GRANT AGREEMENT

NUMBER — 770356 — Co-VAL
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the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’), represented for the purposes of signature of this Agreement by Head of Unit, Research Executive Agency, Industrial Leadership and Societal Challenges Department, Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies, Corinna AMTING,
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on the other part,
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ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA (ATC), established in RIZAREIOU 10, ATHINA 15233, Greece, VAT number: EL094360380, represented for the purposes of signing the Agreement by Legal representative, Yiannis KLIAFAS

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

2. UNIVERSIDAD DE ALCALA (UAH), established in PLAZA DE SAN DIEGO, ALCALA DE HENARES/MADRID 28801, Spain,
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6. The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal asbl (LC), established in rue de la Loi 155, Brussels 1040, Belgium,
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10. UNIVERSITA COMMERCIALE LUIGI BOCCONI (UB), established in VIA SARFATTI 25, MILANO 20136, Italy, VAT number: IT03628350153,

11. BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (CUB), established in FOVAM TER 8, BUDAPEST 1093, Hungary, VAT number: HU15329743,

12. PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS ADVISORY SPA (PWC), established in VIALE MONTE ROSA 91, MILANO 20149, Italy, VAT number: IT03230150967,

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
2a Additional information on the estimated budget
Annex 3 Accession Forms
Annex 4 Model for the financial statements
Annex 5 Model for the certificate on the financial statements (CFS)
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 ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations — Co-VAL’ (‘action’), as described in Annex 1.

ARTICLE 3 — DURATION AND STARTING DATE OF THE ACTION

The duration of the action will be 36 months as of 1 November 2017 (‘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 linked third party) and budget category (see Articles 5, 6, and 14).

4.2 Budget transfers

The estimated budget breakdown indicated in Annex 2 may be adjusted — without an amendment (see Article 55) — by transfers of amounts between beneficiaries, budget categories and/or forms of costs set out in Annex 2, 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 4,461,508.75 (four million four hundred and sixty one thousand five hundred and eight EURO and seventy five 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 **4,461,508.75** (four million four hundred and sixty one thousand five hundred and eight EURO and seventy five 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**)
   - 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 2a (**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 substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or serious breach of 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 and linked third parties (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 or to a linked third party 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 substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or serious breach of 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 seriousness of the errors, irregularities or fraud or 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 the seriousness of the errors, irregularities or fraud or 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:

\{\text{amounts per unit set out in Annex 2a 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 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:

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

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.

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 2a 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 2a multiplied by the number of actual hours worked on the action.

**Calculation**

---

1 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.
Personnel costs must be calculated by the beneficiaries as follows:

{hourly rate
multiplied by
the number of actual hours worked on the action},

plus

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:

{the number of annual productive hours for the year (see below)
minus
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 calculated *per full financial year*, as follows:

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

using the personnel costs and the number of productive hours for each full financial year covered by the reporting period concerned. 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:

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

As an alternative, beneficiaries may calculate the hourly rate per month, as follows:

\[
\frac{\text{actual monthly personnel cost (excluding additional remuneration) for the person}}{\text{number of annual productive hours / 12}}
\]

using the personnel costs for each month and (one twelfth of) the annual productive hours calculated according to either option (i) or (iii) above, i.e.:

- fixed number of hours or
- standard annual productive hours.

Time spent on parental leave may not be deducted when calculating the hourly rate per month. However, beneficiaries may declare personnel costs incurred in periods of parental leave in proportion to the time the person worked on the action in that financial year.

If parts of a basic remuneration are generated over a period longer than a month, the beneficiaries may include only the share which is generated in the month (irrespective of the amount actually paid for that month).

Each beneficiary must use only one option (per full financial year or per month) for each full financial year;

(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 2a (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’**\(^2\) 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 infrastructure\(^3\));

(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.

---

\(^2\) **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.

\(^3\) For the definition, see Article 2(6) of the H2020 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’.
Beneficiaries receiving an operating grant\(^4\) financed by the EU or Euratom budget cannot declare indirect costs for the period covered by the operating grant.

**F. Specific cost category(ies)**

Not applicable

**6.3 Conditions for costs of linked third parties to be eligible**

Costs incurred by linked third parties are eligible if they fulfil — mutatis mutandis — the general and specific conditions for eligibility set out in this Article (Article 6.1 and 6.2) and Article 14.1.1.

**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 or linked third party), 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\(^5\) (or 2014/24/EU\(^6\)) or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC\(^7\) (or 2014/25/EU\(^8\)) 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. The 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 2014/24/EU) or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC (or 2014/25/EU) 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

14.1 Rules for calling upon linked third parties to implement part of the action

14.1.1 The following affiliated entities\textsuperscript{10} and third parties with a legal link to a beneficiary\textsuperscript{11} (‘linked third parties’) may implement the action tasks attributed to them in Annex 1:

\textsuperscript{10} For the definition see Article 2.1(2) Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘affiliated entity’ means any legal entity that is:
- ATC INTERNATIONAL (ATC INTER), affiliated or linked to ATC

The linked third parties may declare as eligible the costs they incur for implementing the action tasks in accordance with Article 6.3.

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 linked third parties.

14.1.2 The beneficiaries must ensure that their obligations under Articles 18, 20, 35, 36 and 38 also apply to their linked third parties.

14.2 Consequences of non-compliance

If any obligation under Article 14.1.1 is breached, the costs of the linked third party will be ineligible (see Article 6) and will be rejected (see Article 42).

If any obligation under Article 14.1.2 is breached, the grant may be reduced (see Article 43).

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

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

- under the direct or indirect control of a participant, or
- under the same direct or indirect control as the participant, or
- 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.

11 ‘Third party with a legal link to a beneficiary’ is any legal entity which has a legal link to the beneficiary implying collaboration that is not limited to the action.
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 Participant Portal 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 or those of its linked third parties and

   (ii) changes in the name, address, legal form, organisation type of its linked third parties;

(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 Article 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 and linked third parties 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.

For costs declared by linked third parties (see Article 14), it is the beneficiary that must keep the originals of the financial statements and the certificates on the financial statements of the linked third parties.

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 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 36

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 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’.

   The report must indicate the communication activities;

   (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 and from each linked third party, 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 and linked third parties 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 and each linked third party 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 and from each linked third party, for the reporting period concerned;

(iii) not applicable;

(iv) a ‘periodic summary financial statement’, 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’, 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 and for each linked third party, 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 and linked third parties 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 and linked third parties 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

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, the Agency may terminate the Agreement (see Article 50) or apply any of the other measures described in Chapter 6.

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 **3,569,207.00** (three million five hundred and sixty nine thousand two hundred and seven EURO).
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 **223,075.44** (two hundred and twenty three thousand seventy five EURO and forty four 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:

1. **Step 1** – Application of the reimbursement rates
2. **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 and the linked third parties (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:

\[
\text{max payment} = 0.9 \times \text{max grant} - \left( \text{pre-financing and previous interim payments} \right)
\]

#### 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 beneficiaries' consent — against any other amount owed by a 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: ING BELGIQUE
Full name of the account holder: ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTRE SA
Full account number (including bank codes): ()
IBAN code: BE18363151177065

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\(^{14}\) and No 2185/96\(^{15}\) (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\(^{17}\), 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).

---


\(^{15}\) Council Regulation (Euratom, EC) No 2185/1996 of 11 November 1996 concerning on-the-spot checks and inspections carried out by the Commission in order to protect the European Communities' financial interests against fraud and other irregularities (OJ L 292, 15.11.1996, p. 2).

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 Agency or the Commission may then start a rejection procedure in accordance with Article 42, on the basis of:

- the revised financial statements, if approved;
- the proposed alternative correction method, if accepted

or

- the initially notified correction rate for extrapolation, if it 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.

22.5.3.2 If the findings concern **substantial errors, irregularities or fraud** or **serious breach of obligations**: 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.

The Agency or the Commission may then start a reduction procedure in accordance with Article 43, on the basis of:

- the proposed alternative flat-rate, if accepted

or

- the initially notified flat-rate, if it does not receive any observations or does not accept the observations or the proposed 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\(^\text{17}\).

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.

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

\(^{17}\)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.
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\textsuperscript{18} established in an EU Member State or ‘\textit{associated country}’\textsuperscript{19}, 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.

\textbf{25.5 Access rights for third parties}

Not applicable

\textbf{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.

\textbf{SUBSECTION 3 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO RESULTS}

\textbf{ARTICLE 26 — OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS}

\textbf{26.1 Ownership by the beneficiary that generates the results}

Results are owned by the beneficiary that generates them.

‘\textit{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.

\textbf{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:

\hspace{1cm} (i) establish the respective contribution of each beneficiary, or

\hspace{2cm} (ii) separate them for the purpose of applying for, obtaining or maintaining their protection (see Article 27).

\textsuperscript{18} For the definition, see ‘affiliated entity’ footnote (Article 14.1).

\textsuperscript{19} For the definition, see Article 2.1(3) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘\textit{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.
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 take place 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 770356.”
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 770356”.

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 770356”.

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).
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 access 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

Not applicable

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 Researchers\(^\text{21}\), 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 AND RESEARCH INTEGRITY

34.1 Obligation to comply with ethical and research integrity principles

The beneficiaries must carry out the action in compliance with:

(a) ethical principles (including the highest standards of research integrity)

---

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 or for activities which destroy human embryos (for example, for obtaining stem cells).

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.

The beneficiaries must respect the highest standards of research integrity — as set out, for instance, in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity22.

This implies notably compliance with the following essential principles:

- honesty;
- reliability;
- objectivity;
- impartiality;
- open communication;
- duty of care;
- fairness and
- responsibility for future science generations.

This means that beneficiaries must ensure that persons carrying out research tasks:

- present their research goals and intentions in an honest and transparent manner;
- design their research carefully and conduct it in a reliable fashion, taking its impact on society into account;

22 The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity of ALLEA (All European Academies) and ESF (European Science Foundation) of March 2011. 
- use techniques and methodologies (including for data collection and management) that are appropriate for the field(s) concerned;

- exercise due care for the subjects of research — be they human beings, animals, the environment or cultural objects;

- ensure objectivity, accuracy and impartiality when disseminating the results;

- allow — in addition to the open access obligations under Article 29.3 as much as possible and taking into account the legitimate interest of the beneficiaries — access to research data, in order to enable research to be reproduced;

- make the necessary references to their work and that of other researchers;

- refrain from practicing any form of plagiarism, data falsification or fabrication;

- avoid double funding, conflicts of interest and misrepresentation of credentials or other research misconduct.

### 34.2 Activities raising ethical issues

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

Before the beginning of an activity raising an ethical issue, each beneficiary must have obtained:

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

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

needed for implementing the action tasks in question.

The documents must be kept on file and be submitted upon request by the coordinator to the Agency (see Article 52). If they are not in English, they must be submitted together with an English summary, which shows that the action tasks in question are covered and includes the conclusions of the committee or authority concerned (if available).

### 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, in addition to Article 34.1, 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. It may disclose confidential information to 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 1290/2013\(^{23}\), 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 information

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 770356”.

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 770356”.

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 Agency and Commission responsibility

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

38.2 Communication activities by the Agency and the Commission

38.2.1 Right to use beneficiaries’ materials, documents or information

The Agency and the Commission 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 received 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.

If the Agency’s or the Commission’s use of these materials, documents or information would risk compromising legitimate interests, the beneficiary concerned may request the Agency or the Commission 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, the Commission 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 or the Commission.

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 or the Commission will insert the following information:

“© – [year] – [name of the copyright owner]. All rights reserved. Licensed to the Research Executive Agency (REA) and the European Union (EU) 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 45/2001 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 privacy statement(s) 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 privacy statement(s) (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
— RELATIONSHIP WITH COMPLEMENTARY BENEFICIARIES —
RELATIONSHIP WITH PARTNERS OF A JOINT ACTION

ARTICLE 41 — DIVISION OF BENEFICIARIES’ ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
— RELATIONSHIP WITH COMPLEMENTARY BENEFICIARIES —
RELATIONSHIP WITH PARTNERS OF A JOINT ACTION

41.1 Roles and responsibility 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 Participant Portal 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 its linked third parties 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 or subcontract the above-mentioned tasks to any other beneficiary or third party (including linked third parties).

### 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 — SANCTIONS — DAMAGES — SUSPENSION — TERMINATION — FORCE MAJEURE

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

ARTICLE 42 — REJECTION OF INELIGIBLE COSTS

42.1 Conditions

The Agency will — after termination of the participation of a beneficiary, 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).

The rejection may also be based on the extension of findings from other grants to this grant (see Article 22.5.2).

42.2 Ineligible costs to be rejected — Calculation — Procedure

Ineligible costs will be rejected in full.

If the rejection of costs does not lead to a recovery (see Article 44), the Agency will formally notify the coordinator or beneficiary concerned of 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 rejection of costs leads to a recovery, the Agency will follow the contradictory procedure with pre-information letter set out in Article 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 rejects costs after termination of the participation of a beneficiary, it will deduct them from the costs declared by the beneficiary in the termination report and include the rejection in the calculation after termination (see Article 50.2 and 50.3).

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

The Agency may — after termination of the participation of a beneficiary, at the payment of the balance or afterwards — reduce the grant amount (see Article 5.1), if:

(a) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has committed:
   
   (i) substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or
   
   (ii) serious breach of obligations under the Agreement or during the award procedure (including improper implementation of the action, submission of false information, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles) or

(b) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decision on its behalf) 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).

43.2 Amount to be reduced — Calculation — Procedure

The amount of the reduction will be proportionate to the seriousness of the errors, irregularities or fraud or breach of obligations.

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 after termination of the participation of a beneficiary, it will calculate the reduced grant amount for that beneficiary and then determine the amount due to that beneficiary (see Article 50.2 and 50.3).

If the Agency reduces the grant at 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 (including undue amounts paid by the Agency for costs declared by its linked third parties), 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/EC27 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:

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

(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:

\[
\text{amount calculated according to point (a) for the beneficiary concerned} \\
\times \frac{1}{\text{sum of the amounts calculated according to point (a) for all the beneficiaries identified according to point (a)}} \\
\times \text{amount set out in the debit note formally notified to the coordinator}.
\]

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:

\[
\text{beneficiary’s costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency} \\
\times \text{reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned}.
\]
plus
its linked third parties’ 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 each linked third party concerned

divided by
the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1

multiplied by
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:

(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 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 SANCTIONS

In addition to contractual measures, the Agency or the Commission may also adopt administrative sanctions under Articles 106 and 131(4) of the Financial Regulation No 966/2012 (i.e. exclusion from future procurement contracts, grants and expert contracts and/or financial penalties).

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

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.

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 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 payments, in whole or in part and for one or more beneficiaries, if:

(a) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decision on its behalf) has committed or is suspected of having committed:

(i) substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or

(ii) serious breach of obligations under the Agreement or during the award procedure (including improper implementation of the action, submission of false information, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles) or

(b) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decision on its behalf) 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).

If payments are suspended for one or more beneficiaries, the Agency will make partial payment(s) for the part(s) not suspended. If suspension concerns the payment of the balance, — once suspension is lifted — the payment or the recovery of the amount(s) concerned will be considered the payment of the balance that closes the action.

48.2 Procedure

Before suspending payments, the Agency will formally notify the coordinator or beneficiary concerned:

- 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 or beneficiary concerned.
During the suspension, the periodic report(s) for all reporting periods except the last one (see Article 20.3), must not contain any individual financial statements from the beneficiary concerned and its linked third parties. The coordinator must include them in the next periodic report after the suspension is lifted or — if suspension is not lifted before the end of the action — in the last 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, if:

(a) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has committed or is suspected of having committed:

(i) substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or
(ii) serious breach of obligations under the Agreement or during the award procedure (including improper implementation of the action, submission of false declaration, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles);

(b) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) 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) 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 or beneficiary concerned:

- 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 (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 or beneficiary concerned 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, 40, 42, 43 and 44) 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 — calculate the amount which is due to the beneficiary and if the (pre-financing and interim) payments received by the beneficiary exceed this amount.

The **amount which is due** is calculated in the following steps:

**Step 1 — Application of the reimbursement rate to the eligible costs**

The grant amount for the beneficiary is calculated by applying the reimbursement rate(s) to the total eligible costs declared by the beneficiary and its linked third parties in the termination report 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.

**Step 2 — Reduction due to substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or serious breach of obligations**

In case of a reduction (see Article 43), the Agency will calculate the reduced grant amount for the beneficiary by deducting the amount of the reduction (calculated in proportion to the seriousness of the errors, irregularities or fraud or breach of obligations, in accordance with Article 43.2) from the grant amount for the beneficiary.

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 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.

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, 40, 42, 43 and 44) 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 (or those of its linked third parties) 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;
(l) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) has committed:

   (i) substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or

   (ii) serious breach of obligations under the Agreement or during the award procedure (including improper implementation of the action, submission of false information, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles);

(m) a beneficiary (or a natural person who has the power to represent or take decisions on its behalf) 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).

(n) despite a specific request by the Agency, a beneficiary does not request — through the coordinator — an amendment to the Agreement to end the participation of one of its linked third parties that is in one of the situations under points (e), (f), (g), (k), (l) or (m) and to reallocate its tasks.

50.3.2 Procedure

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

- 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 or beneficiary concerned 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), (l.ii) and (n) 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.

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 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 sanctions (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, 40, 42, 43 and 44) 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 necessary, the addition of one or more new beneficiaries (see Article 56). 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 — calculate the amount which is due to the beneficiary and if the (pre-financing and interim) payments received by the beneficiary exceed this amount.

The amount which is due is calculated in the following steps:

Step 1 — Application of the reimbursement rate to the eligible costs

The grant amount for the beneficiary is calculated by applying the reimbursement rate(s) to the total eligible costs declared by the beneficiary and its linked third parties in the termination report 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.

Step 2 — Reduction due to substantial errors, irregularities or fraud or serious breach of obligations

In case of a reduction (see Article 43), the Agency will calculate the reduced grant amount for the beneficiary by deducting the amount of the reduction (calculated in proportion to the seriousness of the errors, irregularities or fraud or breach of obligations, in accordance with Article 43.2) from the grant amount for the beneficiary.

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 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, 40, 42, 43 and 44) 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 Participant Portal Terms & Conditions. 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 Participant Portal Terms & Conditions).

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  
Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies  
COV2 16/046  
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 Participant Portal Beneficiary Register.

**ARTICLE 53 — INTERPRETATION OF THE AGREEMENT**

53.1 **Precedence of the Terms and Conditions over the Annexes**


53.2 **Privileges and immunities**

Not applicable

**ARTICLE 54 — CALCULATION OF PERIODS, DATES AND DEADLINES**

In accordance with Regulation No 1182/71\(^28\), 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).

As an exception, if such a dispute is between the Agency and HOGSKOLEN I INNLANDET, the competent Belgian courts have sole jurisdiction.

If a dispute concerns administrative sanctions, 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.
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1.1. The project summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>770356</th>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>Co-VAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

One form per project

General information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting date</td>
<td>01/11/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration in months</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call (part) identifier</td>
<td>H2020-SC6-CULT-COOP-2017-one-stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>CULT-COOP-11-2016-2017 Understanding the transformation of European public administrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed EC Keywords</td>
<td>Social innovation, Open government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free keywords</td>
<td>co-creation, public administrations, public services, service-dominant logic, service innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abstract

The main goal of Co-VAL is to discover, analyse, and provide policy recommendations for transformative strategies that integrate the co-creation of value in public administrations. The project aims to accomplish these objectives by conducting research on the paradigm shift from the traditional top-down model to demand and bottom-up driven models when citizens, civil servants, private, and third sector organizations voluntarily participate in the development of transformative innovations addressing changing needs and social problems.

Co-VAL will push the boundaries of both research and practice by providing: i) a comprehensive and holistic theoretical framework for understanding value co-creation in public services from a service-dominant logic and a service innovation multiagent framework, ii) measurement and monitoring for transformations in the public sector by using both existing data and new metrics (large-scale survey), iii) investigation on 4 public-service-related co-creation areas of public sector transformation: digital transformation (including open platforms, big data, and digital service delivery), service design (including service blue-printing), government living labs, and innovative structural relationships (public-private innovation networks and social innovation), and iv) generation of sustainable impacts in public administration policy and practice by delivering actionable policy recommendations that build on the research findings, by tracking and monitoring how governments’ pilot projects and actions, and by facilitating peer to peer knowledge exchange to facilitate implementation.

