subcontracting complied with the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. if the Beneficiary did not fall under the above-mentioned category the Auditor verified that the Beneficiary followed their usual procurement rules and respected the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement..</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the items included in the sample the Auditor also verified that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries in the consortium;</td>
<td></td>
<td>40) The subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries of the consortium.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ref

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o there were signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor; o there was evidence that the services were provided by subcontractor;</td>
<td>41) All subcontracts were supported by signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42) There was evidence that the services were provided by the subcontractors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C COSTS OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES

C.1 The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of the costs of providing financial support to third parties and sampled __________ cost items selected randomly (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).

The Auditor verified that the following minimum conditions were met:

a) the maximum amount of financial support for each third party did not exceed EUR 60 000, unless explicitly mentioned in Annex 1;

b) the financial support to third parties was agreed in Annex 1 of the Agreement and the other provisions on financial support to third parties included in Annex 1 were

43) All minimum conditions were met
H2020 Model Grant Agreements: H2020 General MGA — Multi: September 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Associated with document Ref. Ares(2015)2128095 - 21/05/2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.1</th>
<th>OTHER ACTUAL DIRECT COSTS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.1 COSTS OF TRAVEL AND RELATED SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor sampled ______ cost items selected randomly <em>(full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 items, or 10% of the total, whichever number is the highest).</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor inspected the sample and verified that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o travel and subsistence costs were consistent with the Beneficiary's usual policy for travel. In this context, the Beneficiary provided evidence of its normal policy for travel costs (e.g. use of first class tickets, reimbursement by the Beneficiary on the basis of actual costs, a lump sum or per diem) to enable the Auditor to compare the travel costs charged with this policy;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o travel costs are correctly identified and allocated to the action (e.g. trips are directly linked to the action) by reviewing relevant supporting documents such as minutes of meetings, workshops or conferences, their registration in the correct project account, their consistency with time records or with the dates/duration of the workshop/conference;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o no ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>44)</strong> Costs were incurred, approved and reimbursed in line with the Beneficiary's usual policy for travels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45)</strong> There was a link between the trip and the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>46)</strong> The supporting documents were consistent with each other regarding subject of the trip, dates, duration and reconciled with time records and accounting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>47)</strong> No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D.2 DEPRECIATION COSTS FOR EQUIPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE OR OTHER ASSETS**

The Auditor sampled ______ cost items selected randomly *(full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 items, or 10% of the total, whichever number is the highest).*

For “equipment, infrastructure or other assets” [from now on called “asset(s)”] selected in the

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>48)</strong> Procurement rules, principles and guides were followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>49)</strong> There was a link between the grant agreement and the asset charged to the action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample the Auditor verified that:

- the assets were acquired in conformity with the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures;
- they were correctly allocated to the action (with supporting documents such as delivery note invoice or any other proof demonstrating the link to the action);
- they were entered in the accounting system;
- the extent to which the assets were used for the action (as a percentage) was supported by reliable documentation (e.g. usage overview table);

The Auditor recalculated the depreciation costs and verified that they were in line with the applicable rules in the Beneficiary's country and with the Beneficiary's usual accounting policy (e.g. depreciation calculated on the acquisition value).

The Auditor verified that no ineligible costs such as deductible VAT, exchange rate losses, excessive or reckless expenditure were declared (see Article 6.5 GA).

### D.3 COSTS OF OTHER GOODS AND SERVICES

The Auditor sampled **[number] cost items selected randomly** *(full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).*

For the purchase of goods, works or services included in the sample the Auditor verified that:

- the contracts did not cover tasks described in Annex 1;

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50)</td>
<td>The asset charged to the action was traceable to the accounting records and the underlying documents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51)</td>
<td>The depreciation method used to charge the asset to the action was in line with the applicable rules in the Beneficiary's country and the Beneficiary's usual accounting policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52)</td>
<td>The amount charged corresponded to the actual usage for the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53)</td>
<td>No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54)</td>
<td>Contracts for works or services did not cover tasks described in Annex 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55)</td>
<td>Costs were allocated to the correct action and the goods were not placed in the inventory of durable equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>they were correctly identified, allocated to the proper action, entered in the accounting system (traceable to underlying documents such as purchase orders, invoices and accounting);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>the goods were not placed in the inventory of durable equipment;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>the costs charged to the action were accounted in line with the Beneficiary's usual accounting practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>no ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared (see Article 6 GA).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Auditor verified that these goods and services were acquired in conformity with the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures, in particular:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>if Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC or of Directive 2004/17/EC, the Auditor verified that the applicable national law on public procurement was followed and that the procurement contract complied with the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>if the Beneficiary did not fall into the category above, the Auditor verified that the Beneficiary followed their usual procurement rules and respected the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the items included in the sample the Auditor also verified that:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>the Beneficiary ensured best value for money (key elements to appreciate the respect of this principle are the award of the contract to the bid offering best price-quality ratio, under conditions of transparency and equal treatment. In case an existing framework contract was used the Auditor also verified that the Beneficiary ensured it was established on the basis of the principle of best value for money under conditions of transparency and equal treatment);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Such goods and services include, for instance, consumables and supplies, dissemination (including open access), protection of results, specific evaluation of the action if it is required by the**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56)</td>
<td>The costs were charged in line with the Beneficiary's accounting policy and were adequately supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57)</td>
<td>No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared. For internal invoices/charges only the cost element was charged, without any mark-ups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 58) | Procurement rules, principles and guides were followed. There were documents of requests to different providers, different offers and assessment of the offers before selection of the provider in line with internal procedures and procurement rules. The purchases were made in accordance with the principle of best value for money. (When different offers were not collected the Auditor explains the reasons provided by the Beneficiary under the**
D.4 AGGREGATED CAPITALISED AND OPERATING COSTS OF RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

The Auditor ensured the existence of a positive ex-ante assessment (issued by the EC Services) of the cost accounting methodology of the Beneficiary allowing it to apply the guidelines on direct costing for large research infrastructures in Horizon 2020.

*In the cases that a positive ex-ante assessment has been issued* (see the standard factual findings 59-60 on the next column),

The Auditor ensured that the beneficiary has applied consistently the methodology that is explained and approved in the positive ex ante assessment;

*In the cases that a positive ex-ante assessment has NOT been issued* (see the standard factual findings 61 on the next column),

The Auditor verified that no costs of Large Research Infrastructure have been charged as direct costs in any costs category;

59) The costs declared as direct costs for Large Research Infrastructures (in the appropriate line of the Financial Statement) comply with the methodology described in the positive ex-ante assessment report.

60) Any difference between the methodology applied and the one positively assessed was extensively described and adjusted accordingly.

61) The direct costs declared were free from any indirect costs items related to the Large Research Infrastructure.
In the cases that a draft ex-ante assessment report has been issued with recommendation for further changes (see the standard factual findings 61 on the next column),

- The Auditor followed the same procedure as above (when a positive ex-ante assessment has NOT yet been issued) and paid particular attention (testing reinforced) to the cost items for which the draft ex-ante assessment either rejected the inclusion as direct costs for Large Research Infrastructures or issued recommendations.

**E USE OF EXCHANGE RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E.1</th>
<th>USE OF EXCHANGE RATES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>For Beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Auditor sampled ______ cost items selected randomly and verified that the exchange rates used for converting other currencies into euros were in accordance with the following rules established in the Agreement (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest):


62) The exchange rates used to convert other currencies into Euros were in accordance with the rules established of the Grant Agreement and there was no difference in the final figures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETERMINED OVER THE CORRESPONDING REPORTING PERIOD.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) For Beneficiaries with accounts established in euros</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor sampled ______ cost items selected randomly and verified that the exchange rates used for converting other currencies into euros were in accordance with the following rules established in the Agreement (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSTS INCURRED IN ANOTHER CURRENCY SHALL BE CONVERTED INTO EURO BY APPLYING THE BENEFICIARY’S USUAL ACCOUNTING PRACTICES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63) The Beneficiary applied its usual accounting practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[legal name of the audit firm]