Co-VAL is a consortium of 13 teams from 11 EU countries formed by leading experts in public administration, co-creation and open governance, digital economy and service innovation. The consortium is organised to co-work with stakeholders representing central, regional and local administrations.
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>ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA</td>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNIVERSIDAD DE ALCALA</td>
<td>UAH</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH</td>
<td>UEDIN</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNIVERSITAT KONSTANZ</td>
<td>UKON</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNIVERSITE DES SCIENCES ET TECHNOLOGIES DE LILLE I</td>
<td>USTL</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal asbl</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT</td>
<td>UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HOGSKOLEN I INNLANDET</td>
<td>INN</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET</td>
<td>RUC</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNIVERSITA COMMERCIALE LUIGI BOCCONI</td>
<td>UB</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM</td>
<td>CUB</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS ADVISORY SPA</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Digital transformation of public administrations</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>37.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Service design for public sector transformation</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation</td>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Policy implications for public sector transformation</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>Sustainable policy impact</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>Dissemination and Communication</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP12</td>
<td>Ethics requirements</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 496.00
### 1.3.2. WT2 list of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>WP number</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>Literature review on public service reform models</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Research report on the case studies</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Research report on the experiments</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>Final synoptic WP Research Report integrating the above and drawing out its conclusions</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Mapping and instruments providing data on the co-creation of public services</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Draft questionnaires for cognitive testing plus the final questionnaires</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Report summarizing cognitive testing plus the final questionnaire</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>List (confidential) of contact details for sampled managers plus sampling protocol</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Survey implementation protocol</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Completed and cleaned survey dataset (confidential)</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.7</td>
<td>Preliminary survey results</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.8</td>
<td>Final report of survey results</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>Expert interviews, transcripts</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report summarizing policy and process tracing outcomes for cases</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Case summary reports and comparative analysis across cases</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4</td>
<td>Results of ethnographies</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.5</td>
<td>Preliminary data analysis and report</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Report on cross country comparison on service design</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Report on in-depth case studies</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Toolbox report on service design approaches to co-creation of public value</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Report on cross country comparison on existing innovation and living labs</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Report on strategic case studies</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Report on participatory stakeholder model</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>4th empirical approach to value co-creation in public services: structural transformations</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Transversal results and scientific articles produced within WP 6</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>4 Policy Briefs</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>3 Reports summarizing the results from the minisurvey</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Sustainability plan</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.1</td>
<td>Co-design of panel report</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Panel activity summary report</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Co-Design of the databases</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.4</td>
<td>Publication of the repository</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.5</td>
<td>Report from online engagement</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.1</td>
<td>Methodology for monitoring</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>Online prototype tracker</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>Guidelines for country experts</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>Complete Dashboard</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>2 yearly reports</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.1</td>
<td>Project Website and Social Media</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.2</td>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.3</td>
<td>Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v1.0</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.4</td>
<td>Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v2.0</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.1</td>
<td>Project quality and assessment plan</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.2</td>
<td>Data management Plan v1.0</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.3</td>
<td>Data management Plan v2.0</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D12.1</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>WP12</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>3</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work package title**: Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL

**Start month**: 1  **End month**: 36

**Objectives**

(i) To map and evaluate extant frameworks for public management reform and the range of roles that citizens play in these;

(ii) To develop further the public service dominant theory as a conceptual framework for the Co-VAL project and in particular to integrate the element of digital governance into it;

(iii) To test out this emergent framework through a series of cross-national case studies;

(iv) To use this empirical analysis to develop the contingencies, challenges and opportunities for citizen engagement in public service delivery through the public service dominant framework.

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP1 - Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL** [Months: 1-36]

UEDIN, ATC, UAH, UKON, USTL, LC, UM-MERIT, INN, RUC, UB

Task 1.1: Map the range of approaches to public service reform in the existing literature (UEDIN) M1-M8

The task here will be to conduct a structured literature review that will identify current frameworks through to understand and enact public service reform and to evaluate the strength of each of these frameworks against the Co-VAL criteria. It will cover the conceptual and theoretical roots of each framework, and evaluation of it both as a framework for practice and as a framework of analysis.

Partners’ Role in this task: UEDIN will conduct the literature review

Task 1.2: Explore the differing roles and relationships of citizens, public service users, service delivery staff, managers and politicians in public service reform through case study methodology (UEDIN) M8-M10

The task here will be to conduct four case studies (across the Co-VAL policy areas) of ongoing public service reform in each of two countries with the intent to clarify specifically how the roles of citizens, service users, managers and politicians are understood. The two countries will be Scotland and Germany as exemplars of large and small states with potentially competing mechanisms for engagement. The case studies will explore the policy drivers of each case. As well as the processes through which they were enacted at the local level, and the comparative evaluation of their success in engagement across the different stakeholder groups identified above.

Partners’ Role in this task: UEDIN will provide the framework for the case studies. Both UEDIN and UKON will conduct the case studies. UEDIN will write the report.

Task 1.3: Test an emergent model of public service reform on the basis of this new framework, through experimental methods (UKON) M10-M12

Having evaluated the approaches identified above this WP will then work with key stakeholders at the local level to set up 2 experiments. These will be designed to address the issues raised in the case evaluations from task 1.2 within a public service-dominant framework. They will be small scale discrete experiments designed to test out if a public service-dominant approach to engagement is significantly more effective than previous approaches and with what contingencies.

Partners’ Role in this task: UKON will provide the framework for the experiments. Both UEDIN and UKON will conduct the experiments. UKON will write the report.

Task 1.4: Identify the key contingencies of effective citizen-centred public service reform through the above case studies and experiments (UEDIN) 12-M14

This task will be to synthesise the evidence arising out of the literature review, case study evaluations and exploratory experiments in order to define the key contingencies of citizen-centred public service reform.

Partners’ Role in this task: UEDIN will lead the synoptic analysis with support from UKON. UEDIN will write the report.
Task 1.5: Use the above data to build and test theory and practice models of citizen-centred public service reform (UEDIN) M14-M36

The final task will be to use the practice evidence above to test and refine theory on citizen-centred engagement and specifically to explore the extent to which a public service-dominant approach is theoretically and empirically robust.

Partners’ Role in this task: UEDIN will lead the theory and practice model testing, with support from Konstanz. UEDIN will write the report.

**Participation per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP1 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - UB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50.00</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>Literature review on public service reform models</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Research report on the case studies</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Research report on the experiments</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>Final synoptic WP Research Report integrating the above and drawing out its conclusions</td>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of deliverables**

D1.1 : Literature review on public service reform models [6]
To review and evaluate existing evidence.

D1.2 : Research report on the case studies [9]
To review and evaluate the evidence on current engagement from the case studies.
D1.3 : Research report on the experiments [13]
To review and evaluate the evidence on future engagement on the basis of the experiments.
D1.4 : Final synoptic WP Research Report integrating the above and drawing out its conclusions [36]
To pull together the findings and evidence from the prior deliverables and to draw out the implications, contingencies and contributions both for policy and practice and for theory.

### 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>MS2</td>
<td>Initial framework for public service reform is defined</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package number</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

WP2 is a core WP measuring and monitoring transformative innovations in the public sector. In addition to analyses of publicly available data and case studies, it includes a large-scale survey of public administration managers responsible for innovation projects and a smaller linked survey of managers of NGOs and other organisations involved in co-creation roles on public sector innovations. The surveys will be conducted in six countries represented by a project partner in the project (France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and the UK). The surveys will focus on the use of collaboration and co-creation in innovative projects in order to produce policy-relevant metrics of co-creation activities and analyses of the factors that influence how collaboration occurs, the roles of different partners in innovative public administration projects, the factors that lead to failure or success, and the impacts of value co-creation in public services.

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP2 - Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation** [Months: 6-30]

**UM-MERIT, UAH, UEDIN, USTL, INN, CUB**

**Task 2.1: Mapping of existing studies providing data on value co-creation in public administration (UM-MERIT) M6-M9**

This task will identify existing (inter)national studies dealing with the measurement of value co-creation in public services, including survey research and analyses of publicly available data obtained from the internet and other sources. Particular attention will be paid to measurement practices, appropriate units of measurement, and recommendations provided for the creation of indicators. An important task is to identify data that can be collected from non-survey sources and data that must be collected in a survey because no other sources are available. Results will be presented as deliverable D2.1 in Month 9. Where possible, existing data will be used to create indicators for co-creation.

**Partners’ role in this task:** UM-MERIT will lead the mapping exercise, with partners providing a review of existing studies and available data in their own country.

**Task 2.2: Design a questionnaire on value co-creation in public administration (UM-MERIT) M10-M15**

Using the results from WP1 and Task 2.1, questionnaire design will be undertaken in 3 steps. Step 1 will identify the main survey questions that are required to collect data. Step 2 will produce two preliminary survey questionnaires, one for public administrators and the other for managers of NGOs/non-governmental collaboration partners, focusing on a respondent-identified most important service innovation introduced in the previous three years. Questionnaire development will start by scanning existing surveys on public sector innovation, collaboration and co-creation. Consecutive drafts of the questionnaires (in English) will be evaluated by consortium partners until an acceptable draft is produced. Step 3 involves cognitively testing national language versions of the draft questionnaire in approximately 12 face-to-face interviews (10 with public sector managers and 2 with NGO managers) in each country for a total of 72 interviews. The end result of this step is two final, tested questionnaires for use in the surveys. Results will be presented as deliverables D2.2 and D2.3 in Months 12 and 15, respectively.

**Partners’ role in this task:** UM-MERIT will lead this task, will draft the questionnaire, train other partners in doing cognitive interviews and do two face-to-face interviews in the Netherlands. Partners will translate the questions, conduct the cognitive testing in their country and make recommendations for changes to the questions based on their cognitive testing results.

**Task 2.3: Construct a comparable and representative sample of public sector and NGO managers to survey in 6 countries (UM-MERIT) M10-M16**

Three methods have been used in public sector innovation surveys. Business registers can be used to send questionnaires to agency heads. Ad hoc methods of identifying managers and using lists of managers held by public sector agencies, will sample middle managers who are often closely involved in the development and implementation of innovations co-created with businesses and citizens. The preference is to use sample both middle managers and agency heads. NGOs (and other partner organisations) will be identified through the survey of public administrators. Step 1 will develop a sample protocol that is flexible enough to cover municipalities, regional and central governments. Step 2 will construct six national samples. Given expected response rates of about 40%, a total sample size of 3,375 public sector and 300
NGO managers will be required to obtain respectively 1,350 and 120 responses. Between 50% and 70% are likely to report a service innovation, of which 80% involves collaboration, giving a minimum estimate of about 600 cases of service innovations involving collaboration. Step 3 will survey a subset of about 120 cases with identified non-governmental partners actively involved in co-creation or collaborated on innovations with a service component. The results will be presented as deliverable D2.4 in Month 16.

Partners’ role in this task: UM-MERIT will develop protocols and be responsible for the Netherlands and the UK. Partners will construct a database of public sector and NGO managers for their country.

Task 2.4: Survey implementation (UM-MERIT) M10-M16

Step 1 involves developing a survey protocol to ensure consistency in implementation (including survey method (online or mailed), follow-up routine (reminders and telephone calls), etc.). If emails are available for respondents, the survey will begin online and switch to a mailed questionnaire for non-respondents. Step 2 consists of the survey implementation, which could take four months for the survey of public administration managers, followed by three months for the second survey of NGOs. Step 3 consists of data cleaning. Results will be presented as deliverable D2.5 in Month 16.

Partners’ role in this task: UM-MERIT will, to improve efficiency and reduce costs, handle almost all of the survey implementation and data-cleaning tasks. Partners will only be responsible for telephone follow-up calls to non-respondents.

Task 2.5: Analysis and report (UM-MERIT) M17-M21

The analyses of the cleaned data will construct policy relevant metrics for co-creation and use both multivariate regression and fuzzy Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) to investigate the research questions described under the objectives. The report will provide main results and indicators by country, agency function, agency size, middle managers and agency heads, etc. However, the most useful results will be obtained through in-depth analyses of specific research questions, such as how managers deal with risk or the role of co-creation and collaboration in successful outcomes. Results will be presented as deliverable D2.6 and D2.7 in Months 21 respectively 24.

Partners’ role in this task: UM-MERIT will provide the general analyses for all countries combined and the separate analyses for the Netherlands and the UK. Other partners involved in the analyses will conduct more in-depth analyses of the data for their own country.

Task 2.6 Validation workshop (UM-MERIT) M25-M30

The results of the survey will be validated in a 1-day workshop in Month 25 in Brussels with key stakeholders, including academics, policy makers, and representatives from organisations active in the co-creation of public services. The number of invited participants will be limited to 20, plus up to 5 persons from the EC and 5 persons from the project team. The recommendations will be used to finalise the analysis of the survey and both will be presented in Month 30 as deliverable D2.8.

Partners’ role in this task: UM-MERIT will organize the workshop and co-ordinate the final report. Partners active in data analysis will attend the workshop and provide input to the final report.

**Participation per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP2 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - CUB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.00</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>D2.1</td>
<td>Mapping and instruments providing data on the co-creation of public services</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Draft questionnaires for cognitive testing plus the final questionnaires</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Report summarizing cognitive testing plus the final questionnaire</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>List (confidential) of contact details for sampled managers plus sampling protocol</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Survey implementation protocol</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Completed and cleaned survey dataset (confidential)</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.7</td>
<td>Preliminary survey results</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.8</td>
<td>Final report of survey results</td>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of deliverables

D2.1 : Mapping and instruments providing data on the co-creation of public services [9]
The main objective is to provide a review of available data and to create comparative indicators on the use of co-creation and transformative service innovations in the public sector. The indicators will be designed to meet requirements for monitoring over time and benchmarking across countries.

D2.2 : Draft questionnaires for cognitive testing plus the final questionnaires [12]
The main output is two draft questionnaires (one for public sector organisations and one for NGO/private sector collaboration partners) for cognitive testing.

D2.3 : Report summarizing cognitive testing plus the final questionnaire [15]
The report will include the two final questionnaires for the survey, plus a description of the cognitive testing results and explanations of the reasons for all changes compared to the draft questionnaires.

D2.4 : List (confidential) of contact details for sampled managers plus sampling protocol [16]
This will consist of a full list of contact details (name, position, email address, telephone number) for managers to be included in the survey plus the sampling protocol which describes the selection process for each partner country. For confidentiality and ethical reasons, the list will only be available to partners participating in WP2, but the protocols will be publicly available.

D2.5 : Survey implementation protocol [16]
This report will include a detailed description of the survey protocol, including the timeline, the number of contacted managers on specific dates, the timing of online and mailed contacts, all telephone follow-ups, contact and follow-up letters, etc.

D2.6: Completed and cleaned survey dataset (confidential) [21]
For confidentiality reasons, the survey dataset will only be available to WP2 partners. Depending on demand and costs, an aggregated dataset that preserves confidentiality could be constructed.

D2.7: Preliminary survey results [24]
This report will include preliminary descriptive results from the survey, for all countries combined and for individual countries. It also includes indicators for transformative innovation and co-creation.

D2.8: Final report of survey results [30]
The final report will provide a methodological overview (cognitive testing, sample selection etc), descriptive results, and econometric results using regression and QCA analytical methods to identify the factors that encourage co-creation, transformative innovation and innovation benefits.

<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>MS4</td>
<td>Instruments for monitoring and data collection, including the implementation protocol, are ready</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Results from data gathering are analysed</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

The objectives of this working package include: (1) Identify and extract the reasons why public administrations are investing into digital transformation activities, goals and expected outcomes, drivers for digital transformation in the public sector, changing internal mindsets and culture to redirect design and implementation paradigm away from their own internal logic toward a human centred design that moves the citizen into the center of the design process. (2) Identify the methods that public managers are adapting from the private sector that are contributing to internal and external public value creation, introduction of these methods. (3) Create international cases of digital transformation describing the relationships to their stakeholders, especially to the contracting industry, and change acquisition routines and policies. 4) Identify new forms of IT acquisition and innovative policies.

Description of work and role of partners

WP3 - Digital transformation of public administrations [Months: 1-36]
UKON, UAH, USTL, LC, RUC, UB

Task 3.1: Expert interviews to define digital transformation in the public sector (UKON) M1-M9
An literature review of the existing academic literature in combination with expert interviews of public managers and ICT consultants will be used to define digital transformation and delineate the differences to the current terms used such as digital government, e-government, and online service delivery.

Partners’ role in this task: The partners will provide access to experts on digital transformation in their countries and will conduct interviews in the country’s language in case the experts won’t be able to respond in English. They will recruit a local transcriptionist and translator to provide the transcripts in English to the consortium.

Task 3.2: Policy and process tracing of international digital transformation practices (UKON) M1-M12
A policy and process tracing approach will be used for country cases included in task 3.3 to conduct an upfront desk research of media coverage, official government reports, as well as to build a repository of existing bills and policies that might have been changed to allow for digital transformation activities (Collier 2011). The results of the policy and process tracing approach is a comparative overview of items such as political system, necessary policy changes, resulting digital transformation agenda, accompanying e-government and innovation concepts, traceable results of digital transformation approaches (D3.2).

Partners’ role in this task: The partners will be asked to follow the policy tracing approach in their countries and provide access to official government documents to support the digital transformation and implementation efforts.

Task 3.3: International comparison of digital public management practices (UKON) M12-M18
An international comparison of public management practices across several countries as embedded cases with several integrated cases that represent selected public administrations (Yin 2013, Scholz and Tietje 2002). Countries: UK, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Estonia. The case studies will be developed based on the results from task 3.1 and conducted during months M10-18. The deliverables D3.3 are: reports for each case and a comparative analysis across all included cases.

Partners’ role in this task: The following countries will be asked to prepare digital transformation cases: Italy, Denmark, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, UK. The role of the partners is to select an appropriate case following pre-determined selection criteria developed by UKON, a shared interview guide provided by UKON, and a shared structure to report the results of each case.

Task 3.4: Ethnographic methods to extract human centred design processes of co-design and co-innovation processes (UKON) M18-M25
We will use ethnographic methods to understand how public administrations are extracting, analysing, and integrating the viewpoints of their clients into the co-design and co-creation processes. We will participate in these client interviews, observe the interactions and outcomes, and trace how the knowledge extracted from interviews is funnelled into the (re)design of ICTs (Miles and Huberman 1994, Glaser and Strauss 1967).
Partners’ role in this task: This task will be taken by the WP leader only.

Task 3.5: Preliminary results and report (UKON) M26-M36

The final task includes the analysis (M26-M30) and the report of the findings (M31-36) across the previous tasks T3.1-T3.4.

Partners’ Role in this task: The task of the partners is to review the initial draft provided by UKON and to provide additional details and corrections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP3 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - UB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.00</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>D3.1</td>
<td>Expert interviews, transcripts</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report summarizing policy and process tracing outcomes for cases</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Case summary reports and comparative analysis across cases</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4</td>
<td>Results of ethnographies</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.5</td>
<td>Preliminary data analysis and report</td>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</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>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D3.1 : Expert interviews, transcripts [9]
20-30 expert interviews with international experts working on digital transformation projects, including public managers, IT consultants who are working for example on applying agile methods. The interviews will be recorded, transcribed, and if necessary translated to English.

D3.2 : Report summarizing policy and process tracing outcomes for cases [12]
A map and timetable of the identified policies and processes extracted during the policy and process tracing approaches.

D3.3 : Case summary reports and comparative analysis across cases [18]
Case reports provided by country partners following a shared structure provided by UKON. The lead partner will provide a summary overview of the main themes including similarities and differences.

D3.4 : Results of ethnographies [25]
UKON will prepare a report of the ethnographies.

D3.5 : Preliminary data analysis and report [36]
The final report will include the preliminary results across tasks 3.1-3.4.

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>MS3</td>
<td>Initial cross-country case studies are specified</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Impact on research analysis is documented</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number 9  WP4  Lead beneficiary 8 - INN
Work package title  Service design for public sector transformation
Start month 1  End month 36

Objectives

This WP will investigate the use of service design methods and assess how service design may enable co-creation of public value. The WP will document various service design techniques and methods, and examine the use of service design in practice through case studies within public services dealing with vulnerable groups such as elderly care, welfare and social services. In line with the overall objectives of the project, the case studies will focus on how service design may enable and enhance co-creation of public value. The WP will more specifically analyse the potential impact and limitations of service design approaches as means for co-creating public value. The WP will thus make essential contributions to the overall objectives of the project by integrating findings from empirical studies on co-creation of value through service design with theories on public value and PSDL.

Description of work and role of partners

WP4 - Service design for public sector transformation [Months: 1-36]
INN, UAH, UEDIN, USTL, CUB
Task 4.1: A cross country comparison of the use of service innovation in the public sector (INN) M1-M12

As the first task of the WP, we will review the literature of service design thinking, methods and techniques; we will review the theoretical and conceptual literature on services design in public sector services, and map in particular the literature that convey empirical examples and studies on the use of service design in public sector service settings. The literature review conducted as a first task of the WP will be central in identifying new and innovative tools and techniques that should be included in the empirical case studies. Final delivery: M18.

Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will provide inputs to the cross-country comparison on the use of service design in public services by providing references to relevant literature and examples in the partner countries. INN will be mainly responsible for the systematization and analysis of the literature and for writing the report with support from UEDIN, USTL and CUB.

Task 4.2: In depth case studies of how service design approaches can be used for co-innovation and co-creation of services (INN) M12-M24

Case studies will be undertaken in 4 countries to gain insight on the contingencies, potential and limitation of service design approaches in efforts to co-create value in public service delivery.” Final delivery is Month 24.

Partners’ Role in this task: Rolf – All partners will take part in assessing which sites the case studies should be carried out based on the cross country comparison literature review. The WP leader, INN will be responsible for carrying out the fieldwork constituting the case studies with active support from UEDIN, USTL and CUB.

Task 4.3: Developing a toolbox for service design approaches to enable co-creation of public value (INN) M24-M36
This task will entail extraction of findings from the work carried out under task 4.1 and 4.2, which will be used as a basis for developing a practical and pedagogical guide and toolbox of service design methods and techniques refined and adapted to public sector services settings. Final delivery is Month 36.

Partners’ Role in this task: INN will be responsible for the development of the toolbox report in close collaboration with UEDIN, USTL and CUB.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP4 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner number and short name</td>
<td>WP4 effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - CUB</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.00</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 cross country comparison on service design</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Report on in-depth case studies</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Toolbox report on service design approaches to co-creation of public value</td>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

D4.1: Report on cross country comparison on service design [12]
The literature review report will convey findings on service design thinking, methods and techniques in use in various public service settings in Europe, it will analyse potential benefits and limitations of public sector service design in a PSDL perspective.

D4.2: Report on in-depth case studies [24]
The case study report will convey findings on the potential impacts and limitations of various service design approaches in different European settings.

D4.3: Toolbox report on service design approaches to co-creation of public value [36]
The toolbox will provide policy makers, public sector managers and service designers, practical knowledge and tools for pursuing service design approaches as means for co-creating public value in public service delivery.

### 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>MS3</td>
<td>Initial cross-country case studies are specified</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Impact on research analysis is documented</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The WP investigates the concept and method of innovation and living labs and how innovation and living labs and other participatory and experimental methods are used to enable value co-creation based on co-innovation of public services. Case-studies will be provided that can generate knowledge about how innovation and living labs are used to bring actors together and carry out citizen-based innovation in real-life settings while also contributing to public value generation in terms of overall service quality and efficiency, public trust and social inclusion. The WP will analyse the structures and tools of innovation and living labs and how they are integrated into public administration in different ways across Europe. WP5 will be a major contribution to co-creation research by exploring how new institutional arrangement are provided to ensure an experiential and citizen-based approach to service development in the context of public administration, and the kind of institutional work that must be provided to transform public services in a sustainable way within a PSDL framework.

**WP5 - Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation [Months: 1-36]**

**RUC, UAH, UKON, USTL, LC, INN, PWC**

**Task 5.1: A cross country comparison of the use of innovation labs in the public sector (RUC) M1-M16**

This work task provides a review of the literature about living labs and other experimental and participative methods in public, private and civil sectors. It explores different concepts, theories and empirical examples of innovation and living lab activities in public services as well as their role for co-creation and co-innovation of services. How such approaches may work as participatory and open structures for co-creation and co-innovation in the context of the public sector and public value will be investigated as well as their limitations for this. Final delivery is Month 18.

Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will contribute to the mapping and literature review.

**Task 5.2: In depth case studies of how living lab approaches are used for co-creation and co-innovation (RUC) M4-M26**

Case studies will be undertaken in the participating countries to explore what innovation and living lab approaches tell about introducing new, open institutional structures of innovation in real-life settings for co-creation and co-innovation of public services. Concrete comparisons of how living labs and experimental and participatory models work, what their practices and structures and outcomes are, and what kind of institutional work they provide for co-creation and co-innovation will be investigated in order to learn as much as possible from living labs with respect to how action strategies for co-creation and co-innovation can be formed, how such institutional structures address individual and public values and resolve conflicts between them. An extensive understanding and analysis of how living lab approaches emerge and achieve legitimacy in specific public sector services will be part of the analysis. Final delivery is Month 24.

Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will contribute with cases from their own country.

**Task 5.3: Developing a model of an experimental, participatory, stakeholder-based approach to co-creation and co-innovation (RUC) M26-M36**

This work is a complement to tasks 5.1 and 5.2. On the basis of and extending tasks 5.1 and 5.2, a model of living labs will be extracted and theorized that can be used in public services in areas such as elderly care or other welfare services. The main focus will be the rationales of the living labs, their different participatory structures, how they can target individual and public value generation, the kind of institutional work that is provided to strengthen co-creation and co-innovation in public administration, how strategic actions can be formed and strengthened that lead to robust and sustainable forms of co-creation in public services, and a model that describes the stakeholders involved, including especially the role of citizens. Final delivery is Month 30.

Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will contribute in the modelling and theorizing of living labs.
Partner number and short name | WP5 effort
---|---
2 - UAH | 5.00
4 - UKON | 6.00
5 - USTL | 4.00
6 - LC | 4.00
8 - INN | 5.00
9 - RUC | 14.00
12 - PWC | 6.00

**Total** | **44.00**

### 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>Report on cross country comparison on existing innovation and living labs</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Report on strategic case studies</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Report on participatory stakeholder model</td>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D5.1 : Report on cross country comparison on existing innovation and living labs [16]**
Providing a review of existing innovation and living labs and other experimental approaches to innovation.

**D5.2 : Report on strategic case studies [26]**
Providing in depths case studies of innovation living labs in participating countries. Analysing how they evolve as organizational and institutional structures and arrangements.

**D5.3 : Report on participatory stakeholder model [36]**
Analysing the organizational models, rationales and tools of living labs in the public sector to support co-creation and public value creation.

### 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>MS3</td>
<td>Initial cross-country case studies are specified</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>Impact on research analysis is documented</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number 9  WP6  Lead beneficiary 10  5 - USTL

Work package title  Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation

Start month  1  End month  36

Objectives

The objectives of this WP are the following ones:
1. Mapping of the existence of PSINs experiences across the different European countries
2. Analyzing a certain number cases of PSINs in the different European countries involved in the project
3. Deriving theoretical implications for SDL and multiagent frameworks
4. Deriving measurement, managerial, and political implications from PSINs cases

Description of work and role of partners

WP6 - Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation [Months: 1-36]
USTL, UAH, INN, RUC, CUB
Task 6.1: Case selection (USTL) M1-M6
The PSINs cases will be selected, in different countries and different fields, on the basis that they are examples of intensive public-private collaboration in the field of public service innovation.
Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will identify relevant cases in different fields in their country.
Task 6.2: Development of the case-study framework (USTL) M1-M6
The analytical framework will be developed and implemented in order to ensure comparability across countries and fields. Thus, while each case study is an independent analysis, all share the same structure and deal with the generic set of project research questions.
Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will contribute to the design of the analytical framework.
Task 6.3: Data collection (USTL) M6-M18
The analytical framework will be applied to a set of selected public service innovations and public service innovation networks. Data will be collected through interviews with representatives of public institutions, firms, users and users associations participating in the innovation networks. Data collection is not necessarily restricted to the home country of the participant.
Partners’ Role in this task: All partners will collect data.
Task 6.4: Empirical analysis and impact assessment (USTL) M6-M24
Once the analytical framework and the data collection are ready, the empirical analysis will be implemented. We will test the role of PSINs as a co-innovation and value co-creation source and an organizational mode, and examine the impact of these networks on the innovation processes developed in the provision and quality of public services. For this purpose a number of qualitative and quantitative techniques will be applied.
Partners’ Role in this task: All countries will provide an analysis of their own data.
Task 6.5: Conclusions (USTL) M24-M36
Based on the set of case studies investigated in WP4, lessons will be drawn on:
a) the potential impacts of various configurations of PSINs on public service quality, efficiency and performance,
b) the advantages/disadvantages of different types of PSINs models,
c) the implications for maximizing the efficiency of resource in PSINs,
d) the role of policy-makers in supporting the development of successful PSINs.
Partners’ Role in this task: None. The WP leader will provide transversal conclusions based on national and sectorial case studies and analyses provided by partners.

Participation per Partner

Partner number and short name | WP6 effort
--- | ---
2 - UAH | 7.00
5 - USTL | 14.00
8 - INN | 5.00
9 - RUC | 5.00
11 - CUB | 8.00
| Total | 39.00

### 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>14</td>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th empirical approach to value co-creation in public services: structural transformations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transversal results and scientific articles produced within WP 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D6.1**: 4th empirical approach to value co-creation in public services: structural transformations [24]
Components: • Results of the investigation: sectorial analysis (cases in different public service sectors). • Results of the investigation: national case studies reported explaining specificities and how they link to the general purpose of the research project.

**D6.2**: Transversal results and scientific articles produced within WP 6 [36]
Components: • Transversal (trans-sectorial and trans-national) results. • Results of the workpackage will be published as scientific articles. A second report will collect these outcomes from the WP.

### 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>MS3</td>
<td>Initial cross-country case studies are specified</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Impact on research analysis is documented</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP7 aims to ensure that the work carried out by other WPs is translated into policy action during the project and after its end. In the current critical state of public affairs, we can’t afford funding more research that is detached from practice, especially in an empirical field such as co-creation. WP7 will ensure that the results of the project are actionable and useful.

WP7 will periodically produce a set of policy briefs that will summarize the value of the findings of the research WPs, including concrete recommendations for policy makers. It will organise high profile events around some of these briefs, in order to generate attention from the policy community.

The WP will also set the basis for transforming this project into a sustainable service after its end. Based on the extensive experience of LC as independent think tank with public and private funding, it will develop a sustainability plan to make sure that activities can continue after the end of the project.

At the same time, this WP acts as a feedback loop from the community of policy-makers towards the research community, in order to ensure maximum relevance. This WP will organise evaluation activities about the impact of the CO-VAL project from policy-makers and practitioners.

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP7 - Policy implications for public sector transformation** [Months: 6-36]

**LC, ATC, UAH, UKON, USTL, CUB**

**Task 7.1: Drafting of policy briefs (LC) M6-M36**

This task will produce a set of 4 policy briefs (one every 9 months) summarizing the results of the project. Each brief will have an appealing look and feel, and include practical policy recommendations.

Partners’ Role in this task: The Lisbon Council will lead the drafting of the papers and the editorial review.

**Task 7.2: Events (LC) M9-M36**

This task will organise 3 events alongside the policy briefs. High profile international speakers will be invited. Around 40 participant are envisaged. The majority of the events will be in Brussels, but at least one will be organised in the US and one in another EU country.

Partners’ Role in this task: The Lisbon Council will organise the three events.

**Task 7.3: Feedback from stakeholders (LC) M10-M30**

This task will organise a set of minisurvey for policy makers in order to gather feedback on their appreciation of the results of the projects, the identification of successful and unsuccessful results, and the assessment of the usage of the results in policy. One survey per year is envisaged.

Partners’ Role in this task: The Lisbon Council will lead the design of the survey, while UAH, USTL, CUB will support the data gathering and analysis.

**Task 7.4: Sustainability plan (LC with collaboration of all core partners) M24-M34**

This task will prepare, in collaboration with partners and based on the result of the survey, a sustainability plan for the services of the projects. It will include the analysis of different revenue streams and the organisation of presentations and pitches to at least 4 potential private and public funders.

Partners’ Role in this task: The Lisbon Council will provide the methodology and analysis for the sustainability plan. All partners will provide input, while UAH, USTL and CUB will provide the data gathering of best practices.

### Participation per Partner
### Partner number and short name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Short Name</th>
<th>WP7 Effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ATC</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATC INTER</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UAH</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UKON</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>USTL</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>24.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CUB</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>55.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number14</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type15</th>
<th>Dissemination level16</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>4 Policy Briefs</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>3 Reports summarizing the results from the minisurvey</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Sustainability plan</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D7.1 : 4 Policy Briefs [36]**
A policy brief will be produced every 9 months based on the research results and the policy debate. They will be professionally edited and published, as usual for The Lisbon Council standard.

**D7.2 : 3 Reports summarizing the results from the minisurvey [30]**
A yearly report will be produced, based on the feedback obtained by stakeholders. The report will be for internal usage.

**D7.3 : Sustainability plan [34]**
The sustainability plan will be short and actionable. It will provide an overview of the business models of think tanks, results of the pitches with potential funders, and a proposed roadmap for the future. The report will be for internal usage.
## 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>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Results from data gathering are analysed</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Project is successfully completed</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objectives**

WP8 aims to ensure information sharing and knowledge flows between the research and policy community, and within each community based on peer to peer mechanisms. The idea is that stakeholders can be engaged since the very early stages of the project to participate in the coproduction of the ideas, approaches and policy outcomes of the project. A stakeholder’s panel will be created to this end following the methodology indicated in section 1.3. It aims to enrich the research findings form other WPs with a practice-led perspective on “what works”. Indeed, the WP will create a database of good practices based on the “whatworks approach”. It will also create a research database to make sure that there is easy access to specific expertise from both practitioners and researchers. Both databases (good practice and research) will have a global approach by reaching out and involving top researchers and practitioners globally. Last but not least, this WP will manage online engagement activities to ensure maximum knowledge sharing through online means. It will organise social media events and webinars to activate the community around the results of the project. Interactions and co-production will be related to all WPs in the project, but a particular attention will be paid to co-design, test and validate the track prototype to be developed in WP9.

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP8 - Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders** [Months: 1-36]
UAH, ATC, UEDIN, UKON, USTL, LC, UM-MERIT, INN, RUC, UB, CUB, PWC

Task 8.1. Stakeholders panel (UAH) M1-M36
Creation of 25 people stakeholders panel after the launch of a call of expression of interest in municipalities, regions and countries where dynamic value co-creation experiences are reported. This task involves the launch of the call for expression of interest, the selection of policy makers, 5 meetings expected and budgeted under this WP, and the interactions with the panel all over the project. Design thinking techniques may apply in the first meetings.

Partners’ Role in this task: All partners in with WP will collaborate in this tasks by facilitating contact, interactions and supporting the organizations of the meetings.

Task 8.2: “whatworks” Database of good practices (LC) M6-M36
Building on the data gathered by WP9 (tracker), by the research findings and by the community feedback, the project will develop a repository of good practices that crystallizes the knowledge of the community. Good practices will have to be validated by a steering group created within the project partners.

Partners’ Role in this task: Information inputs to the task leader.

Task 8.3: Research knowledge based (UAH) M6-M24
Building on the existing research repositories, the WP will curate a repository of research related to the topic of the project. Rather than build a repository from scratch, the WP will expand the existing one developed by TheGovLab.org.

Partners’ Role in this task: information inputs to the task leader.

Task 8.4: Online engagement (LC) M6-M24
The project will maintain very active social media accounts, a blog, and will periodically organise webinars.

Partners’ Role in this task: information inputs to the task leader.

**Participation per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP8 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC INTER</td>
<td>3.00</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>Co-design of panel report</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Panel activity summary report</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Co-Design of the databases</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.4</td>
<td>Publication of the repository</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.5</td>
<td>Report from online engagement</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D8.1 : Co-design of panel report [12]**  
This delivery will present the goals and working methods of the stakeholders' panel as the outcome of interactions between Co-VAL full members and Co-VAL panel members.

**D8.2 : Panel activity summary report [36]**  
This delivery will report on the worked achieved by the panel, with special attention at its impact on the design and implementation of the work.

**D8.3 : Co-Design of the databases [12]**  
This will include the design of good practices (LC) and the enrichment of research knowledge base (UAH).

**D8.4 : Publication of the repository [24]**  

This will be the publication of the repository.

D8.5 : Report from online engagement [36]
This report will summarize the outcomes of the interactions with stakeholders on-line.

### 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>MS6</td>
<td>Tool development for research knowledge and the assessment of policy implementation actions is released</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR, DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Results from data gathering are analysed</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Project is successfully completed</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number 9 | WP9 | Lead beneficiary 10 | 6 - LC
--- | --- | --- | ---
Work package title | Sustainable policy impact
Start month | 6 | End month | 36

Objectives

WP9 aims to ensure the recommendations developed in WP7 are translated into policy action by tracking at very granular level what Member States are doing. This WP will develop a policy tracker that will enable collaborative monitoring of what governments are doing in implementing co-creation policies. The tracker will be built based on the large experience accumulated with the Startup Manifesto Policy Tracker and the eGovernment Action Plan Evaluation.

The WP will first design a prototype tracker based on the existing reference policy documents (Malmoe Declaration, eGov Action Plan, Open Government Partnership plans…) and updated in the course of the project to reflect the recommendations from WP7.

It will then develop the online tracker, with a consolidated smart crowdsourcing approach where national experts and the public in general can help the monitoring. The tool will include interactive visualisation to make the results intuitive and appealing. It will enable rankings of government activity.

Finally, the WP will produce yearly status reports and scoreboard to assess progress.

Description of work and role of partners

**WP9 - Sustainable policy impact** [Months: 6-36]

**LC, ATC, UAH**

**Task 9.1: Design of the tracker prototype (LC) M6-M12**

This task will first design the indicator checklist, transforming the most recent policy document into trackable operational checklists based on Y/N indicators. It will also develop the web based tool and the guidelines for country experts.

Partners’ Role in this task: LC will design the indicator checklist and the online tracker.

**Task 9.2: Data gathering (LC with support from ATC) M10-M15**

The task will first review policy reports in order to extract data to populate the dashboard. It will identify 29 country experts that will provide additional data from national reports and other information sources. The information will be directly uploaded on the web tracker, and after accurate quality check become visible on the dashboard. The tracker will also allow open comments to each country fiche, in order to identify best practices and feedback from the community.

Partners’ Role in this task: The Lisbon Council will provide the first round of data gathering supported by national experts, while ATC will provide additional data for specific gaps.

**Task 9.3: Reporting (LC) M15-M36**

This task will produce a yearly report on the progress of collaborative government, based on the data gathered by the tracker. The report will be a well-designed publication, accompanied by the tracker.

Partners’ Role in this task: LC will deliver the reports.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP9 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34.00</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>D9.1</td>
<td>Methodology for monitoring</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>Online prototype tracker</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>Guidelines for country experts</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>Complete Dashboard</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>2 yearly reports</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D9.1: Methodology for monitoring [9]**

The deliverable will present the methodology to transpose the policy recommendations in yes/no indicators, corroborated by evidence.

**D9.2: Online prototype tracker [12]**

The online tracker will be based on the checklist of indicator, and will allow data gathering and data visualization regarding the implementation of the recommendations. It will be a dedicated mini-site, integrated in the main CoVAL site. It will allow experts to upload data and display summary information per Member State.

**D9.3: Guidelines for country experts [12]**

The document will be used by country experts (both partners and non-partners) to upload the data.

**D9.4: Complete Dashboard [15]**

The dashboard is the online tracker, completed with data. It will allow to quickly visualize who is doing what on co-creation, and rank MS based on their activity in the different policy areas.

**D9.5: 2 yearly reports [36]**

The data and the dashboard will also be used for producing a report about the progress in implementing the recommendations. This is designed to complement the online dashboard, in order to ensure accountability by governments, and to promote further adoption of the recommendations.

### Schedule of relevant Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number[^18]</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>MS4</td>
<td>Instruments for monitoring and data collection, including the implementation protocol, are ready</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Tool development for research knowledge and the assessment of policy</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR, DV</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>18</td>
<td>implementation actions is released</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP10 aims at disseminating the project results and creating awareness towards the scientific and policy community, stakeholders in general, practitioners and citizens. Co-VAL will carry out traditional, large-scale dissemination and communication activities, online and offline.

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP10 - Dissemination and Communication [Months: 1-36]**  
**ATC, UAH, UEDIN, UKON, USTL, LC, UM-MERIT, INN, RUC, UB, CUB, PWC**

**Task 10.1: Development of communication strategy (ATC) M1-M6**

The first task to be completed is the creation of a communication strategy to promote Co-VAL to the key stakeholders. The strategy will outline the target audiences and will set out a variety of dissemination and communication tactics ranging from the more traditional techniques such as scientific publications, conference presentation, press releases to the more innovative including social media and online visibility. In addition, the strategy will set up an impact measurement matrix based on Key Performance Indicators.

**Partners’ Role in this task: ATC will lead the activities in this task with the support of all partners.**

**Task 10.2: Dissemination activities (ATC) M1-M36**

Certain activities that support the dissemination of the results have been identified and will be undertaken during this WP:
- Publication of papers and articles at scientific/policy conferences and scientific journals;
- Presentation of project results in key events at national, regional and EU level;
- Production of press releases on a regular basis alongside the project results, and for all policy briefs;
- Organisation of 1 dissemination conference;
- Establishment of close contact with other R&D projects and Thematic Networks at national and EU-levels as well as with research colleagues and organisations relevant to Co-VAL.