[name and function of an authorised representative]

[dd Month yyyy]

<Signature of the Auditor>
MODEL FOR THE CERTIFICATE ON THE METHODOLOGY

- For options *in italics in square brackets*: choose the applicable option. Options not chosen should be deleted.
- For fields in [grey in square brackets]: enter the appropriate data.
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Terms of reference for an audit engagement for a methodology certificate in connection with one or more grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

This document sets out the ‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ under which

[OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]  [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary] [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)

agrees to engage

[insert legal name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’)

to produce an independent report of factual findings (‘the Report’) concerning the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual accounting practices for calculating and claiming direct personnel costs declared as unit costs (‘the Methodology’) in connection with grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme.

The procedures to be carried out for the assessment of the methodology will be based on the grant agreement(s) detailed below:

[title and number of the grant agreement(s)] (‘the Agreement(s)’)

The Agreement(s) has(have) been concluded between the Beneficiary and [OPTION 1: the European Union, represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)][ OPTION 2: the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom,) represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)][OPTION 3: the [Research Executive Agency (REA)] [European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA)] [Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA)] [Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)] (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’).]
The [Commission] [Agency] is mentioned as a signatory of the Agreement with the Beneficiary only. The [European Union] [Euratom] [Agency] is not a party to this engagement.

1.1 Subject of the engagement

According to Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement, beneficiaries [and linked third parties] that declare direct personnel costs as unit costs calculated in accordance with their usual cost accounting practices may submit to the [Commission] [Agency], for approval, a certificate on the methodology ('CoMUC') stating that there are adequate records and documentation to prove that their cost accounting practices used comply with the conditions set out in Point A of Article 6.2.

The subject of this engagement is the CoMUC which is composed of two separate documents:

- the Terms of Reference ('the ToR') to be signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor;

- the Auditor's Independent Report of Factual Findings ('the Report') issued on the Auditor’s letterhead, dated, stamped and signed by the Auditor which includes; the standard statements ('the Statements') evaluated and signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party], the agreed-upon procedures ('the Procedures') performed by the Auditor and the standard factual findings ('the Findings') assessed by the Auditor. The Statements, Procedures and Findings are summarised in the table that forms part of the Report.

The information provided through the Statements, the Procedures and the Findings will enable the Commission to draw conclusions regarding the existence of the [Beneficiary's] [Linked Third Party's] usual cost accounting practice and its suitability to ensure that direct personnel costs claimed on that basis comply with the provisions of the Agreement. The Commission draws its own conclusions from the Report and any additional information it may require.

1.2 Responsibilities

The parties to this agreement are the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor.

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]: 
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- is responsible for preparing financial statements for the Agreement(s) (‘the Financial Statements’) in compliance with those Agreements;
- is responsible for providing the Financial Statement(s) to the Auditor and enabling the Auditor to reconcile them with the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] accounting and bookkeeping system and the underlying accounts and records. The Financial Statement(s) will be used as a basis for the procedures which the Auditor will carry out under this ToR;
- is responsible for its Methodology and liable for the accuracy of the Financial Statement(s);
- is responsible for endorsing or refuting the Statements indicated under the heading ‘Statements to be made by the Beneficiary/ Linked Third Party’ in the first column of the table that forms part of the Report;
- must provide the Auditor with a signed and dated representation letter;
- accepts that the ability of the Auditor to carry out the Procedures effectively depends upon the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] providing full and free access to the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] staff and to its accounting and other relevant records.

The Auditor:

- [Option 2 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party has an independent Public Officer: is a competent and independent Public Officer for which the relevant national authorities have established the legal capacity to audit the Beneficiary].
- [Option 3 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party is an international organisation: is an [internal] [external] auditor in accordance with the internal financial regulations and procedures of the international organisation].

The Auditor:

- must be independent from the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party], in particular, it must not have been involved in preparing the Beneficiary’s [and Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statement(s);
- must plan work so that the Procedures may be carried out and the Findings may be assessed;
- must adhere to the Procedures laid down and the compulsory report format;
- must carry out the engagement in accordance with these ToR;
- must document matters which are important to support the Report;
- must base its Report on the evidence gathered;
- must submit the Report to the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

The Commission sets out the Procedures to be carried out and the Findings to be endorsed by the Auditor. The Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence. As this engagement is not an assurance engagement the Auditor does not provide an audit opinion or a statement of assurance.
1.3 Applicable Standards

The Auditor must comply with these Terms of Reference and with¹:

- the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB);
- the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA). Although ISRS 4400 states that independence is not a requirement for engagements to carry out agreed-upon procedures, the Commission requires that the Auditor also complies with the Code’s independence requirements.

The Auditor’s Report must state that there was no conflict of interests in establishing this Report between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party] that could have a bearing on the Report, and must specify – if the service is invoiced - the total fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report.

1.4 Reporting

The Report must be written in the language of the Agreement (see Article 20.7 of the Agreement).

Under Article 22 of the Agreement, the Commission, [the Agency], the European Anti-Fraud Office and the Court of Auditors have the right to audit any work that is carried out under the action and for which costs are claimed from [the European Union] [Euratom] budget. This includes work related to this engagement. The Auditor must provide access to all working papers related to this assignment if the Commission, [the Agency], the European Anti-Fraud Office or the European Court of Auditors requests them.

1.5 Timing

The Report must be provided by [dd Month yyyy].

¹ Supreme Audit Institutions applying INTOSAI-standards may carry out the Procedures according to the corresponding International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions and code of ethics issued by INTOSAI instead of the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 and the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IAASB and the IESBA.
1.6 Other Terms

[The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor can use this section to agree other specific terms, such as the Auditor’s fees, liability, applicable law, etc. Those specific terms must not contradict the terms specified above.]

[legal name of the Auditor]  [legal name of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]]
[name & title of authorised representative]  [name & title of authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy]  [dd Month yyyy]
Signature of the Auditor  Signature  
Signature of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]
Independent report of factual findings on the methodology concerning grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

(To be printed on letterhead paper of the auditor)

To

[Name of contact person(s)], [Position]

[Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] name

[Address]

[dd Month yyyy]

Dear [Name of contact person(s)],

As agreed under the terms of reference dated [dd Month yyyy]

with [OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)] [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’),

we

[name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’),

established at

[full address/city/state/province/country],

represented by

[name and function of an authorised representative],
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have carried out the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) and provide hereby our Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’), concerning the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual accounting practices for calculating and declaring direct personnel costs declared as unit costs (‘the Methodology’).

You requested certain procedures to be carried out in connection with the grant(s)

[title and number of the grant agreement(s)] (‘the Agreement(s)’).

The Report

Our engagement was carried out in accordance with the terms of reference (‘the ToR’) appended to this Report. The Report includes: the standard statements (‘the Statements’) made by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party], the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) carried out and the standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) confirmed by us.

The engagement involved carrying out the Procedures and assessing the Findings and the documentation requested appended to this Report, the results of which the Commission uses to draw conclusions regarding the acceptability of the Methodology applied by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

The Report covers the methodology used from [dd Month yyyy]. In the event that the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] changes this methodology, the Report will not be applicable to any Financial Statement2 submitted thereafter.

The scope of the Procedures and the definition of the standard statements and findings were determined solely by the Commission. Therefore, the Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence.

Since the Procedures carried out constitute neither an audit nor a review made in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, we do not

2 Financial Statement in this context refers solely to Annex 4 of the Agreement by which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement.
give a statement of assurance on the costs declared on the basis of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] Methodology. Had we carried out additional procedures or had we performed an audit or review in accordance with these standards, other matters might have come to its attention and would have been included in the Report.

Exceptions

Apart from the exceptions listed below, the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] agreed with the standard Statements and provided the Auditor all the documentation and accounting information needed by the Auditor to carry out the requested Procedures and corroborate the standard Findings.