**Partners’ Role in this task: ATC will lead this task with the active participation of all partners to support running dissemination.**

**Task 10.3: Communication Activities (ATC) M1-M36**

During the lifecycle of the project there will be a number of communication activities, online and offline, including:
- Development and maintenance of a website to collect and present project information and project results;
- Creation of project collateral including project logo, PPT template and communication material i.e. brochures and posters;
- Establishment of project presence on major social networking sites (Twitter, Facebook) for sharing project news and results and reach a wide range of communities.

**Partners’ Role in this task: ATC will lead this task with the active participation of all partners.**

### Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP10 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC INTER</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Partner number and short name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP10 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - UB</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - CUB</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - PWC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.00</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>D10.1</td>
<td>Project Website and Social Media</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Websites, patents filing, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.2</td>
<td>Communication Plan</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.3</td>
<td>Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v1.0</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.4</td>
<td>Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v2.0</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

D10.1 : Project Website and Social Media [3]
Development of the Project website and Social Media accounts.

Detailed Communication plan outlining the communication strategy that will be applied by Co-VAL.

D10.3 : Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v1.0 [18]
Reporting on accomplished dissemination and communication activities for the first reporting period and planned activities for the next period.

D10.4 : Report on Dissemination and Communication Activities v2.0 [36]
Reporting on accomplished dissemination and communication activities for the second reporting period.
## 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>MS1</td>
<td>Co-VAL initialisation: The project means have been set up, including the project quality plan, the communication strategy and the Web Site-Social Media.</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DV, SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Project is successfully completed</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

This work package will provide support for the successful implementation of the project, through strong coordination and continuous monitoring and reporting. The relevant activities include the overall project and management, quality monitoring and assurance that the work conducted in the project and by all participants is aligned to the project objectives. This work package also caters for all communication with the European Commission.

Description of work and role of partners

WP11 - Project Management [Months: 1-36]
ATC, UAH, UEDIN, UKON, USTL, LC, UM-MERIT, INN, RUC, UB, CUB, PWC

The relevant tasks in this WP will ensure the overall management of the work conducted in the project, supporting work package leaders in coordinating their tasks and fostering communication between partners. Through continuous monitoring of all activities and resources the management board will be able to foresee any risks and provide appropriate contingency actions. Periodic reports will be communicated to the European Commission for evaluating the progress of the project. Internal assessment and quality control procedures will be defined in order to ensure the proper realization of the envisioned framework and the quality of the work delivered. These procedures will be documented in the beginning of the project and internal activity report templates will be created, if necessary.

Task 11.1: Project Control and Resource Monitoring (ATC) M1-M36
This will be the main task of this work package and will consist of the execution of all the management procedures for the day-to-day operations of the project. These procedures include activities, such as coordinating the project tasks and preparing for project meetings, providing support and generating all periodic reports. This task will, also, monitor the use of resources from the different project participants so that they are properly and justifiably consumed, in accordance to the agreed work plan and the provisions of the Horizon 2020 guidelines.

Partners’ Role in this task: ATC as the coordinator of the project will lead the activities in this task. All partners participate in the task for the administrative and financial issues.

Task 11.2: Quality Management (ATC) M1-M36
Quality management is essential for the smooth operation of the project activities. In that respect, this task will ensure that all work conducted by the project participants meets the expected quality standards. This will be effected by defining a detailed Quality Management Plan, which will draft all the quality procedures and project standards. Additionally, the key performance indicators, which will be elaborated in the course of the project, will be constantly monitored to allow assessment of the project progress and results.

Partners’ Role in this task: ATC as the coordinator of the project will lead the activities in this task.

Task 11.3: Risk Management and Contingency Planning (ATC) M1-M36
Through this task, the project will define and follow an appropriate risk management plan, which is adopted by the management team, to continuously monitor the progress of the individual tasks and work packages and promptly perform risk assessment, through identification of potential risks and their impact on the smooth execution of the project activities. Thus, this task will deliver a risk management plan, detailing on the task level risks and the respective controls to mitigate the impact on the work plan from the exposure of these risks.

Partners’ Role in this task: ATC as the coordinator of the project will lead the activities in this task.

Task 11.4: Data management (ATC) M1-M36
Co-VAL is willing to participate in the Open Research Data pilot. Following the guidelines of the EC in the area of open access, special interest will be placed to the openness of the whole research and innovation process (i.e., taking measures to make it possible for third parties to access, mine, exploit, reproduce and disseminate the data and associated metadata, as well as a cross-subsidiary plan to publish papers with the golden route). The task will then define the datasets that will be opened, their format, syntax and structure. Where necessary, anonymised data and metadata regarding the participation of experts in the surveys for service innovation will be made...
available by Co-VAL, while the structure of the project datasets will be considered, all in the form supported by the project technologies. To this end, we will adhere to international standards and recommendations regarding the data formats, structure and syntax of such data, like W3C. Data will be made available to the research community, subject to any limitations imposed by the Consortium partners. We will deal with such regulatory aspects in the course of the project and according to the activities adopted in this task. An open dissemination strategy in WP 10 will also allow liaising with similar initiatives.

Partners’ Role in this task: ATC as the coordinator of the project will lead the activities in this task.

<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 - ATC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATC INTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - UB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - CUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - PWC</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>D11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.3</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>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Services)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D11.1 : Project quality and assessment plan [2]
This will be a document detailing the quality and assessment procedures that will be followed during the course of the project, along with the templates to be used for all project documents and deliverables.

D11.2 : Data management Plan v1.0 [6]
This deliverable is reporting on the Co-VAL participation in the Open Research Data Pilot, as per the template on the Guide on Data Management.

D11.3 : Data management Plan v2.0 [36]
This deliverable is reporting on the Co-VAL participation in the Open Research Data Pilot, as per the template on the Guide on Data Management.

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>MS1</td>
<td>Co-VAL initialisation: The project means have been set up, including the</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DV, SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project quality plan, the communication strategy and the Web Site-Social Media.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Project is successfully completed</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Work package number** | WP12 | **Lead beneficiary** | 1 - ATC
---|---|---|---
**Work package title** | Ethics requirements
**Start month** | 1 | **End month** | 36

### Objectives

The objective is to ensure compliance with the 'ethics requirements' set out in this work package.

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP12 - Ethics requirements** [Months: 1-36]

ATC

This work package sets out the 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with.

### 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>D12.1</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

The 'ethics requirements' that the project must comply with are included as deliverables in this work package.

**D12.1 : H - Requirement No. 2 [3]**

Templates of the informed consent forms and information sheet must be submitted on request. They should explain the rights of participants to withdraw at any time.

### 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>
</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>Co-VAL initialisation: The project means have been set up, including the project quality plan, the communication strategy and the Web Site-Social Media.</td>
<td>WP10, WP11</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DV, SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>Initial framework for public service reform is defined</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>Initial cross-country case studies are specified</td>
<td>WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Instruments for monitoring and data collection, including the implementation protocol, are ready</td>
<td>WP2, WP9</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>SR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Draft results from the evaluation of initial case studies are analysed</td>
<td>WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7</td>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Tool development for research knowledge and the assessment of policy implementation actions is released</td>
<td>WP8, WP9</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>SR, DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>Results from data gathering are analysed</td>
<td>WP2, WP7, WP8</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>DV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Impact on research analysis is documented</td>
<td>WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6</td>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Project is successfully completed</td>
<td>WP10, WP11, WP7, WP8</td>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>DV, PR</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>
</table>
| 1           | Poor quality list of contacts for survey, lack of comparability across partner countries  
Likelihood: Medium, Impact: Medium                                                                                                                                  | WP2       | Development of a comprehensive protocol in consultation with the partners in WP2 to ensure comparable results and a high quality, random selection process. The protocol will describe all contact details that will be required to ensure that there is no missing information. |
| 2           | Low survey response rate  
Likelihood: Medium, Impact: High                                                                                                                                     | WP2       | Based on UM’s extensive previous experience with surveying both private sector and public sector managers on innovation, we expect to achieve a response rate of 40%. This will be reached through a well-developed survey protocol, the use of both online and mailed questionnaires, reminder letters, and telephone follow-up calls. To maximize quality and the survey response rate and to reduce costs, the survey for all countries will be implemented by UM, with the partner countries only responsible for telephone follow up calls. |
| 3           | There is no risk involved in WP3: the interview partners can stop their participation at any time in case they feel that they can’t answer questions or exclude the research team from participatory observations during the ethnography.  
Likelihood: Low, Impact: Medium                                                                                                                                       | WP3       | The research subjects will be informed about the potential risks, which might include disagreement with the types of questions, or inability to answer to certain questions. They are informed that they can skip certain questions or decline to answer. |
| 4           | Low number of cases, practical obstacles for carrying out fieldwork due to external circumstances  
Likelihood: Low, Impact: Medium                                                                                                                                     | WP4       | Selection, planning and preparation of fieldwork for the case studies will start at the outset, with one year to prepare. Selection of sites for case studies will be conducted in close dialog with participating partners in the WP. |
| 5           | Context complexities and cross country adversities may complicate comparisons and analysis.  
Likelihood: Low, Impact: Medium                                                                                                                                  | WP4       | Partners from the countries in which the case study will be conducted will be actively involved in the systematization and analysis of data from the case studies. This will contribute to ensure viable cross-country analysis and comparisons. |
| 6           | Low number of cases  
Likelihood: low, Impact: high                                                                                                                                 | WP5       | Close contact with partners and stakeholders in the mapping phase, in selection of cases and in the common design of case studies.                                                                 |
| 7           | Lack of alignment between Co-VAL research results and policy debate  
Likelihood: High, Impact: High                                                                                                                                       | WP7       | At every partner’s meeting, The Lisbon Council will provide a brief overview to the research partners about the current and emerging policy issues. In case of strong misalignment, additional desk research will be carried out within WP7 to fill the gaps between research and policy needs and to demonstrate the policy relevance of the |
<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>8</td>
<td>Lack of policy attention towards the policy recommendations</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>The WP7 lead partner will ensure continuous interaction with policy-makers. The combination of policy briefs, events and tracking will be used to stimulate attention. The involvement of the EU Estonian presidency, particularly important in this theme, will facilitate the policy attention from the beginning of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lack of suitable revenue streams for sustainability</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Increase the range of possible options to new and emerging funding methods, such as corporate philanthropy and crowdfunding. Establish partnership with global players such as TheGovLab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Difficulty in designing indicators for the policy recommendations</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>WP9 leader The Lisbon Council will be involved in the policy briefs in order to make sure that recommendations are “measurable”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Difficulty in data gathering from MS level in the tracker</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>WP leader will ensure that indicators are not only measurable, but they rely as much as possible on existing monitoring systems (e.g. eGov action plan monitoring, EPSI platform, Open Government Partnership monitoring system).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Low impact in communication. The actual/potential impact on the project are low penetration to the target groups, low public awareness of the project concepts and achievements.</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>As per the project dissemination and communication strategy. The relevant activities are driven by a partner with extensive network who has a lot of experience in communication and dissemination activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Low quality of deliverables</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>Addressed through regular quality reviews and assignment of peer reviews for each deliverable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Low commitment, availability and productivity of project partners</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>Addressed through established methodologies for project planning and project control and involvement of appropriate management committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Inappropriate methods or questionnaire development</td>
<td>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6</td>
<td>A sufficient number of key staff have sufficient experience in methodologies required and to develop a high quality questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Not adequately analysing risks</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Produce project risk list at kick off meeting.</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>17</td>
<td>Communication breakdown between partners Likelihood: Low, Impact: High</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>The communication strategy laid out will help to mitigate against this risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Change in key staff during project Likelihood: Low, Impact: High</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Ensure that more than one person in each partner organisation is aware of what is going on in each of the specific tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Failing to involve relevant Stakeholders Likelihood: Medium, Impact: Medium</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP11, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Call for expression of interest for the selection of 25 panel stakeholders. The idea is to be selective in order to have policy makers with high degree of engagement. Besides, the contingency plan foreseen intensive and targeted dissemination actions to promote the project and attract/encourage stakeholders to participate.</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>WP9</th>
<th>WP10</th>
<th>WP11</th>
<th>WP12</th>
<th>Total Person/Months per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - ATC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ATC INTER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - UAH</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UEDIN</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - UKON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - USTL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - LC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - UM-MERIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - INN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - RUC</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - UB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - CUB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - PWC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Person/Months</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>496</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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>t.b.c.</td>
<td>Venue tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Venue tbc</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.

6. Call (part) identifier
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
Deliverable numbers: D1 - Dn

15. Type
Please indicate the type of the deliverable using one of the following codes:
- R Document, report
- DEM Demonstrator, pilot, prototype
- DEC Websites, patent filings, videos, etc.
- OTHER
- ETHICS Ethics requirement
- ORDP Open Research Data Pilot

16. Dissemination level
Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

- **PU** Public
- **CO** Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)
- **EU-RES** Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
- **EU-CON** Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
- **EU-SEC** Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)

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

20. **Installation Number**
Number progressively the installations of a same infrastructure. An installation is a part of an infrastructure that could be used independently from the rest.

21. **Installation country**
Code of the country where the installation is located or IO if the access provider (the beneficiary or linked third party) is an international organization, an ERIC or a similar legal entity.

22. **Type of access**
- VA if virtual access,
- TA-uc if trans-national access with access costs declared on the basis of unit cost,
- TA-ac if trans-national access with access costs declared as actual costs, and
- TA-cb if trans-national access with access costs declared as a combination of actual costs and costs on the basis of unit cost.

23. **Access costs**
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>19.06.2017</td>
<td>Part B adapted to the Description of Action template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>23.06.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section 3.2.1 in order to be consistent with the Organisational Structure of the project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated description of the “other direct costs” and Table is included in Section 3.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>26.06.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replaced references to OE with LC (Section 1.4.2, 2.2.1, 3.3, 4.2-third party table).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Figures 5 and 6 (deleted OE).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted OE from “Involvement of Industry including SMEs” in Section 3.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Figure 8 (deleted OE and transferred total effort from OE to LC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Figure 9 (deleted OE and transferred requested grant from OE to LC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted OE and updated LC rows from the introductory table with the Responsibilities and expertise of the Co-VAL partners in Section 4 to depict the transfer of all related tasks and activities from OE to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added Mrs Anna Triantafillou’s CV in Section 4.1.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted OE profile table from Section 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moved Benoît Desmarchelier from “Other Experts” to “Permanent staff at Clercé-Lille 1 University” in Section 4.1.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated LC profile table in Section 4.1.6 to depict the transfer of role and personnel from OE to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>27.06.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted OE from the Co-VAL consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Financial Information for LC to depict the transfer of budget from OE to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effort for the implementation of the tasks in WP1, WP3, WP5, WP7-WP11, originally allocated to OE, transferred to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP9 originally assigned to OE transferred to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The order of D9.2 and D9.3 deliverables in the original deliverables list of the proposal changed to be in consistent with the deliverables order in the WP9 description.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following Deliverables titles changed to be in consistent with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deliverables titles in the WPs description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• D2.2 “Draft questionnaire for cognitive testing” changed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Draft questionnaire for cognitive testing plus the final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>questionnaires”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• D2.4 “List (confidential) of contact details for sampled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>managers” changed to “List (confidential) of contact details for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sampled managers plus sampling protocol”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• D9.2 “Online tracker” changed to “Online prototype tracker”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The following Deliverables titles changed as the duplicate title was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not accepted in SyGMA:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• D4.1 “Report on cross country comparison” changed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Report on cross country comparison on service design”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• D5.1 “Report on cross country comparison” changed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Report on cross country comparison on existing innovation and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>living labs”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D11.2 Data management Plan was split in two deliverables,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>namely D11.2 Data management Plan v1.0 due in M6 and D11.3 Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>management Plan v2.0 due in M36, and assigned from R to ORDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consequently, D11.3 First periodic report and D11.4 Final periodic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>report became D11.4 and D11.5 accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replaced references to OE with LC in WP7, WP8 and WP9 descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assigned to OE, transferred to LC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Replaced reference to OE with LC in Critical Risk 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated the Ethics section (Section 5.1) including information on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>informed consent procedures that will be implemented for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>participation of humans;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>28.06.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Added ATC INTER as ATC’s Linked Third Party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Section 4.1.1. to add description of ATC’s Linked Third Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised ATC’s third party table in Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>27.07.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UAH budget / effort has been calculated at a lower monthly rate. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>overall budget remains the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated UAH key personnel in Section 4.1.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revised Figures 7, 8 and 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>01.08.2017</td>
<td><strong>Consolidated version</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.08.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part A:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deleted D7.2 &quot;3 events&quot;, D11.4 “First periodic report” and D11.5 “Final periodic report”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>28.08.2017</td>
<td><strong>Changes in Part B:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Updated Other direct costs justification for ATC and UKON in Section 3.4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Excellence

1.1. Objectives

1.1.1 Rationale and goal

The rationale for this project builds on the role of public administrations facing European challenges of the 21st century. These challenges include the delivery of efficient high-quality public services and improved public sector capacity to deal with societal challenges, such as the ones included under the EU Societal Challenge 6 addressing social inclusion of diverse populations and vulnerable communities. The societal challenges are met with an increasing demand for public sector transformation to cope with the growing complexity of public administration problems, as reflected in the current discourse between what citizens demand and the responses offered by governments. Oftentimes, designing public services following the internal logic of government – based on top-down policy assessments – do not meet the changing needs of citizens anymore. One important example that many public administrations are facing throughout Europe is the external shock of the migrant crisis that leads to never before seen pressures on, especially, local government to rethink their current policies and programs for social inclusion and integration of immigrants. Expectations for increased public value creation to meet the complex demands on public administrations are rising as well as the pressure to deliver high-quality services in an efficient and accountable manner.

Public sector transformation requires thinking of inclusive ways of citizen engagement in the creation of public value. The traditional view of top-down public administrations, in which citizens can only passively absorb supply-led services, is no longer appropriate. The above-mentioned challenges increase the need for a demand-driven design of public services that incorporates the opportunities provided by new technologies in order to allow the effective engagement of citizens and organizations “to unlock social assets”.

A key element for a public sector transformation is the paradigm shift from designing and delivering public services solely based on the internal – policy-driven logic of public administrations to an external, open and co-productive logic. Efforts that solely rely on administration-driven service design will lead to non-adoption, rejection, or even non-compliance of service use. A case in point is the recent introduction of the biometric ID in Germany that comes with a series of online apps. While the passport itself is highly popular and citizens have accepted the new format, only 4% of new passport owners also use the accompanying online apps. To make things worse, frontline government workers actively discourage the use of the apps, leading to rejection and non-adoption.

Recent public sector innovations have included the use of e-government for delivering services (including services, such as online tax payments) and digital platforms to include citizens’ ideas and knowledge. Yet efforts have stalled in many European countries at the existing off-line service delivery levels, without progressing to transformative innovation. Some of the changes have contributed to time and resource savings, but oftentimes online service delivery is merely a replication of existing offline processes, without rethinking mission support or redesign of services, so that citizens are willing to accept them as a reliable alternative to meeting frontline workers in their physical offices. ICT-enabled public service delivery requires a paradigm shift away from designing and delivering services that follow the traditional logic of public administrations. Instead, new forms of agility and responsiveness in service delivery should be co-designed and co-produced by the public, as pointed out by the EU Commission (Vision Public Services Paper on ICT-enabled public sector innovation in H2020). In this context, ‘co-creation’ refers to the roles that citizens play in co-creating value in public services – and this value may involve meeting welfare or economic needs, increasing personal well-being through public service delivery, adding value to the community or society, and/or creating the capacity for value creation in the future.

The modernisation of public administrations and their connectivity represent two of the three pillars of the EU eGovernment Action Plan 2016-2020. The third pillar, engagement through digital interactions, is essential for the design and delivery of new services. Our project contributes to this third pillar, related to the call for “make it together”, complementing the “make it simple” modernisation and the “make it for all” shift in service design and delivery. Co-VAL contributes to the “make it together” target using a new approach of value-creation in service

---

1 Challenges of particular importance are those related to the UN sustainable development goals under the EU societal challenges working areas such as promote peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provide access to justice for all and build effective, accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels, reduce inequality within and among countries, and make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and stable.