List here any exception and add any information on the cause and possible consequences of each exception, if known. If the exception is quantifiable, also indicate the corresponding amount.

…..

Explanation of possible exceptions in the form of examples (to be removed from the Report):

i. the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] did not agree with the standard Statement number ... because...;

ii. the Auditor could not carry out the procedure ... established because .... (e.g. due to the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability or inconsistency of data);

iii. the Auditor could not confirm or corroborate the standard Finding number ... because ....

Remarks

We would like to add the following remarks relevant for the proper understanding of the Methodology applied by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or the results reported:

Example (to be removed from the Report):

Regarding the methodology applied to calculate hourly rates ... 

Regarding standard Finding 15 it has to be noted that ...

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] explained the deviation from the benchmark statement XXIV concerning time recording for personnel with no exclusive dedication to the action in the following manner: ...
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Please provide the following documents to the auditor and annex them to the report when submitting this CoMUC to the Commission:

1. Brief description of the methodology for calculating personnel costs, productive hours and hourly rates;
2. Brief description of the time recording system in place;
3. An example of the time records used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party];
4. Description of any budgeted or estimated elements applied, together with an explanation as to why they are relevant for calculating the personnel costs and how they are based on objective and verifiable information;
5. A summary sheet with the hourly rate for direct personnel declared by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and recalculated by the Auditor for each staff member included in the sample (the names do not need to be reported);
6. A comparative table summarising for each person selected in the sample a) the time claimed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in the Financial Statement(s) and b) the time according to the time record verified by the Auditor;
7. A copy of the letter of representation provided to the Auditor.

Use of this Report

This Report has been drawn up solely for the purpose given under Point 1.1 Reasons for the engagement.

The Report:

- is confidential and is intended to be submitted to the Commission by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in connection with Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement;
- may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the Commission for any other purpose, nor distributed to any other parties;
- may be disclosed by the Commission only to authorised parties, in particular the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.
- relates only to the usual cost accounting practices specified above and does not constitute a report on the Financial Statements of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

No conflict of interest exists between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party] that could have a bearing on the Report. The total fee paid to the Auditor for producing the Report was EUR __________ (including EUR __________ of deductible VAT).

A conflict of interest arises when the Auditor's objectivity to establish the certificate is compromised in fact or in appearance when the Auditor for instance:

- was involved in the preparation of the Financial Statements;
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We look forward to discussing our Report with you and would be pleased to provide any further information or assistance which may be required.

Yours sincerely

[legal name of the Auditor]

[name and title of the authorised representative]

[dd Month yyyy]

Signature of the Auditor

- stands to benefit directly should the certificate be accepted;
- has a close relationship with any person representing the beneficiary;
- is a director, trustee or partner of the beneficiary; or
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her independence or ability to establish the certificate impartially.
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Statements to be made by the Beneficiary/Linked Third Party (‘the Statements’) and Procedures to be carried out by the Auditor (‘the Procedures’) and standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) to be confirmed by the Auditor

The Commission reserves the right to provide the auditor with guidance regarding the Statements to be made, the Procedures to be carried out or the Findings to be ascertained and the way in which to present them. The Commission reserves the right to vary the Statements, Procedures or Findings by written notification to the Beneficiary/Linked Third Party to adapt the procedures to changes in the grant agreement(s) or to any other circumstances.

If this methodology certificate relates to the Linked Third Party’s usual accounting practices for calculating and claiming direct personnel costs declared as unit costs any reference here below to ‘the Beneficiary’ is to be considered as a reference to ‘the Linked Third Party’.

Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Use of the Methodology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The cost accounting practice described below has been in use since [dd Month yyyy].</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor checked these dates against the documentation the Beneficiary has provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The next planned alteration to the methodology used by the Beneficiary will be from [dd Month yyyy].</td>
<td><strong>Factual finding:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The dates provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with the documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Description of the Methodology</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. The methodology to calculate unit costs is being used in a consistent manner and is reflected in the relevant procedures.</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor reviewed the description, the relevant manuals and/or internal guidance documents describing the methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Please describe the methodology your entity uses to calculate personnel costs, productive hours and hourly rates, present your description to the Auditor and annex it to this certificate]</td>
<td><strong>Factual finding:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The brief description was consistent with the relevant manuals, internal guidance and/or other documentary evidence the Auditor has reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. The methodology was generally applied by the Beneficiary as part of its usual costs accounting practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factual Findings</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Personnel costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IV. The unit costs (hourly rates) are limited to salaries including during parental leave, social security contributions, taxes and other costs included in the remuneration required under national law and the employment contract or equivalent appointing act; | Procedure: The Auditor draws a sample of employees to carry out the procedures indicated in this section C and the following sections D to F. The Auditor has drawn a random sample of 10 full-time equivalents made up of employees assigned to the action(s). If fewer than 10 full-time equivalents are assigned to the action(s), the Auditor has selected a sample of 10 full-time equivalents consisting of all employees assigned to the action(s), complemented by other employees irrespective of their assignments. |}
| V. Employees are hired directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with national law, and work under its sole supervision and responsibility; | |}
| VI. The Beneficiary remunerates its employees in accordance with its usual practices. This means that personnel costs are charged in line with the Beneficiary's usual payroll policy (e.g. salary policy, overtime policy, variable pay) and no special conditions exist for employees assigned to tasks relating to the European Union or Euratom, unless explicitly provided for in the grant agreement(s); | |}
| VII. The Beneficiary allocates its employees to the relevant group/category/cost centre for the purpose of the unit cost calculation in line with the usual cost accounting practice; | |}
| VIII. Personnel costs are based on the payroll system and accounting system. | |}
| IX. Any exceptional adjustments of actual personnel costs resulted from relevant budgeted or estimated elements and were based on objective and verifiable information. Please describe the 'budgeted or estimated elements' and their relevance to personnel costs, and explain how they were reasonable and based on objective and verifiable information, present your explanation to the Auditor and annex it to this certificate. | |}
| X. Personnel costs claimed do not contain any of the following ineligible costs: costs related to return on capital; debt and debt service charges; provisions for future losses | |}

- the Auditor reviewed all documents relating to personnel costs such as employment contracts, payslips, payroll policy (e.g. salary policy, overtime policy, variable pay policy), accounting and payroll records, applicable national tax, labour and social security law and any other documents corroborating the personnel costs claimed; |
- in particular, the Auditor reviewed the employment contracts of the employees in the sample to verify that: |
  - i. they were employed directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable national legislation; |
  - ii. they were working under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter; |
  - iii. they were remunerated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual practices; |
  - iv. they were allocated to the correct group/category/cost centre for the purposes of calculating the unit cost in line with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices; |
- the Auditor verified that any ineligible items or any costs claimed under other costs categories or costs covered by other types of grant or by other grants financed from the European Union budget have not been taken
Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or debts; interest owed; doubtful debts; currency exchange losses; bank costs charged by the Beneficiary’s bank for transfers from the Commission/Agency; excessive or reckless expenditure; deductible VAT or costs incurred during suspension of the implementation of the action.</td>
<td>into account when calculating the personnel costs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Personnel costs were not declared under another EU or Euratom grant (including grants awarded by a Member State and financed by the EU budget and grants awarded by bodies other than the Commission/Agency for the purpose of implementing the EU budget).</td>
<td>✓ the Auditor numerically reconciled the total amount of personnel costs used to calculate the unit cost with the total amount of personnel costs recorded in the statutory accounts and the payroll system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ to the extent that actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, the Auditor carefully examined those elements and checked the information source to confirm that they correspond to objective and verifiable information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If additional remuneration as referred to in the grant agreement(s) is paid</td>
<td>✓ if additional remuneration has been claimed, the Auditor verified that the Beneficiary was a non-profit legal entity, that the amount was capped at EUR 8000 per full-time equivalent and that it was reduced proportionately for employees not assigned exclusively to the action(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. The Beneficiary is a non-profit legal entity;</td>
<td>✓ the Auditor recalculated the personnel costs for the employees in the sample.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. The additional remuneration is part of the beneficiary’s usual remuneration practices and paid consistently whenever the relevant work or expertise is required;</td>
<td>Factual finding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. The criteria used to calculate the additional remuneration are objective and generally applied regardless of the source of funding;</td>
<td>4. All the components of the remuneration that have been claimed as personnel costs are supported by underlying documentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. The additional remuneration included in the personnel costs used to calculate the hourly rates for the grant agreement(s) is capped at EUR 8000 per full-time equivalent (reduced proportionately if the employee is not assigned exclusively to the action).</td>
<td>5. The employees in the sample were employed directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable national law and were working under its sole supervision and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Their employment contracts were in line with the Beneficiary’s usual policy;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Personnel costs were duly documented and consisted solely of salaries, social security contributions (pension contributions, health insurance, unemployment fund contributions, etc.), taxes and other statutory costs included in the remuneration (holiday pay, thirteenth month’s pay, etc.);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. The totals used to calculate the personnel unit costs are consistent with those registered in the payroll and accounting records;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. To the extent that actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, those elements were</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factual Findings:</strong></td>
<td>relevant for calculating the personnel costs and correspond to objective and verifiable information. The budgeted or estimated elements used are: — (indicate the elements and their values).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personnel costs contained no ineligible elements;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Specific conditions for eligibility were fulfilled when additional remuneration was paid: a) the Beneficiary is registered in the grant agreements as a non-profit legal entity; b) it was paid according to objective criteria generally applied regardless of the source of funding used and c) remuneration was capped at EUR 8,000 per full-time equivalent (or up to up to the equivalent pro-rata amount if the person did not work on the action full-time during the year or did not work exclusively on the action).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. Productive hours

XVI. The number of productive hours per full-time employee applied is [delete as appropriate]:

- A. 1720 productive hours per year for a person working full-time (corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time).
- B. the total number of hours worked in the year by a person for the Beneficiary
- C. the standard number of annual hours generally applied by the beneficiary for its personnel in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices. This number must be at least 90% of the standard annual workable hours.

If method B is applied

XVII. The calculation of the total number of hours worked was done as follows: annual workable hours of the person according to the employment contract, applicable labour agreement or national law plus overtime worked minus absences (such as sick leave and special leave).

XVIII. ‘Annual workable hours’ are hours...


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during which the personnel must be working, at the employer’s disposal and carrying out his/her activity or duties under the employment contract, applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX. The contract (applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation) do specify the working time enabling to calculate the annual workable hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If method C is applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. The standard number of productive hours per year is that of a full-time equivalent; for employees not assigned exclusively to the action(s) this number is reduced proportionately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. The number of productive hours per year on which the hourly rate is based i) corresponds to the Beneficiary’s usual accounting practices; ii) is at least 90% of the standard number of workable (working) hours per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. Standard workable (working) hours are hours during which personnel are at the Beneficiary’s disposal preforming the duties described in the relevant employment contract, collective labour agreement or national labour legislation. The number of standard annual workable (working) hours that the Beneficiary claims is supported by labour contracts, national legislation and other documentary evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[If certain statement(s) of section “D. Productive hours” cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E. Hourly rates**

The hourly rates are correct because:

XXIII. Hourly rates are correctly calculated since they result from dividing annual personnel

**Procedure**

- The Auditor has obtained a list of all personnel rates calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with the methodology used.
- The Auditor has obtained a list of all the relevant employees, based on which the
### Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>costs by the productive hours of a given year and group (e.g. staff category or department or cost centre depending on the methodology applied) and they are in line with the statements made in section C. and D. above.</td>
<td>personnel rate(s) are calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For 10 full-time equivalent employees selected at random (same sample basis as Section C: Personnel costs):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The Auditor recalculated the hourly rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ The Auditor verified that the methodology applied corresponds to the usual accounting practices of the organisation and is applied consistently for all activities of the organisation on the basis of objective criteria irrespective of the source of funding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factual finding:**