2 This is also happening at the national level, where populist parties are growing, in part, because of a divorce between the needs of citizens and government institutions.
delivery: the public governance service-dominant logic (PSDL) combined with the service innovation multi-agent framework (to be explained later on in the proposal). The Co-VAL research and innovation action proposal takes on the challenge to find new ways of integrating the co-creation of value as a way to transform public administration services and processes. The core contribution is the analysis of innovative ways for a) the design of service models for public administration processes, mainly driven by demand (where service providers and the users of services, such as citizens and organizations, are the key actors), and (b) by bottom-up supply (e.g. through civil servants, front-line workers, or third parties) that promotes the voluntary and active integration of society in the transformative efforts of public administrations.

The main goal of Co-VAL is to discover, analyse, and provide policy recommendations for transformative strategies that integrate the co-creation of value in public administration through the introduction of a new paradigm of public service design and delivery. The project accomplishes these objectives by conducting research on the paradigm shift from the traditional top-down model of service design to demand and bottom-up driven models. In the latter model, citizens, civil servants, private and third sector organizations voluntarily participate in the development of transformative innovations that can address changing needs and solve social problems.

In summary, the objectives of Co-VAL are:

1. To provide a comprehensive and holistic theoretical framework for understanding three aspects of value co-creation in public services: i) its nature and characteristics, ii) its modes of organization and implementation and iii) its impacts. These first three objectives lead to the following five intermediate targets:
   a. To develop a conceptual framework of value co-creation in service delivery from different perspectives, including the service-dominant logic paradigm, the service innovation, and co-innovation frameworks leading to change, enrichment or complementing existing public governance perspectives;
   b. To identify the contingencies of value co-creation (and value co-destruction) in public service delivery in relation to a range of key stakeholders (e.g. users, citizens, public service organisations, , politicians) and consider if they are congruent or competing;
   c. To examine the tensions between individual value and social values and how they might be resolved. The Co-VAL project will evaluate and consider social and individual values in the business model for public administration services;
   d. To place the role of social innovation and innovation networks in the transformation of public administrations, by building an analytical bridge between social innovation approaches and innovation in public services; and
   e. To analyse the conceptual relationship between co-creation of values and traditional forms of participation in order to assess co-creation in terms of inclusiveness, meaningfulness, and legitimacy.

2. To measure and monitor transformative innovations in the public sector by using both existing data and new metrics from a large-scale survey among public sector managers and managers of NGOs and other non-governmental organizations, including businesses. These metrics will be used to analyse how co-creation activities occur, the roles of different partners in innovative public administration projects, the factors that explain failure or success, and the social impact of value co-creation in public services.

3. To investigate value co-creation by focusing on four public-service-related co-creation areas of public sector transformation: digital transformation of public administrations, including open platforms, big data, and digital service delivery (which is a transversal co-creation area); service design and blue-printing in the participatory policy-making context; innovation and living labs; as well as innovative structural relationships between public-private-third sector innovation networks and social innovation in public services. The analysis will investigate innovative approaches and the impact of national and cultural contexts. Analysis of best practices and evidence from selected case studies will be critically analysed in a comparative research design in order to derive policy recommendations for value co-creation of public administration transformation.

4. To ensure that research results on the four identified co-creation areas not only contribute to theoretical knowledge, but also generate sustainable impact in public administration policy and practice. While Co-VAL research remains future-oriented and policy-driven, focussing on analysing barriers and drivers for value co-creation in public services, the role of supervising authorities, the monitoring of indicators and the identification of future trends, the policy pillar of the project will ensure that the research findings are transformed into public sector innovation: by delivering actionable policy recommendations that build on the research findings, by tracking how governments’ pilot projects and actions are in line with the research-based recommendations, and by facilitating peer-to-peer knowledge exchange to ensure implementation.
1.1.2 Research questions
The objectives outlined in the previous section are guided by a set of Co-VAL research questions:

- What is value in public services and how can the co-creation of value in public services be defined? How can value-creation lead to innovations in public administration? What are the best theoretical frameworks to approach these issues? How can we differentiate ‘individual’ and ‘public’ value and resolve potential conflicts between them? How can co-creation and collaboration transform the way public and collective issues are explored and how services (and related-policies) are designed, produced and delivered?
- How is co-creation of value designed, adopted, and implemented? What does the lifecycle of value co-creation in public services look like? How effectively do Co-VAL elements explain co-creation and the implementation of service innovations?
- What are the appropriate metrics for value co-creation in public services? What indicators are available to monitor value co-creation and its impacts?
- How can governments create an open environment and ecosystem, where public administrations make tools, supported by ICT, assets, data, information and resources, available for re-use and invite all actors to collaborate within clear frameworks?
- How will new demands, limited resources, and modified perceptions of the functions of the public sector under conditions of global interdependencies change public sector services, particularly in core areas such as security (external/internal/social), justice (rule of law), infrastructures and social challenges and policies?
- How is co-creation used by public sector organizations and what obstacles does co-creation face? And, do we find similar and replicable patterns of co-creation processes and outcomes across Europe? Are there local contextual factors that influence value co-creation? What can we learn from good practice from outside Europe? What can we learn from examples of failures and successes with the use of co-creation?
- What are the underlying conditions, enablers, risks, and barriers for co-creation?
- What are the most relevant (short/long term) impacts of current and future social and economic changes on public sector organizations and services? What are the effects of co-creation innovations on different participatory values (inclusiveness, meaningfulness, and legitimacy) and on outcomes? Are these influenced by different country contexts?
- What are the policy implications of this research? What methods can be used to measure the extent to which government strategies, practices and pilots are in line with the recommendations? How can we ensure a continuous positive feedback loop between research and policy implementation?
- What new rules and standards, organizational structures, resource allocations, and institutional capacities are needed to encourage transformative innovations based on co-creation?

1.2. Relation to the work programme
The following table outlines the work programme and how the proposal addresses the challenges of each topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme and Call text</th>
<th>How the proposal addresses the priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **About Rationale**          | The Co-VAL project will present a novel conceptual framework to support public institutions in their development of public services, using a model of the co-creation of public and individual value by public administrations and their core stakeholders (e.g. citizens, companies, NGOs, etc.). The overall goal is to improve efficiency and the effective transformation of public service delivery.  
The complexity of business and citizen expectations, the interrelationships between them, and legitimacy and accountability challenges are included in the research questions. One WP will be devoted to evaluation and measurement issues, focusing on both “markets and industrial” indicators but also on alternative indicators based on alternative concepts of value (reputation, trust, confidentiality, fairness, creativity, proximity, etc.)  
The Co-VAL project aims to provide a holistic framework of transformation strategies for public administrations, starting from a theoretical framework |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme and Call text</th>
<th>How the proposal addresses the priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Addressing these complex issues requires holistic responses, which in turn call for the transformation of public administrations and its role in society.</strong></td>
<td>That combines existing theories on value creation with the co-creation of public service innovations. Co-VAL will take into account the complexity of public administration networks and their role in changing societal values. A multi-agent focus will be used to identify the roles of multiple stakeholders in the co-creation of value for public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective collaboration across government departments and with non-governmental actors is essential to good governance... ICT is a key enabler to facilitate this...</strong></td>
<td>The Co-VAL project will analyse and frame the foundations of the co-creation of value, with a specific focus on transforming how services are designed, delivered, and used by citizens. ICTs play an important role in these processes as archetypes of government transformation jointly used by public administrations and non-governmental actors (citizens, suppliers, organizations) taking part in service design that is fit-for-purpose. One of the Co-VAL WPs will therefore focus on digital transformation strategies. In addition, WP2 will examine both co-creation and collaboration, both across government departments and between governments and non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, the key role of ICT in public administration transformation is a transversal issue which will be tackled in all of the empirical WPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effective engagement with societal actors can help unlock societal assets...It allows them to be involved in the co-creation of services, ... This calls for innovative and collaborative mechanisms with new institutional arrangements leadership and human resources’ capacities and structures for greater collaboration among government agencies and departments and with other actors.</strong></td>
<td>The Co-VAL project will explore structural transformation through innovative collaborative arrangements, such as service co-design, service digitalization, public-private networks, and social innovation in public services. Social engagement, empowerment, new institutional arrangements and leadership and human resource capacities are included in these mechanisms. In addition, the Co-VAL project will study the potential outcomes of four transformation strategies (corresponding to the four different WPs): service design and blue-printing, digital transformation of public administrations, innovation and living labs, and public-private service innovation networks and social innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It requires understanding the legal, political and cultural aspects of this transformation</strong></td>
<td>As a result of the multi-disciplinary focus in building the conceptual framework of Co-VAL, legal, political and cultural aspects that may be relevant for public service transformation will be considered in each of the transformation strategies. From the empirical viewpoint the context diversity will be addressed by the selection and analysis of a variety of co-creation and collaboration cases across different European countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About Research questions</strong></td>
<td>The previous section lists how Co-VAL has already integrated research questions proposed by the call. The only two missing questions out of the ones included in the Call are: Which role can professional communicators (e.g. journalists) play in the process? What sector of public policy are potentially the most concerned by this transformation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About European impact</strong></td>
<td>Whilst there is widespread recognition of the need for innovation in the public sector, there is little or no consensus on how the ‘European social model’ can be reformed, or which reform options are available. There is a lack of consensus regarding the relationship between public sector, third sector, and private sector organizations in the development of public sector services. Theory and practice lack robust models for the co-creation, co-design, and co-implementation of social value.—Co-VAL will develop a framework for better understanding of how to transform public administration to ultimately increase social welfare in a diverse Europe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) **About the objective and methodological considerations**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme and Call text</th>
<th>How the proposal addresses the priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>About the Objective</strong>&lt;br/&gt;Research is needed to explore and analyse how the public administrations can become open and collaborative, encouraging the engagement and participation of public, private and civil society stakeholders - such as for example other public authorities, users, citizens, businesses, researchers, civil society organisations, social innovators, social entrepreneurs, media actors, artists and designers - for effective, appropriate and user-friendly public service design, delivery and policy-making.</td>
<td>The Co-VAL project objective has been defined to be fully aligned with the proposed objective. It will build a theoretical frame with the purpose of addressing what happens in the “black-box” of public service value co-creation, where openness in the engagement and collaboration of non-governmental actors (especially service users) are key for effective and user-friendly public service design, delivery and policy-making. In addition, the Co-VAL project will explore approaches for allowing and encouraging the engagement needed for a successful co-creation or collaborative process with all the agents mentioned in the Call text. On top of the assessment on how much of the public administration can become open and collaborative, Co-VAL will also explore how openness could be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>About methodological recommendations</strong>&lt;br/&gt;The research proposals should present evidence of previous experience in creating environments fostering co-creation through engaging different societal actors in addressing research and impact goals (scientific, political and social) and their planned research should go beyond the existing theories and empirical evidence...</td>
<td>The Co-VAL project will advance the current state-of-the-art, first by theoretical research on concepts of value co-creation and innovation for the transformation of the public sector through a service-dominant logic. Second, Co-VAL will conduct empirical research on a set of selected co-creation areas, in order to identify best practices in current and previous experiences in fostering co-creation. This will include the participation of societal actors (and other non-governmental actors) to address research and impact goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestion on teams composition</strong>&lt;br/&gt;The actions need to engage multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral teams to explore the complexity of public services, enablers for public administrations, identify the necessary changes, risks and barriers to implementation, assess the potential of different policy domains and explore feasibility in different public administration contexts (across a representative set of Member States and different levels of governments).</td>
<td>The Co-VAL project will gather a consortium of experts from research institutions and universities across the EU (10 teams from 9 countries plus 2 pan-European organizations). Co-VAL combines a group of leading researchers on services, open government and e-government, service innovation in the public sector and service-dominant logic. They represent a variety of academic fields: economics, sociology, political science, business management, and ICT science. The countries represented by team members cover different public administration settings and models of policy making. Finally, the Co-VAL consortium will include stakeholders coming from private, academic and government backgrounds, ensuring a multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral approach. At the very beginning of the project, a call for expressions of interest in Co-VAL will be launched for public administrations at central, regional, and municipal levels. The consortium envisions the engagement of bodies such as the European Council of Regions and Municipalities, representing Member States at the levels where many public services are offered in Europe; European centres, research projects and think tanks on public sector transformations such as EUPAN (European Public Administration Network), the OECD OPSI (Observatory of the Public Sector Innovation) UN CEPA (Center for Economics and Public Administration), EIPA, (European Institute of Public Administration) and COCOPs (Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Co-VAL project is based on observing the interactions between various stakeholders (multi-agent and networks) and public administrations within an open and collaborative setting. Co-VAL will derive a set of metrics and tracking systems for monitoring public sector transformation across European countries to account for diversity and shared values. Co-VAL, guided by the subsidiarity principle, will go beyond central administrations to evaluate transformations at the municipal and regional levels and identify possible differences in success factors by the area of responsibility of public agencies. In addition, all empirical WPs include comparisons between different European countries. This will permit the identification of practices that are appropriate for all EU countries and those which are necessary for specific national contexts.

The ‘Fit-for-purpose’ paradigm of public service delivery – for effectively meeting citizens needs and demands – is integrated in the conceptual framework of Co-VAL. This condition is one of the main features that will drive Co-VAL’s methods and approaches, especially when analysing service blue-printing and service design from a user perspective. The consortium’s expertise on open government and social innovation will be used to improve our understanding of the role of community assets in public services.

The Co-VAL project will include empirical analysis in areas such as government innovation labs. These labs can provide an experimental arena for innovation and the co-creation of new services with citizens in real-life settings. However, in addition to innovation labs, all four proposed areas in Co-VAL are models of participatory practices. As meta-models of participation, they can be scaled up and diffused. Co-VAL’s empirical analysis of these meta-models will also seek to identify more specific participatory practices at the agent levels (modes, intensity, duration, tools used, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme and Call text</th>
<th>How the proposal addresses the priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestion on Policy</strong></td>
<td>A main part of the expected outcomes of the Co-VAL project consists of a set of concrete policy recommendations and policy actions at all levels of government. The policy work represents a substantial part of the Co-VAL resources and three specific working packages that shows the dedication of Co-VAL to policy issues. Moreover, the implementation of the recommendations will be tracked through an open tool that will encourage greater policy attention towards the recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suggestion on Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>In order to assure transferability and sustainability of the results, the CO-VAL project will kick-start the establishment of a new think tank after completion, based on private and public funding. The Lisbon Council, itself an example of a sustainable think tank, will take over the sustainability strategy which includes business model analysis, meetings, and pitches to potential funders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User engagement, essential request</strong></td>
<td>Co-VAL is designed to co-produce its research and policy works with high and permanent interactions between Co-VAL teams and stakeholders. The users of Co-Val are the policy makers that could make use of its results and are expected to be engaged since the very beginning. Co-VAL has designed WP8 just to achieve continuous knowledge sharing and co-design and coproduction of activities among stakeholders. The track prototype to be developed in WP9 will be co-designed, tested and validated with the users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c) About the several aspects to be covered by the proposal</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work programme and Call text</td>
<td>How the proposal addresses the priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposals need to address several of the below aspects:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exploring what the role of governments in an open and collaborative government setting may be and how this could be embedded in an EU setting (taking into account shared European values, diversity as well as principles of subsidiarity);</strong></td>
<td>The Co-VAL project is based on observing the interactions between various stakeholders (multi-agent and networks) and public administrations within an open and collaborative setting. Co-VAL will derive a set of metrics and tracking systems for monitoring public sector transformation across European countries to account for diversity and shared values. Co-VAL, guided by the subsidiarity principle, will go beyond central administrations to evaluate transformations at the municipal and regional levels and identify possible differences in success factors by the area of responsibility of public agencies. In addition, all empirical WPs include comparisons between different European countries. This will permit the identification of practices that are appropriate for all EU countries and those which are necessary for specific national contexts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing methods and approaches to understanding community assets, needs and requirements in order to provide meaningful public services;</strong></td>
<td>The ‘Fit-for-purpose’ paradigm of public service delivery – for effectively meeting citizens needs and demands – is integrated in the conceptual framework of Co-VAL. This condition is one of the main features that will drive Co-VAL’s methods and approaches, especially when analysing service blue-printing and service design from a user perspective. The consortium’s expertise on open government and social innovation will be used to improve our understanding of the role of community assets in public services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding the demographics, appropriateness of participatory practices and their feasibility for scaling up, so as to generate civic participation on all levels, ensure level playing field in public engagement and legitimacy of the process;</strong></td>
<td>The Co-VAL project will include empirical analysis in areas such as government innovation labs. These labs can provide an experimental arena for innovation and the co-creation of new services with citizens in real-life settings. However, in addition to innovation labs, all four proposed areas in Co-VAL are models of participatory practices. As meta-models of participation, they can be scaled up and diffused. Co-VAL’s empirical analysis of these meta-models will also seek to identify more specific participatory practices at the agent levels (modes, intensity, duration, tools used, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the necessary cultural attitudes, roles, skills, expertise, knowledge as well as incentives and drivers (such as for example possibilities for wellbeing, healthy life, employment, democracy issue, etc.) of those involved in this process (including civil servants, service providers and users);</td>
<td>The theoretical model for value co-creation used by Co-VAL identifies the importance of the expertise, skills, knowledge, attitudes, incentives, and drivers of stakeholders in the process of service co-implementation/co-delivery, co-construction, co-design, and co-innovation. The analysis of these stakeholder characteristics will be covered by the empirical research, especially through in-depth interviews with relevant stakeholder participants in co-creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring how innovative processes and mechanisms [...].to create an open digital government environment and ecosystem for improving service delivery and citizen engagement;</td>
<td>The transformation of public administration through open innovation and the creation of an open digital ecosystem will be studied as part of the digital and structural transformation approaches, for example, in public-private innovation networks and social innovation projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the conditions under which user-knowledge input is fully integrated in the services/policy development/design process;</td>
<td>The integration of citizen knowledge input in all phases of the process of service value co-creation is a transversal element in the Co-VAL project. Co-VAL research in all selected co-creation areas (and theoretical research as well) will identify the conditions that make user-knowledge an important input for effective value creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing what co-creation in the public sector can learn from the private sector in terms of critical drivers and enabling factors;</td>
<td>Due to a multi-disciplinary and holistic focus, the Co-VAL project will draw on different theories to build up a conceptual platform that also explains drivers and enabling factors of the value co-creation process. This includes service theory, primarily developed in private sector research, but also collective innovation theory (open innovation, user-led innovation, virtual users and user-created content, innovation communities, and employee-driven innovation). WP6, on structural relationships for value co-creation, will specifically address the public-private networks and lessons learned from the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the suitability of different institutional frameworks for collaboration both within the public sector and with external actors that allow sharing data, information and services internally between departments and with external parties for re-use;</td>
<td>The WP6 research on value co-creation in public services is devoted to specific structural arrangements, namely partnerships or networks dedicated to public service innovation. These public-private networks involve public actors (public administrations at different levels), but also private actors (commercial and voluntary actors, individual consumers and citizens) collaborating to develop and implement an innovation for the supply of public services. Institutional frameworks will also be covered in the WP2 survey of examples of collaboration and co-creation. Living labs, the focus of WP5, are also an “institutional framework for collaboration”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the suitability of innovative technologies that facilitate for example co-creation, sharing relevant information between stakeholders, address issues of privacy, data protection and security or improve communication;</td>
<td>Public sector transformation using innovative and non-traditional technologies is driven by citizen demands based on their experiences with private sector tools, but also by industry innovations or simple upgrades to industry standards. ICTs are used both to facilitate the inclusion of citizens in co-design, as well as in the co-implementation of public services. Digital transformation and ICTs are one of the selected co-creation areas for Co-VAL empirical research and a cross-cutting dimension for other WPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing the drivers and enabling factors for societal actors to engage in public service or policy co-creation and identifying different sustainability models (such as for example Public Private</td>
<td>The different arrangements for enabling engagement and participation of societal actors will be intensively analysed in Co-VAL’s theoretical research on value co-creation. In addition, the empirical research will analyse sustainability models and the role of social innovation in structural transformation. The three policy WPs (WP7, WP8, and WP9) cover sustainability models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships, government spin-offs, hybrid government teams, etc.;</td>
<td>Exploring, monitoring and measurement approaches, methods and tools to understand the impact of open, innovative and collaborative government for public administrations, for growth and societal well-being and for substantiating the link between innovative public sector service and public sector efficiency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An important part of the empirical research in the Co-VAL project consists of identifying methods for measuring and monitoring transformative innovations in the public sector. WP2 focuses on the use of collaboration and co-creation in innovative projects in order to produce policy-relevant metrics of co-creation activities and analyses of the factors that influence how collaboration occurs, the factors that lead to failure or success and the impacts of value co-creation in public services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3. Concepts and Methodology

#### 1.3.1 The Co-VAL concept: Service coproduction for co-creation of value in public services

The concept underpinning our proposal builds on the theory of the co-creation of value in public service design, production, and delivery (Osborne et al, 2016). This concept views co-production and the co-creation of value for public administrations as "intrinsic to the process of public service delivery and linked to the co-creation of value both for service users and for society" (2016: 644). The innovative understanding of value creation promotes a new paradigm of service delivery that is a result of interactions between all stakeholders at all phases in the service delivery process, following the coproduction and multiagent focus of the service innovation literature (e.g., Gallouj, 2002). Under the service dominant logic (SDL) (Lusch and Vargo, 2006; Vargo and Lusch, 2008) and other service management approaches (e.g., Edvarsson et al., 2011), services do not have intrinsic value. Instead, value is co-created through co-production, or the involvement of all stakeholders into all phases of the service design and implementation process (Osborne et al., 2013). Following a service-dominant logic, the more service quality is co-produced in an effective and efficient way, the more value is co-created. This process can transform public administrations.