19. No differences arose from the recalculation of the hourly rate for the employees included in the sample.

### F. Time recording

**XXIV.** Time recording is in place for all persons with no exclusive dedication to one Horizon 2020 action. At least all hours worked in connection with the grant agreement(s) are registered on a **daily/weekly/monthly** basis [delete as appropriate] using a **paper/computer-based system** [delete as appropriate];

**XXV.** For persons exclusively assigned to one Horizon 2020 activity the Beneficiary has either signed a declaration to that effect or has put arrangements in place to record their working time;

**XXVI.** Records of time worked have been signed by the person concerned (on paper or electronically) and approved by the action manager or line manager at least monthly;

**XXVII.** Measures are in place to prevent staff from:

1. recording the same hours twice,
2. recording working hours during absence periods (e.g. holidays, sick leave),
3. recording more than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and

**Procedure**

- The Auditor reviewed the brief description, all relevant manuals and/or internal guidance describing the methodology used to record time.

The Auditor reviewed the time records of the random sample of 10 full-time equivalents referred to under Section C: Personnel costs, and verified in particular:

- ✓ that time records were available for all persons with not exclusive assignment to the action;
- ✓ that time records were available for persons working exclusively for a Horizon 2020 action, or, alternatively, that a declaration signed by the Beneficiary was available for them certifying that they were working exclusively for a Horizon 2020 action;
- ✓ that time records were signed and approved in due time and that all minimum requirements were fulfilled;
- ✓ that the persons worked for the action in the periods claimed;
- ✓ that no more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly rates.
**Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iv. recording hours worked outside the action period.</td>
<td>personnel rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII. No working time was recorded outside the action period;</td>
<td>✓ that internal controls were in place to prevent that time is recorded twice, during absences for holidays or sick leave; that more hours are claimed per person per year for Horizon 2020 actions than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates; that working time is recorded outside the action period;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX. No more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates.</td>
<td>✓ the Auditor cross-checked the information with human-resources records to verify consistency and to ensure that the internal controls have been effective. In addition, the Auditor has verified that no more hours were charged to Horizon 2020 actions per person per year than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and verified that no time worked outside the action period was charged to the action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**[Please provide a brief description of the time recording system in place together with the measures applied to ensure its reliability to the Auditor and annex it to the present certificate].**

**[If certain statement(s) of section “F. Time recording” cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor]:**

- ...

**Factual finding:**

20. The brief description, manuals and/or internal guidance on time recording provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with management reports/records and other documents reviewed and were generally applied by the Beneficiary to produce the financial statements.  

21. For the random sample time was recorded or, in the case of employees working exclusively for the action, either a signed declaration or time records were available;  

22. For the random sample the time records were signed by the employee and the action manager/line manager, at least monthly.  

23. Working time claimed for the action occurred in the periods claimed;  

24. No more hours were claimed than the number productive hours used to calculate the hourly

---

4 The description of the time recording system must state among others information on the content of the time records, its coverage (full or action time-recording, for all personnel or only for personnel involved in H2020 actions), its degree of detail (whether there is a reference to the particular tasks accomplished), its form, periodicity of the time registration and authorisation (paper or a computer-based system; on a daily, weekly or monthly basis; signed and countersigned by whom), controls applied to prevent double-charging of time or ensure consistency with HR-records such as absences and travels as well as it information flow up to its use for the preparation of the Financial Statements.
Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25. There is proof that the Beneficiary has checked that working time has not been claimed twice, that it is consistent with absence records and the number of productive hours per year, and that no working time has been claimed outside the action period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26. Working time claimed is consistent with that on record at the human-resources department.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Official name of the Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]
[Name and title of authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy]
<Signature of the Beneficiary> [Linked Third Party]>

[Official name of the Auditor]
[Name and title of authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy]
<Signature of the Auditor>
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