Osborne et al (2016) define four ideal types of value co-creation during the public service delivery process targeting respectively: individual needs, community needs, individual well-being and social capital. Further, they argue these four types of value co-creation, that need to be conceptually refined, are intertwined with, or emerge from, four modes of co-production: (1) co-production (in a narrower sense), (2) co-design, (3) co-construction, and (4) co-innovation. These types and modes may be combined and slightly re-defined to address the Co-VAL objectives and presented as follows:

1. **Co-design**: May lead to value co-creation targeting community needs through specific individual services ensuring that the public service delivery is “fit to purpose”. This requires a voluntary effort to include different stakeholders into the early phases of the co-production effort. Their contributions are required in the initial phase of the value creation process and there are involved in co-innovation co-creation, for example in policy drafting, idea generation, and preparation of potential implementation alternatives.

2. **Co-implementation and co-delivery**: May lead to value co-creation targeting individual needs of public services during the service implementation stage in collaboration with each stakeholder by including individual stakeholders needs and with the welfare of the population in mind.

3. **Co-construction**: This may lead to value co-creation targeting the lived experience and well-being of service users through a co-constructed service system and its consequent impact on the well-being and life experience of its stakeholders. The system outcome of individual value-creation does not require specific voluntary efforts. Tensions between individual value and social value can be particularly identified in this kind of co-creation way: the values from service experiences may differ from user to user; individual values can be in conflict with the dominant at given moment of time and space.

4. **Co-innovation**: value -co-creation targeting social capital through actions seeking to solve problems in the future and to unlock social assets. This also requires a voluntary and dedicated effort, not only just by the individual but also by the service innovation system.

In this approach ‘value’ is understood as being created both internally and externally by public service organizations and the users based in different forms of co-production in the broad sense. It is concerned with
meeting social and economic objectives, affecting the well-being of citizens and users, addressing community integration and cohesion, and creating the capacity to respond to changing needs in the future. Value co-creation through co-production in public services encompass new practices, such as innovative forms of cooperation with stakeholders, organization policy instruments – methods, processes and regulations that are developed and adopted by public sector organizations (including areas where private and third sector organizations, or social entrepreneurs, provide a public service) in order to meet social demands and to resolve societal challenges in a better way than existing practices. Changing social needs, together with budgetary constraints, call for radically new and innovative public service models. Figure 1 presents the Co-VAL research diamond and shows how the four types of value co-creation relate to two interconnected public administration transformations and two forms of value impacts.

![Co-VAL Research Diamond](image)

In most democracies, traditional innovation creation in public administration is initiated by a policy mandate, designed and enacted top down by policy makers. Implementation of innovations then occurs bottom-up, allowing subordinated agencies to decide on the extent, variations, and service components of public sector innovations. Transformative public administration approaches, especially those driven by recent innovations in Open Government, have promoted shifts toward open and collaborative approaches to use social assets available among citizens and other stakeholders that can be used to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of public service coproduction.

The transformative modes of the Co-VAL proposal integrate two pillars: the engagement and empowerment of citizens, organizations and civil servants, on the one hand, and the use of ICT and open government systems, as tools and frameworks for the public administration transformation, on the other hand. These two pillars represent two sides of the same coin of citizen engagement and empowerment and can be linked to ICT tools and open governance systems. They create two types of interconnected impacts: direct impacts that can transform public administration through better performance, efficiency, higher service quality delivery, public sector legitimacy and accountability and indirect impacts that meet ultimate public administrations goals, such as the capacity to serve citizens and organizations, address societal challenges, and increase social welfare.

We intend to explore how to co-create value for individuals and society through the design and delivery of public services, as well as identifying models for the resolution of potential conflicts between these two levels of value co-creation. We will explore and evaluate the relevance of our research diamond to the understanding of social and economic needs and the consequent individual and societal value that they relate to. At the heart of this will be an examination of the tension between social values at the societal level and individual value for individual
service users. Services will then be evaluated in terms of their abilities to co-create value for citizens and service users.

The Co-VAL value co-creation concept aims to produce three outcomes:

- **Theoretical framework.** An integrated conceptual framework to understand the process of value co-creation in public service delivery, developing and operationalising the NPG and PSDL approaches (knowledge creation) and integrating service innovation multilateral frameworks. This will be complemented by an evaluation of different approaches to knowledge transformation in public administration, both in terms of their process and their impact.

- **New evidence and metrics.** New metrics for public administration transformation and new empirical case studies on existent and ongoing efforts to develop innovative public services in ways that enable the co-creation of value.

- **Policy recommendations and policy tools.** Policy tools for implementing new ideas and scaling up best-practice experiences that effectively use value-co-creation to unlock social assets. The policy tools also include indicators for monitoring and evaluating existing initiatives to support public service transformation.

### Positioning of the project

The Co-VAL project will develop an understanding of the co-creation of value as part of the public service dominant logic (PSDL) framework. PSDL (Osborne et al., 2013) draw on insights from service research, such as the development of the service dominant logic (SDL) perspective (Vargo and Lusch 2004; 2008; 2016). PSDL emphasizes co-creation, management, and the evaluation of public services. It takes a holistic and systemic approach to the delivery of (public) services and acknowledges the central role of service users’ expectations of the performance of (public) services (Osborne et al 2013).

Positioning and developing our notion of co-creation of value as part of the PSDL framework has several important implications. It entails a shift from perceiving co-creation of value as merely a set of tools to enhance citizen-centric services, instead it highlights the changing mindsets and logics that need to permeate public administration and services in order to profoundly enable the long-term co-creation of value as part of the new logic of public administration. Therefore, we take a holistic approach in researching approaches to design and implementing public services using co-creation. ICT may play a vital role as an enabling tool in this regard, in two ways. Firstly, ICT plays a new role in the tension between industrialisation and customisation and between repetition and personalisation in services (Gallouj, 2002; et al, 2015). Some services are defined by a high degree of personalisation (e.g., social services) while others are highly standardised (e.g., e-government). In both cases, a decision needs to be made to balance competing outcomes. Less dialectical balances are possible, which means that the same organisation can often implement both strategies simultaneously in co-value contexts. ICT can promote reconciliation between industrialisation and customisation for example, when social inclusion policies combine supply-led standards and the personalised needs of specific communities. Second, ICT is one key element in a paradigmatic shift from a goods dominant logic (GDL) to a service dominant logic (SDL) and can also play an important role as an enabling tool for enhancing service delivery (i.e. improving access and coping with societal changes) and increasing efficiency in public accountability.

Another concept is the co-creation of value in the innovation process, especially through collaborative or collective innovations (co-innovation). Innovation is a concept based on the implementation of significant novelty that produces tangible results (Olso Manual 2005, Rogers 2003). Recently, that has been revisited to reflect a shift from visible to invisible innovation, i.e. from technological innovation (often based in R&D and patents) to non-technological innovation in its various forms: intangible product and process innovations, organizational innovations, methodological innovations, social innovation, ad hoc innovation, new formulas, and new concepts. Service innovation depends on knowledge derived from interactions among a network of agents which typically includes the organization itself (firm or public organization), collaborative organizations, service users (clients/citizens), or suppliers of public services.

Figure 2 positions Co-VAL in the above mentioned theoretical frameworks: the public service dominant logic connected to the new public governance theoretical framework, and the multiagent framework, both connected by the service dominant logic. The latter, as well as the multiagent framework, were developed to understand innovation in private services or in specific services such as health, but they have not yet been applied to public service transformations. Co-VAL with integrate them with public dominant logic to create a public service dominant logic.
**Figure 2: Theoretical and methodological positioning of the project**

For the research proposed here, interdisciplinary stakeholder knowledge is a core component. Both the SDL and service innovation frameworks require input from management, economics, sociology and political sciences. The Co-VAL approach will also conduct collaborative research involving the stakeholders of public sector organizations as part of the consortium. As stated by Osborne (2006), public service has been largely seen as a ‘black-box’, with a large part of the interest in implementation and a limited will to unpack its complex sub-processes. Dealing with process complexity requires attention to multiple theoretical backgrounds for a more complete analysis of the relations and interaction that are taking place. For example, citizen (user) participation in the co-creation of public service delivery takes place within public service systems, which are themselves embedded in societal contexts. It is necessary to include observations of the experiences of users while using a service, as well as their prior expectations. It requires insights from the public policy literature about meeting citizen’s needs, the strategies that marketers use for offerings, societal aspects having an impact on the value assigned to the service and even the psychology literature to understand subjective experience and the formation of expectations. A recent study on service research by Wilden et al. (2013) found that the service dominant logic – one of the pillars in the theoretical framing of the Co-VAL concept – has a rich and interdisciplinary theoretical heritage that connects traditional and emerging areas of service research.

**Technology Readiness Levels (TRL).** When dealing with co-design and collaborative innovation, traditional linear models of innovation are of limited utility. Collaboration in government is typically emergent, iterative, organic, and complex: it can’t be captured within rigid conceptual models such as the Technology Readiness Level. Open government apps can be developed from concept to beta version in the space of a weekend-long hackathon; other social innovation emerges from informal networks of collaboration led by citizens to respond to emerging urgencies.

While the specific technique of TRL in itself is not applicable or relevant, the holistic notion of innovation, covering all the different phases in the innovation process and especially research and implementation – is fully embedded in the Co-VAL proposal. Co-VAL not only aims to increase the state-of-the-art for research in this domain, but also to ensure that these findings generate actual innovation in public administrations throughout Europe. For this
reason, the policy stream of the proposal ensures that research findings inform actual government practices by framing them in the current policy context, disseminating them as actionable policy recommendations, tracking actual implementation by governments, and providing knowledge-based support to implementation.

**National or international research and innovation activities which will be linked with Co-VAL.** Beyond building on past and current research on SDL, GDL, SI, etc., Co-VAL will build on the following research projects and policies:

a) **EU policies for ICT-enabled public sector innovation in H2020 and OECD OPSI.** The Co-VAL objectives are aligned with new European short and medium term ICT-enabled public sector innovation and e-government plans to promote digital public services through modernization of public administration by i) delivering efficient and effective public services, ii) connectivity for cross-border mobility and iii) engagement in digital co-design of new high-quality innovative public services. The project will mainly build on past, on-going and future initiatives and research projects for the third pillar related to engagement through digital interactions. Digital public services must be open, user-driven and cross-border “by design” according to this paradigm and Co-VAL will provide a framework, evidence and policy tools to promote this from strong analytical foundations. Co-VAL will also participate in the knowledge sharing and mutual learning of different initiatives inside and outside EU policies such as DG Connect policies, CIO-IOTA Network, EUPAN, OECD, and the UN. Particular interactions are expected with the OECD Observatory of Public Service Innovation (OPSI), funded by the European Union. OPSI collects and analyses shared best practices to provide practical information, advice, and examples for how to insert innovation in the development of public services. The OPSI platform provides a place where users can share, discuss, and co-create real solutions that work in other countries. The OECD is also demanding the delivery of innovative public services that can engage users in a “data driven public sector” in a time of budgetary constraints. Co-VAL will interact about related strategies to bring governments closer to citizens and businesses and increase their trust, under the principles of openness, transparency, and inclusiveness.

b) **Past EU and on-going projects on public services, e-government, open government, social innovation and co-creation** (some participated or coordinated by CO-VAL teams). Results from EU public sector innovation projects will provide inputs for reinforcing the CO-VAL framework. Previous work on innovation networks and policy learning are of especial interest to build the CO-VAL theoretical base: PUBLIN (Innovation in Public Services); ServPPIN (The contribution of services to growth and welfare in Europe and the role of Public-Private innovation networks); INNOSERV (Innovation of Social Services); and LIPESE (Learning Innovation in Public Sector Environments). Projects on e-government and open government initiatives will be useful for CO-VAL in understanding the role of ICT as a citizen-empowering tool in the transformation of public administration: ‘Analysis of the value of e-government services’ (SMART 2014/0066); ‘Towards faster implementation and uptake of open government’ (SMART 2015/0041); and ‘Study on collaborative production in e-government’ (SMART 2010/0075). Findings of social and social innovation projects are of interest concerning findings on the role of social capital and social value: SOLIDUS (Solidarity in European societies: empowerment, social justice and citizenship), CRESSI (Creating Economic Space for Social Innovation); ITSSOIN (Social Innovation and Civic Engagement); SI-DRIVE (Social Innovation: Driving Force of Social Change); TRANSIT (Theory of Transformative Social Innovation); and TEPSIE (Theoretical, Empirical and Policy Foundations for Social Innovation in Europe). In order to assure the achievement of the project objectives, and in accordance with the Horizon 2020 Work Program, CO-VAL is going to keep a close link in its development with the rest of the projects from the ‘Co-creation for Growth and Inclusion’ call; especially with those from topics *Applied co-creation to deliver public services* (Co-creation 04-2017), *Co-creation between public administrations: once-only principle* (Co-creation 05-2016), and *Policy-development in the age of big data: data-driven policy-making, policy-modelling and policy-implementation* (Co-creation 06-2017). Respect to all these projects, CO-VAL will develop a novel comprehensive and holistic framework and provide new evidence for understanding aspects of value co-creation in public services from a service-dominant logic and a service innovation multiagent framework perspective, leading to concrete, policy recommendations and tools.

### 1.3.2 Methodology

The methodology for Co-VAL is organised around 11 work packages (the pert diagram in section 3 shows their interconnections):

- WP1 Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL
- WP2 Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation
- WP3 Digital transformation of public administrations
- WP4 Service design for public sector transformation

---
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• WP5 Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation
• WP6 Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation
• WP7 Policy implications for public sector transformation
• WP8 Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders
• WP9 Sustainable policy impact
• WP10 Dissemination and Communication
• WP11 Project Management

The work will be organised on three pillars:

**Theoretical and metrics framework.** The first pillar has two objectives: (1) to create the conceptual and theoretical basis to understand the Co-VAL research diamond and to further develop the co-creation of value beyond the state-of-the-art (see section 1.4) (WP1), (2) to provide metrics for the evaluation of the co-production of value and collect evidence for a pilot survey (WP2). These tasks will serve as the basis for the other WPs.

**Research on key co-creation areas.** WPs 3 to 6 listed in this pillar will create new evidence for selected co-creation areas or policy strategies. One will be a cross-cutting co-creation area: digital transformations and ICT in public administration (WP3). Three other WPs are “vertical”: one on service design, including service blueprinting (WP4), another on government living labs (WP5), and the third on structural relations, including public-private innovation networks and social innovation in public administrations (WP6). The four areas of value-creation were selected because they provide a wide range of concrete value co-creation situations involving (separately or jointly) the different vertices of the Co-Val research diamond, i.e.; service co-design, service co-implementation and co-delivery, service co-construction, and service co-innovation.

**Policy work.** The theoretical and empirical working packages will systematically provide the policy implications of their findings. By triangulating these findings with the policy debates, Co-VAL will develop policy briefs with bold and actionable concrete policy recommendations (WP7). But perhaps the distinguishing factor of Co-VAL is the focus on ensuring uptake of these recommendations: it will design and implement of a “co-creation policy tracker” for the transformation of public administration in Europe (WP8), further enhanced by a knowledge exchange system and platform (WP9) to make effective the requested actions in the Call during and after the project life of Co-VAL. Last but not least, it will work towards creating a sustainable think tank out of Co-VAL to ensure continuity after the project ends.

For all these three pillars, the CO-VAL’s research method will conform with the six keys of the Responsible Research and Innovation framework, adopted by the EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation 2014-2020 (i.e. Public engagement, Gender equality, Science education, Open access, Ethics, and Governance). For example, gender equality considerations will be included when performing empirical work through surveys and case studies. Methodological details on how Co-VAL intends to deal with different aspects of this proposal is included in different places of the proposal, some of them in the descriptors in section 3. The policy work (WP7-WP9) is presented in section 2 describing Co-VAL’s impacts.

**Methodology for measuring and monitoring public sector transformation (WP2)**

The first source of evidence will be provided by the metrics work (WP2). It consists of methods for measuring and monitoring transformative innovations in the public sector. In addition to analyses of publicly available data and case studies, it includes a large-scale survey of public administration managers responsible for innovation projects and a smaller linked survey of managers of NGOs and other organisations involved in co-creation roles on public sector innovations. The surveys will be conducted in six countries represented by a project partner in the project (France, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain and the UK) and covering a diverse range of European countries by size and governance forms.

WP2 will first review existing studies measuring value co-creation in public administration to first identify data that can be collected from non-survey sources and second data that can only be collected using surveys. WP2 will then design two questionnaires on value co-creation in public administration for public administrators and managers of NGOs/non-governmental collaboration partners. National language versions of both questionnaires will be tested in cognitive interviews with 60 public sector managers and 12 NGO managers. Both questionnaires will focus on a respondent-identified most important service innovation that was introduced in the previous three years. Focusing on a single innovation permits the collection of higher quality data and targeted questions.
A representative sample will then be constructed for each of the six countries using business registers, ad-hoc methods of identifying managers and other sources. The focus on the sample will be on middle managers and agency heads. Given expected response rates of about 40% for both surveys, a total sample size of 3,375 public sector managers and 300 NGO managers will be required to obtain respectively 1,350 responses and 120 NGO managers. Based on existing surveys, between 50% and 70% are likely to report a service innovation, of which 80% are likely to involve collaboration. This gives a minimum estimate of about 600 cases of a service innovation involving collaboration.

Separate questionnaires will be send to the public sector managers and NGO samples using a mix of online and mailed survey methods. A follow-up routine will be used to maximize the response rate. Both surveys will be in the field for three to four months. Collected responses will then be cleaned, including checks for illogical results, errors, etc. Using the cleaned database, both multivariate analysis and fuzzy Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) will be used to evaluate policy-relevant issues for value co-creation, in particular answering questions such as how managers deal with risk, with whom they collaborate and the barriers they face. Results will be validated in a one-day workshop in Brussels with key stakeholders. These stakeholders will include academics, policy makers, and representatives from organisations active in the co-creation of public services. Results will also be published in academic publications, briefs and newsletters and in professional magazines.

**Methodology for the 4 co-creations areas (WP3-WP6)**

The second source of new evidence will be the in-depth study of co-creation areas, including mapping and empirical case studies on existing and ongoing efforts to innovate public services in ways that enable co-creation of value. These reported cases will focus on experimental and innovative ways of interacting with users, and innovative ways of including various types of users in the development of public services. Co-VAL will search for such innovative measures within four main co-creation areas: Agile approaches of digital transformation linked to ICT development, service design and blueprinting, government innovation labs, and the structural relationship for public administration transformation through the use of PPP for co-production and co-creation of services and through social innovation in public services.

**Common objectives for co-creation areas**:

1. To investigate the nature and patterns of value co-creation through the selected areas and to develop a typology that captures and develops the diversity of the 4 types included in the Co-VAL research diamond.
2. To analyse the different roles, motivations and strategies of the actors involved in the value co-creation process, to examine the tensions between individual values and social values and how they might be resolved, and to identify the contingencies of value co-creation (and value co-destruction) in public service delivery in relation to a range of key stakeholders (e.g. users, citizens, PSOs, politicians, private sector, third sector), and consider if they are congruent or competing.
3. To assess the impacts of value co-creation through these areas using a PSDL and multi-agent framework perspective. WPs will also identify the barriers, facilitators and critical factors associated with maximising the positive impact of each of the areas in enabling and enhancing public sector co-creation.
4. To exchange and compare experiences in different countries with respect to value co-creation in order to identify best practices and derive conclusions on lessons to be learnt from successful/less successful cases. This WP will explore innovative approaches to value co-creation and the ways that it is enacted and carried out in practice, including the impact of national and cultural contexts.
5. To explore possible future developments and opportunities for boosting value co-creation through policy recommendations and guidelines.

WP 4-5-6 will develop two main tasks:

**Task 1: State-of-the-art, mapping and cross-country comparison.** A detailed survey of the contemporary literature on value co-creation cases related to each of the areas will be undertaken. A key aim will be to identify special characteristics and commonalities across the existing empirical and theoretical literature. Desk research will be complemented with interviews and/or focus groups with key innovation, policy, and academic actors. A framework for identification of best practices will be provided and mapping will be performed to offer evidence of value co-creation across Europe. Some concrete examples will also be selected and discussed. Co-VAL will focus on European cases without excluding other international experiences and will try to build typologies of the
various co-creation areas on the basis of different criteria: types of innovation involved, intensity of collaboration, diversity of stakeholders, temporality of the arrangements (permanent, transitory). Beyond the four selected areas, Co-VAL will also consider other existing co-creation areas.

**Task 2: Case Studies.** Case studies will be undertaken in those countries where team members participate to gain insight on the contingencies, potential and limitation of existing approaches in efforts to co-create value in public service delivery. The case studies will follow, document, assess and compare the use of various modes/techniques in different countries, and the empirical material will be analysed in light of the PSDL-perspective. The analysis will focus on understanding potential impacts and limitations of various approaches in different European settings. The case studies should concentrate on the level with the most face-to-face interaction with the end-users, which will probably be the municipal and regional level for most countries, according to the subsidiarity principle expressed in the terms of the Call. They will not focus on specific sector targets, but may include services such as health, social and welfare services. Some common methodological elements are provided:

*Case identification, screening and selection.* Co-VAL networks will be mobilised to provide an international screening of key value co-creation in each policy area. A large number of examples will be sought, and basic data with respect to main features and characteristics will be recorded. A subset of approximately five cases per participating team will be selected for further investigation on the basis of generalizability/impact/content/access criteria. The cases will be selected, in different countries and different fields, on the basis that they are examples of intensive value co-creation in public services.

*Data collection.* The operational analytical framework developed in the Task Force WP3-WP6 will be applied to the set of selected case studies. Data will be collected through interviews with representatives of public institutions, firms, users and users associations participating in the innovation networks. Data collection is not necessarily restricted to the home country of the participant. Data collection will involve (a) review of relevant secondary materials, (b) the organisation of focused interviews with the key actors involved in developing the transformation/innovation, and (c) discussions with experts in the field.

*Empirical analysis.* The analytical framework will be developed and implemented in order to ensure comparability across countries and fields. Thus, while each case study is an independent analysis, all share the same structure and deal with the generic set of project research questions. Once the analytical framework and the data collection are ready, the empirical analysis will be implemented to test the role of each area as a co-innovation and value co-creation source and an organizational mode for the provision and quality of public services. For this purpose, a number of qualitative and quantitative techniques (content analysis, statistical and network analysis) will be applied, and tackle the project research questions from different angles. Cases will investigate the topics included in the Call.

Below follows the summary description of each of the policy areas work (WP3-WP6). In methodological terms, this information can be complemented with the one included in the descriptors fiches in section 3.

**WP3 – Digital transformation of public administrations**

**Rationale.** Innovative technological developments outside the public sector are changing citizens’ expectations of governments’ ability to deliver high value digital services. Governments can no longer afford to separate efficiency and effectiveness from other objectives in the governance and management of digital services. The economic and financial crisis is showing that improved service delivery and internal public sector efficiency go hand-in-hand with economic growth, societal equality, and good governance objectives such as greater transparency, integrity and citizen engagement (Daglio, et al, 2015). The achievement of digital transformation requires new ways of working and new partnership attitudes to establish and strengthen cross-sectorial synergies and public-private partnerships (European Commission 2013); capacities, workflows, business processes, operations, methodologies, and frameworks need to be adapted to the evolving dynamics and relations between stakeholders enabled by the digital environment. The real challenge is to integrate citizens and other partners into the co-design and co-delivery of public sector modernization efforts. This requires governments to re-organize themselves around user expectations, needs and associated requirements, rather than their own internal logic and needs. It also implies that governments’ digital services can no longer be designed, managed, delivered and evaluated only based on the internal logic of government (Osborne et al 2016). Instead, in order to be truly transformative, governments are starting to integrate citizens into these four phases to design digital services from a citizen-centric point of view.
**Goals.** One of the main drivers for digital transformation in the public sector are the changing needs of citizens driven by their experiences raised by their use of third-party online platforms. How are public administrations changing their internal mindset and culture to redirect their design and implementation paradigm away from their own internal logic toward a human-centred design that moves the citizen into the centre of the design process? How are they creating organizational readiness for this paradigm shift? What are the methods that public managers are adapting from the private sector that are contributing to internal and external value creation? How are these methods introduced, what are the training needs, what are additional skills that public administrations might need to hire from the private sector? - Existing international cases of digital transformation show that public administrations have had to rethink the relationships to their stakeholders, especially with the contracting industry, and change acquisition routines and policies. Which new forms of IT acquisition had to be created and implemented? - Given that public administrations need to learn from the private sector, which existing policies have to be adjusted or have become obsolete? Which new policies have to be introduced and implemented? Policy reviews will include HR policies to hire IT talent from the private sector, acquisition policies to change the way public administrations create value through innovative forms of acquisition methods, and others.

**Methods:** WP3 will conduct an international comparison of public management practices using the case study methods. Each country is treated as an embedded case with integrated cases representing a number of public administrations (Yin 2013, Scholz and Tietje 2002). The goal is to trace practices and outcomes, understand the political context, and draw conclusions about similarities and differences. WP3 will start each investigation with a policy and process tracing approach, which will help the research team to conduct an upfront desk research of media coverage, official government reports, as well as to build a repository of existing bills and policies that might have been changed to allow for digital transformation activities (Collier 2011). Human-centred design methods are at their core qualitative in nature and start with interviews with the ‘client.’ The client in a human-centred design approach can be an internal client, such as an agency that needs to change the way that citizens search for and fill out forms, or they can be the final end-users, in our case mostly citizens. Instead of focusing on the internal logic of the public administration, the external viewpoint is at the centre of the investigation. WP3 will use ethnographic methods to understand how public administrations are extracting, analysing, and integrating the viewpoints of their clients into the co-design and co-creation processes. We will participate in these client interviews, observe the interactions and outcomes, and trace how knowledge extracted from interviews is funnelled into the (re)design of ICTs. After we have traced individual projects, we will conduct interviews with decision makers, clients, and designers/software developers to extract the process phases (design, management, delivery, and evaluation), ideal or expected, as well as actual outcomes of the co-production process (Richards 1996). The interviews will be analysed using a grounded-theory like approach to understand emerging patterns across the different cases (Miles and Huberman 1994, Glaser and Strauss 1967).

**WP4 - Service design for public sector transformation**

**Rationale.** Service design thinking and techniques provide means for ‘slipping into the shoes’ of service users, and to assess the service experience from this viewpoint (Stickdorn, 2014). Service design is about designing with people and not for them, and may in this way work as a driver of people-centred innovation (EU-commission, 2012). People, in this context, are not to be understood merely as the end users of services, but may also include frontline staff and other stakeholders (Polaine, Løvlie and Reason, 2013). Service design thus provides means for operationalizing co-production of public services and co-creation of public value (Radnor et al., 2014). Scholars, and the EU-commission, have recognized the potential benefits of applying service design thinking and techniques for enabling innovation and strengthening co-creation in public services (Bason, 2010; 2014; EU commission. 2012; 2013; Polaine, Løvlie & Reason, 2013). However, there is need for more systematic knowledge on how service design works in public sector service contexts. There are knowledge gaps when it comes to assessments of actual impacts and limitations of applying service design approaches for co-creation of public value. This WP will contribute to fill these knowledge gaps by studying concrete service design cases, and by positioning service design within the PSD framework. Service design thinking and techniques capture, in many ways, the essence of co-creation of value in services, by taking the users’ experiences and perspectives as point of departure for holistic understanding, innovation and improvement of services. The work package on service design makes in this way a central and valuable contribution to the overall objectives of the project.

**Goals and methodology.** The WP will investigate the use of service design approaches and assess how service design may enable co-creation of public value in practice. The WP will document various service design techniques
and methods, and examine the use of service design in practice through case studies. The WP will generate knowledge on how service design may entail innovative tools for transforming public services in Europe, and it will generate knowledge on how service design may foster innovation and transformation in service systems. The WP will consist of multiple case studies in various countries within public services dealing with vulnerable groups such as elderly care, welfare and social services. The WP will in sum generate practical knowledge on how to best make use of service design approaches in different public service contexts. This knowledge will be generated by carrying out the following investigations:

Cross-country comparison of the use of service innovation in the public sector based on literature reviews. WP4 will assess how the literature explicitly and implicitly deals with service design as means for co-innovation and co-creation of value, and explore the value dimensions in use in extant literature. The literature review will work as a foundation for the subsequent fieldwork-based case studies by contributing to the operationalization and demarcation of the service design concepts and the specific service design approaches that WP4 will focus on in the case studies. The literature review will also form part of the basis for selecting specific sites for empirical case studies. Service design is a broad term which may consist of range of material and symbolic processes. As a preliminary demarcation, WP4 will in this project focus on the kind of service design processes that deal with visual and symbolic representations of services and service systems as means for improving and innovating services by including or taking the users’ perspectives. Service blueprinting is a central tool and technique in this regard consisting of process modelling by visualizing the various components, activities, actors and units that are mobilized in specific service processes. The ‘blueprint’ is the graphical representation of the service process, which can be used as a basis for identifying illogical solutions, bottlenecks etc., and this may subsequently be used as a basis for rethinking and innovating service delivery systems in which ICT infrastructure may be a central component. While WP4 will focus on blueprinting and similar techniques of service design as a starting point, WP4 will not from the outset limit the WPs’ research on service design to these techniques since the aim of the project is to explore innovative ways of co-creating public services with users. In-depth case studies of how service design approaches can be used for co-innovation and co-creation of services. The case studies will be carried out as ethnographic field studies in four countries, and the data collection will consist of observation, interviews and document studies. The case studies will be carried out in order to gain insight on the contingencies, potential and limitation of service design approaches in efforts to co-create value in public service delivery. The case studies will be undertaken in service sectors that provide services to vulnerable groups such as elderly care, welfare and social services. In these sectors, the demands to the service providers are high in terms of quality and sensitivity to users’ needs, while capacity issues and heavy workloads tend to pressing concerns at the same time. Thus, innovating and rethinking solutions within these kinds of services are particularly urgent. The case studies will follow, document, assess and compare the use of various service design techniques in different countries and the empirical material will be analysed in light of the PSDL-perspective. The analysis will focus on understanding potential impacts and limitations of various service design approaches in different European settings. Finally, the WP will develop a toolbox that will give concrete guidelines for how to apply service design approaches to enable co-creation of public value. The toolbox will be developed on the basis of the findings derived from the literature review and empirical findings from the case studies. The development of a practical toolbox will be central in bringing the PSDL framework from a theoretical and conceptual level to a practical level.

WP5 - Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation

Rationale. Innovation and living labs are open organizational arenas for co-innovation that may enable value co-creation between citizens and public service providers. Innovation and living labs may contribute to transformations of public administration in significant ways by providing such institutional arrangement of co-innovation. They may further provide mechanisms to resolve conflicts between individual and public value. The WP is coherent with the Call’s request for research that explores and analyses how public administrations can become open and collaborative, and the search for innovative and collaborative mechanisms with new institutional arrangements that generate public value based on co-creation.

Innovation and living labs have previously been seen as innovation intermediaries (Howells, 2006; Gascó, 2016). They have been organized in private sector services (Sundbo & Sørensen, 2014) and have started to emerge also in the public sector (Burstein & Black, 2014; Carstensen & Bason, 2012; Gascó, 2016; Tonurist et al., 2015). In urban areas, living labs have been seen as a means to develop cities together with residents and other stakeholders in a real-life context (Buhr et al., 2016). Innovation and living labs are used in different more or less
strict ways to facilitate and support service innovation, and they can be more or less integrated into real-life settings. This can be organized within single public sector organizations, in collaboration between them, at the policy level, or in an open innovation environment in real-life settings as so-called living labs (Bergvall-Kåreborn & Ståhlbröst, 2009). Preliminary research shows that innovation and living labs may effectively bring together varied stakeholders characterized by different practices and norms, thereby creating a basis for co-creation of services across varied norms and practices (Gascó, 2016). However, we still lack an overview of the many different models of innovation and living labs and their usefulness for public value generation, how they may be used to resolve conflicts between individual and public value, and how they can be used in real-life-settings to generate quality and efficiency of services.

**Goals and methodology.** Based on empirical analysis, the WP will provide a thorough analysis of different types of innovation and living lab approaches and activities and will investigate the following issues: A cross-country comparison of the use of innovation and living lab approaches in the public sector; Exploration of how they bring varied stakeholders together, and how they generate public value, and address conflicts between individual and public value; Exploration of varied models of living labs in public services in terms of how they create experiential real-life settings for innovation; Concrete comparison of how living labs work, what their practices, structures, and outcomes are, and what kind of institutional work is provided for co-creation and co-innovation that transform public administration; An understanding and analysis of how they emerge and achieve legitimacy in public sector services. The methods used in this WP will include literature reviews, interviews with innovation and living lab settings in public services, observations of these activities, development of feedback loops from practitioners through workshops, panels and surveys. Scenarios and models of innovation and living labs will be crafted, and could be assessed and evaluated by policy makers. Assumptions for the analysis include: - Innovation and living labs are innovation intermediaries that exist in many forms and can provide an arena for interaction and co-creation of services between citizens, public service organizations, and other stakeholders; - Innovation and living lab approaches can provide organizational tools and an experimental mind-set for co-creating and co-innovating new services with citizens in a real-life setting that address both individual and public value and conflicts between them; - Innovation and living lab structures are often developed together with external ‘niche’ actors who must achieve moral and pragmatic legitimacy within the public sector; - Innovation and living labs can provide a mechanism for institutionalizing Co-VAL and PSDL structures and practices and transform public administration; and - Innovation and living labs can be separate organizations in their own right but can also be understood as experimental approaches that are highly integrated with public service delivery.

**WP6 - Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation**

**Rationale.** WP6 is devoted to specific structural arrangements: Public Service Innovation Networks (PSINs), including, among others, social innovation in public services. These public-private networks involve public actors (public administrations at different levels), but also private actors (commercial and voluntary actors, individual consumers and citizens) collaborating to co-create value by developing and implementing innovation (in various forms: product, process, organizational, mixed) in the public service supply. Thus, this value co-creation area is mainly focused on the “co-innovation” facet of the Co-VAL research diamond. PSINs should not be confused with other structural arrangements such as traditional public-private partnerships or traditional innovation networks (INs). They are particular cases of public-private innovation networks (PPINS) (Gallouj, Rubalcaba and Windrum, 2013), the latter being networks that strive to bridge the industrialist, market and technologist biases that characterize traditional INs. In PSINs, service providers are the main players, relations between public and private actors are at the center of the analysis and non-technological innovation, often neglected in the literature, is often the main purpose. Any public or para-public organization, whatever its level (local, regional, national, supranational) is eligible for PSINs. However, in these networks, it does not only intervene as a support for innovation, but also and above all, as an innovator or co-innovator in the strict sense. Within the PSINs framework of interactions, public administrations co-produce new public services or new public service processes. In this WP, we will consider in particular the collaboration system that aims to address key societal challenges (such as elderly people, immigrants/refugees, school drop-out, etc.) and provide social innovation. PSINs are part of the general
Theoretical framework, namely the multi-agent framework for innovation (MAFI) elaborated in WP1. MAFI contains public service producers (public administrations at different levels), consumers (citizens, associations, NGOs) and policy makers. It also includes for each of these actors their preferences in terms of service characteristics, their competences and their technologies. It provides the overarching framework in which to understand interactions between public and private sector organizations seeking to produce a public service innovation.

**Goals.** The purpose of this WP is to empirically validate MAFI in order to understand how the interaction between different public and private agents leads to the collective creation of value, here through the channel of a new public service. The more precise objectives of this WP are the following ones: To investigate and identify the characteristics and typology of public-private innovation collaborations in the design of innovative public services; To analyse differences in the role of innovation agents in public and private institutions and their contribution to public services innovation; To analyse the role of public and private institutions in multi-agent public service innovation networks; To investigate the types and domains of public service innovation co-created within these innovation networks; To investigate the impacts of these innovation networks on social inclusion of the different populations (including vulnerable communities and marginalised people) and, as a consequence, on the economic and social welfare; To carry out national comparisons in terms of PSINs dynamics; To carry out sectoral comparisons in terms of PSINs dynamics; To obtain conclusions and make suggestions for policy implications in the organization of innovation networks, how to increase policy effectiveness, increase the efficiency of resource allocation.

**Methodology.** On the basis of the mapping of PSINs experiences across European countries, each country involved in this WP will have to select at least five significant PSINs cases. These cases should be selected on the basis of being illustrations of intensive collaboration between public and private agents in order to coproduce value through co-innovation. The innovation in question should be a social innovation that seeks to provide a solution to a social or societal issue. The social or societal issues that could be addressed include elderly care, school dropouts, immigration/refugees, long-term unemployment, etc. A common analytical framework will be established in order to gather answers to the generic set of project research questions and to allow comparability between countries and cases. The empirical investigation will be based on interviews with representatives of public institutions, firms and user-associations participating in the PSIN. The research should guarantee a satisfactory coverage of different countries and different fields (social innovations, innovation networks), in order to allow some comparison. The empirical investigation will address the role of PSINs as a co-innovation and value co-creation source and an organizational mode, and examine the impact of these networks on the innovation processes developed in the provision and quality of public services. To achieve these goals, different qualitative and quantitative techniques (content analysis, statistical and network analysis) that address the project research questions from different perspectives, will be applied.

**Methodology for knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders in Co-VAL (WP8)**

A final methodological remark for this section 1.3 must be provided regarding the fact the project Co-VAL is designed to co-produce its research and policy works with a high engagement between Co-VAL teams and stakeholders. The users of Co-Val are the policy makers that could make use of its results and are expected to be engaged since the very beginning. Co-VAL has designed WP8 for knowledge exchange with different communities, including a set of policy makers representing different realities of the public administration in Europe. For that reason, the work carried on by 13 members of the consortium will be co-produced with stakeholders at three levels:

i. a panel of about 25 policy makers and practitioners who will be permanent members of Co-VAL through the life of the project; Co-VAL will launch a call for expression of interest to central government, regions and municipalities in order to form a selective representation of policy makers that can substantially
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3 Theoretical work will also cover open innovation in services (Chesbrough 2003), user-led innovation (von Hippel 2001), virtual users and user-created content (Dahan and Hauser 2001), innovation communities (Tuomi 2002, Bartl et al. 2004), employee-driven innovation (Kesting and Ulhoi 2010), as well as insights into intangible services, organizational and social innovations by Windrum and Koch (2008), Djellal and Gallouj (2010), Vand der Have and Rubalcaba (2016).
contribute to the success of the project. The stakeholders’ panel will include about 25 policy makers representing different EU realities and backgrounds (Nordic Europe, Central Europe, South Europe, Eastern EU countries, UK), different levels of public administration (central, regional, municipality) and different public services (no preference for a particular type of public service or sector). They will be selected mainly on the basis of their interest in the topic and the experience-expertise they can bring to the panel. The panel will meet face to face at least five times and will use design-thinking techniques to co-produce the different outputs, with a particular focus on co-design of the work in the first initial phase of the project.

ii. a group of high level policy makers that will participate in policy events, and provide constant feedback on the policy strategy and policy direction,

iii. a third group is formed by the wide set of stakeholders (the European Commission, representative of associations of public administrations at central, regional and local level, civil servants trade unions and business and consumer associations, among others). A particular communication strategy, mostly online, will be devoted to these groups, in particular with the goal to reach out “beyond the usual suspects.” A set of advanced online tools and methodologies will be used to ensure that co-creation is not only the topic of the research, but also a culture that informs the results of the project itself.

The following table shows the main Co-VAL stakeholders that will participate in all three levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Institutions/Public Administrations</td>
<td>European Commission; European Committee of the Regions; European Economic and Social Committee; Eurostat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National, Regional and Local Administrations</td>
<td>Municipalities, Regions and Countries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Stakeholders, associations and research centres in the public sector | • CCRE Council of European Municipalities and Regions  
• EUPAN. European Public Administration Network  
• OPSI - OECD. –Observatory of the Public Sector Innovation.  
• Center for Economics and Public Administration (CEPA) – United Nations, New York  
• EIPA – European Institute of Public Administration & EPSA – European Public Sector Award.  
• COCOPs Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future.  
• Enterprise Europe Network and European Public-Private Partnerships; Association of European Regions (AER);  
• Trade unions for civil servants such as FFPE, EPSU and Eurofedop (The European Federation of Public Service Union, European Federation of Public Service employees, European Civil Service Federation) |
| Ongoing H2020 projects on co-creation | (to be listed at the project kick-off) |
| Co-creation and social innovation Communities | Social Innovation Europe; European School of Social Innovation; Innovation journals; Scientific Associations |
| Supervising authorities | European Ombudsmen and People’s Advocacies in MS; European Court of Auditors |

1.4. Ambition

Co-VAL extends knowledge and policy beyond the state-of-the-art:

- By developing new scientific concepts and theoretical frameworks for understanding the key characteristics, drivers and barriers of value co-creation in public services;
- By generating new empirical evidence on public service value co-creation across Europe, including the identification and assessment of current trends and pressures on public sector organizations;
- By considering future changes and the specification of potential drivers and barriers of co-value creation and innovations in key policy issues; and
The delivery of policy recommendations on how to increase societal benefit through better services, participatory design of work flows in public sector organizations and the participation of citizens.

By developing a set of knowledge base, incentives and support transformations in public administrations.

This project addresses the needs of policy-makers by developing an integrated body of knowledge regarding the key drivers and barriers at distinct stages of the process of value co-creation in public sector services: notably those affecting co-creation networks at development and piloting stage, and those affecting institutionalisation and embedding in the diffusion stage. New co-creation processes and networks are likely to involve a change in the roles of citizens and organizations in the service delivery process. It is therefore necessary to develop a coherent understanding of the (multiple) roles that citizens, organizations and policy-makers play in developing value in public services, in different public sectors and in different European countries. We will therefore develop a framework that integrates our research on ‘co-creation’ in public services value – the development and diffusion/embedding by citizens, organizations and civil servants.

Using the integrated conceptual and empirical knowledge developed in Co-VAL, the project will provide policy makers with a coherent policy instrument platform. This enables the embedding of value co-creation practices in public sector services and commissioning of innovative services, and the development of new practices and competences for civil servants on risk management and leadership in initiatives.

1.4.1 Theoretical and empirical research pillar: progress beyond the state of the art

From New Public Management to Public Service Dominant Logic. Historically, public services have been designed from the supply side, with public service professionals at the top level of public administration deciding upon the appropriate configuration of services and their aims and objectives. There have been periodic attempts at participative planning (of course) since the 1960s (with noticeable differences between countries). However, these have been sporadic and were still dominated by professional, rather than citizen or service user, discourses. More recent approaches assign greater importance to participation of front-desk employees (the ones in more direct contact with users) in generation of ideas and development of service improvements; however, it has become apparent that this is not yet a ‘fit for purpose’ approach. Too often, this has led to services that do not have enough congruence with citizen or user needs. Over the last decade, an alternative approach has evolved situated within the New Public Governance (NPG) paradigm. Drawing upon service theory, this paradigm posits that public services are indeed services rather than products, as articulated with the New Public Management (NPM). This has significant consequences for our understanding of them.

A few decades ago, NPM arose as a new and pre-eminent paradigm for public administration practice and theory. It indeed represented a concept innovation and was helpful in dealing with some contemporary problems of ‘traditional’ public administration (TPA). Nonetheless, many scholars now argue that NPM was flawed from the beginning and flaws have mislead the reforming aim with which it was born, because of its pre-occupation with treating public service as a manufacturing rather than service delivery process (Osborne et al., 2013). It presents production and delivery of services as if they were manufactured goods, which completely neglects the very nature of services, in general, and public services in particular. This kind of considerations, together with difficulties in its applicability, caused practitioners and scholars to move to a more ‘holistic’ theory of public administration, one that puts into consideration the intangible nature of services and the networked nature of PSOs. Among efforts towards new theory, the construct known as New Public Governance is noticeably gaining popularity. Osborne (2006) has sketched out some elements that NPG should have in order to gather a consistent body of theory. Such elements include an emphasis on service processes and outcomes and on service systems rather than individual organisations or even organisational networks, theory rooted within organizational sociology and networking theory, and governance mechanisms through trust or relational contracts.

As seen above, one of the main elements of NPG theory is service processes and outcomes (as opposed to good’s manufacturing processes). Services defined within the scope of NPG are invariably process-based (with production and consumption often occurring simultaneously) and concerned with the transformation of
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4There is a discussion on whether or not NPM could really be considered as a paradigm (Osborne, 2006).
5For more information on TPA and the transition to NPM see for example Osborne, 2006.
6For the transition into networked governance concepts see for example Langergaard and Scheuer (2009) Hartley (2005) and Hess and Adams (2007).
knowledge (more precisely: the transformation of the state of the medium in which the service provider and the user are linked, in accordance to Gadrey (1996)), intangible in nature, and co-produced between service users (‘consumers’) and Public Service Organisations (PSOs). Significantly, public service delivery occurs not within individual PSOs, or even within networks of them, but rather within public service systems that include not only PSOs but also service users, collaborative user organisations, local communities and citizens, and hard and soft technology. Furthermore, users are not only co-producers of the service itself (in design, expectations and experience) but they also co-produce service value, in that there is no extant value for service until it is used. The understanding of public services as services, will be developed in Co-VAL in the context of the Public Service Dominant Logic (PSDL) suggested by Osborne et al. (2013), as a consequence of the theoretical basis of NPG.

The conceptual development of the Co-VAL project will put the public service-dominant logic (PSDL) at the heart of the NPG. This implies articulating how value is co-created (or sometimes co-destroyed) by service users and PSOs through co-productive relationships in the design, delivery and management of public services. As illustrated in the concept section 1.1. value is conceptualised in a novel research diamond across four dimensions – the co-production of actual public services in relation to individual needs and welfare, the co-construction of the lived experience of service users within a service system and its consequent impact upon the well-being and life experience of the user, the co-design and co-management of public services to ensure that they are ‘fit for purpose’ in the delivery of public services, and the co-innovation of new forms of public service delivery to create social capital for the future. In this approach ‘value’ is understood as being created externally to PSOs. It is concerned with meeting social and economic objectives, affecting the well-being of citizens and users, addressing community integration and cohesion, and creating the capacity for responding to changing needs in the future.

Presently, we know little about the mechanisms through which knowledge (both user and professional) and experience are transformed in order to design effective public services for the future. The concepts of ‘value’ for public services and ‘co-creation,’ are also ‘fuzzy concepts’ within the public policy discourse. This issue is at the heart of this proposal. We intend to explore how to co-create value for individuals and society through the design and delivery of public services. We will explore and evaluate six approaches to the understanding of social and economic needs and the consequent individual and societal value that they relate to. At the heart of this, will be an examination of the tension between social values at the societal level and individual value for individual service users.

Understanding of the value co-creation process through collective activities of service production – including co-design, co-implementation and co-delivery, co-construction, and co-innovation in public services (the four vertices of our research diamond) – is essential for improving the roles of citizens, organizations and policy-makers in the development and diffusion of value in public services. It is the basis for effective policy-making. Practitioners need to know how to produce more and better innovations. Likewise, policymakers and funders need to know how to design contexts supporting the service’s value creation processes that are organizationally sustainable. The PSDL framework developed by Co-VAL will provide a comprehensive framework for understanding and discussing public service value co-creation processes and outcomes. This framework is novel in its explicit consideration of the interests, preferences and competences of citizens, organizations, and policy makers and how these interact in the processes of co-creation and diffusion.

The PSDL framework provides novel insights into the process dimension of value co-creation. The framework makes explicit citizen competences and social capital, and highlights conflicting areas of interest between citizens and other stakeholders in the development of competences and social capital. This is essential to discussions concerning the role and importance of societal engagement and creativity, and the development and scaling-up of value co-production.

Osborne et al. (2016) provided some preliminary ideas on how to adapt SDL to the public context. One of the main goals of the theoretical advances of Co-VAL is to build on this and develop the idea in order to contribute to the NPG paradigm in public administration reform. This entails a foundation for development of more resilient and responsive public services. Thus, the theoretical advancements of Co-VAL will help to take beyond the state-of-the-art three bodies of theory that are contemporarily relevant for public policy – and are simultaneously under construction – each particular one framed by a more general one. First, as a primary objective of Co-VAL, we have the co-creation of value of public services, by interactions within a networked system that is at the core of PSDL. At the same time, PSDL is meant to be one of the pillars of the NPG paradigm in what it helps to emphasize service processes and outcomes and a governance mechanism through trust and relational contracts.
The integration of services in public services studies from a multiagent perspective. Services studies and public service studies are two research fields that have developed separately with relatively scarce intersections between them. This lack of interaction is partly explained by the different disciplinary backgrounds: economics and management (especially marketing) for services studies, political science and public management for public service studies. Thus, on the one hand, the theory of services has grown by focusing essentially on market services, excluding mostly public services and, on the other hand, public services studies have long overvalued the public dimension of the activities in question, overlooking their service-based dimension. By focusing on the co-creation of value in the delivery of public service, the Co-VAL project seeks to (re)place the service dimension at the heart of public services and thus to reconcile public services studies and services studies. The NPG paradigm under construction, which the Co-VAL project intends to contribute to, precisely reflects this rise of service in the public product, i.e. the public product servitization. This conquest of public service studies by the theory of services can be described in several theoretical perspectives, which follow one another, while overlapping or complementing each other. In more recent times public studies have favoured the integrative approaches and the SDL and the multi-agent and network approaches.

The service theory gained consistency by more complex and inclusive theoretical models, and in completing the demarcation perspective (focusing on the specificity of services) by a synthesis or integration perspective, which considers that everything is service. These less mechanical theories include the functional economy (economics) (Stahel, 1997), which defines any good (or service) by the function (service) it provides, the experience economy (economics) (Pine and Gilmore, 1999), which defines a good or service by the experience it provides to the consumer, the new perspective in terms of ”service science” (Maglio and Spohrer, 2008), which is a science of services and goods. Another formulation of this integrative theoretical perspective is more directly focused on the issue of innovation. It is the characteristics-based approach (Gallouj and Weinstein, 1997; De Vries, 2006; Windrum and Garcia-Goñi, 2008) which describes any product (whether a good or a service) as the mobilization of competences and technical characteristics belonging to the customer, the provider or to other agents in order to coproduce service characteristics. These integrative theoretical approaches include the approach in terms of "Service-Dominant Logic" (Vargo and Lusch, 2006) which is very successful because of its conceptual simplicity and its ability to integrate the various previous advances in the theory of services. SDL defines value by the value-in-use. It also focuses on the co-production of value by the customer and the provider. The Co-VAL project intends to go beyond the SDL paradigm, building a public service dominant logic (PSDL).

A key assumption of Co-VAL project is that the co-production of value should not be considered in a dyadic perspective (a relationship between the user and the provider), but in a multi-agent, open or systemic perspective. Earlier on, Benington and Hartley (2001) describe a transition conducive to generation and adoption of innovation in public organisations. Transition goes from a Traditional Public Administration, through New Public Management, to the settlement of a Networked Governance, whose key concept is ‘public value’ and whose main actors are Networks, Partnerships and Civic leadership. Also, Dunleavy et al. (2005) point out a process by which NPM is dying out in favour of a post-era of governance characterised by holistic and needs-oriented structures and progressing digitalization of administrative services (i.e. use of ICTs). Likewise, Osborne et al. (2016) review the change of paradigm, from NPM to NPG. The core in Osborne’s NPG is that public services are (co-) produced and (co-) delivered within public service systems: a more complex form of networks of public organisations and external agents. A key contribution of the Co-VAL project is therefore the development of a multi-agent framework for understanding the (multiple) roles which citizens/users, public and private, organizations and policy-makers play in co-producing and co-creating value, and how their interactions shape the value that is developed. Organizations shouldn’t be considered as single actors but as networks of individuals with different goals and different (complementary or competing) visions of the public service to be provided.

Although it also encompasses the use of external sources, this multiagent perspective goes way beyond the mere use of external sources by public administrations. Thanks to the interaction between various agents’ competences, technologies and preferences it emphasises the co-creation dynamics and knowledge spillovers. Co-VAL intends to explore the form in which the use of external sources is done, through the four categories in the research diamond (co-innovation, co-design, co-implementation and co-delivery and co-construction). This four-category approach will allow us to better understand the role of external sources in public services and its specificities against innovation in other areas of the economy, private sector in particular. While studies on manufacturing firms assign importance to R&D as the main source on which the innovation process relies,
innovation in services mostly relies on sources that are not directly related to R&D (Barra, 1990; Howells, 2000; Miles & Tether, 2003; Tether, 2005; Rubalcaba et al., 2012) and opens up to a variety of ways of innovation interactions that still need comprehensive frameworks to be understood, specially in public services where incentive systems are different (e.g. mainly non-market) and external sources are heavily connected to citizens and final users, instead of customers or market users. The services approaches given by the service innovation multiagent framework and by the Public Service Dominant Logic will make possible a new holistic and operational framework for understanding the transformation of public administration.

**Novelty of the empirical and evidence-based approach**

**Novelty in Co-VAL metrics and international survey**

The international survey in WP2 will be the first large-scale survey collecting information from managers on value co-creation in public administration. The target response of 1,350, will allow for a robust statistical analysis aimed at identifying the key factors that explain co-creation in public services. A better understanding of these key factors will allow to re-design innovation projects in the public sector to better exploit opportunities for co-creating new public services maximizing their impact on users and society. The survey and the accompanying guidelines will be designed so that they can easily be implemented in other EU countries.

**Novelty in Co-VAL mapping and case studies in four value co-creation areas**

**Creation on digital transformations and ICT.** WP3 focuses on the emergent concept of digital transformation in the public sector and the integration of the existing co-value creation approaches in the public administration literature. Digital transformation has so far been used in the private sector to describe the exploitation of digital technologies to change the existing business models. In the public sector, digital transformation highlights the change from designing public service delivery following the internal administrative logic to designing digital innovations from a client-service-centred perspective, putting the citizen at the centre of the design process.

**Service design.** Service design originates from marketing and management disciplines, and has traditionally, and most commonly, been applied to private sector services to enhance customer experience and satisfaction. While the thinking, methods and techniques are highly valuable also in public sector service settings, its’ potential and limitations need to be understood in relation to the complexity involved in generating value for users, citizens and European communities. There are some fundamental differences between enhancing customer experience through service design in commercial services compared to public services. Public sector administers and distributes limited resources, and public services need to constantly balance conflicting demands when it comes to meeting different groups and stakeholders in just and reasonable ways. The equality of treatment principle, underlying public services, affects the way in which service design approaches can be used to transform existent service systems. Moreover, the needs and desires of service users need to be balanced against professional expertise. For instance, treatment of patients in health care services cannot be based merely on what patients find reasonable and desirable, but also on decisions based in medical expertise. The novelty of the research carried out in this WP relates to how it will generate systematic knowledge on the special characteristics of public sector services, and subsequent implications for the use of service design approaches. This knowledge can be obtained by analysing the use of service design in public service contexts within a PSDL framework.

**Government living labs.** The WP will investigate the concept and method of innovation and living labs and explore how innovation and living labs and other participatory and experimental methods are used as a basis for co-creation and co-innovation of public services that transform public administration. Innovation and living labs are open organizational settings for service innovation that provide structure and tools for combing inputs from citizens and other stakeholders with public sector concerns. Previous research has investigated innovation labs as a basis for innovation in the private sector (Sundbo & Sørensen, 2014). Other studies investigate living labs as a basis for co-creational innovation in social settings such as urban areas (Buhr, et al., 2016; Friedrich et al., 2013; Hillgren et al., 2011; Björgvinsson, et al., 2012). More recently, research on innovation and living labs in the public sector has also emerged (Carstensen & Bason, 2012; Gascó, 2016; Tonurist, et al., 2015). However, we still need an overview over different models and approaches to innovation and living labs in order to understand how they can address individual and public value and conflicts between them, and the kind of institutional work that is provided to change public administration. Further, we need to differentiate between different organizational models of various innovation labs and living labs in terms of the breadth and intensity of the social interaction and participation they create, the risks and downsides of participatory approaches, the structures and tools they
provide, how they bring actors together in co-creational frameworks, how they are integrated into real-life settings, how they deal with conflicting values, and how they become accepted and institutionalized. Particularly we know little about how such frameworks can generate value in terms of, for example, service quality and efficiency, social inclusion and public trust. Further, we know little about how they can operate in a productive way in a real-life-setting, where they need to address both individual and collective value and tensions between them. Finally, we need to know how they deal with conflicts between public, private and civic actors characterized by different practices and norms. The WP will contribute by exploring collaborative models for dealing with such conflicts in respectful and effective ways, particularly in real-life-settings, seeking to understand them as resources for public innovation and development rather than as barriers.

**Structural relationships.** WP6 (Structural transformations: public-private innovation networks and social innovation in public services) will provide empirical validation for an important theoretical component of our analysis, i.e. the multiagent framework for (social) innovation in public services. The multi-agent framework will provide a comprehensive framework for understanding and discussing innovation in public services and its relationship with social innovation. This framework is novel in its explicit consideration of the interests, preferences and competences of citizens, organizations, and policy makers and how these interact in the processes of collective innovation and diffusion. The multi-agent framework provides novel insights into several pillars of the Co-Val research diamond:  

i) **Social innovation and its relationship with public service innovation.** Social innovation is often seen as an alternative to traditionally conceived models of innovation, and innovation Policy (business innovation and public innovation). WP6 will contribute to advance our knowledge of the nature of social innovation, which often has both a service and public dimension. It will show that, especially due to their collective nature (their coproduction within public-private multiagent networks) and the citizen empowerment dynamics involved (see below), social innovations are not necessarily substitutes to public innovations, but facets of the same reality.  

ii) **Citizen roles and empowerment.** Citizens can play many ‘active’ roles in value co-creation and innovation in public services. However, active citizen engagement requires particular sets of competences, knowledge bases, and social capital. When absent, supporting policies are required. The multi-agent framework makes explicit these citizen competences and social capital, and highlights conflicting areas of interest between citizens and other stakeholders in the development of competences and social capital. This is essential to discussions concerning the role and importance of societal engagement and creativity, and the development and scaling-up of social and public innovation.  

iii) **Collective creation and diffusion.** Collective creation is a distinguishing aspect of social/public innovation. It is the interactions between key stakeholders that shape the direction of innovation, and the types and features of the new products and services that are developed. A great advantage of the multi-agent framework is that it enables modelling of the interactions of stakeholders who develop and diffuse social and public innovations, and how these interactions shape the features of new goods and services.

### 1.4.2 Policy research pillar: progress beyond the state of the art

In December 1995, the Green Paper on innovation (Com 95/688) introduced a term that framed the debate on innovation policy for decades: the so-called European innovation paradox argued that Europe was excellent in research, but failed to translate the results into marketable product. It is fair to say that this paradox is very much visible in the context of research about public administration and e-government, which have been a frequent topic in the previous Framework Programme and where European researchers have been global leaders. This impressive body of research (both in quality and quantity), however, has achieved a limited impact in the practice and policy of European governments. Typically, research projects delivered a substantial review of the state of the art, a set of well-designed pilots, and a well-written, ambitious exploitation plan. While the insight from the project was significant, the actual impact on the practice was very limited: the increased attention towards openness and co-creation was more the result of institutional isomorphism than of evidence-based policy-making (Osimo, 2015).

Co-VAL aims to overcome this paradox by dedicating a major part of the project to achieving policy impact. Rather than focussing on a set of micro-actions, it already includes activities for scaling up public sector innovation at a systemic level, by leveraging and learning from the substantial amount of innovation that is already taking place. Too often governments are considered purely as resistant to change, where in reality they have to deal with a complex reality and negotiate constantly their action. Co-VAL recognizes this and aims precisely to empower the innovators inside public administrations (policy-makers and practitioners) by providing them the best possible evidence, ambitious policy recommendations and ways to demonstrate progress.
In three years, Co-VAL aims to set the foundations for a sustainable think tank that is recognized as an engine of public sector innovation by providing the best available evidence, inspiring guidelines, concrete ways to implement them and a trusted monitoring system to show progress. To do so, Co-VAL brings together the skills of some of the most advanced knowledge centre in this domain.

The first set of activities refers to the development of high-impact policy briefs, accompanied by high level events with senior administrators. The Lisbon Council has unique experience in delivering such kind of policy impact and participates in the proposal precisely to enhance its capacity to generate change in public administration, as demonstrated with document such as the Scale Up Europe Manifesto. Within Co-VAL, partners will deliver a set of bold but actionable recommendations that provide greater legitimacy and endorsement for government innovators; they will support and pave the way for proposed innovation measures; and they will speak to and be listened by policy-makers.

The second strand of policy activities cover the knowledge to implement those recommendations. Co-creation is both an art and a science. Co-VAL will provide structured knowledge base of good practices and open platforms for mutual learning between government. It will create a trusted space for honest and direct dialogue between practitioners and researchers, through a set of state of the art online and offline instruments: database, panel events, online engagement.

Finally, the third strand of policy support will deliver a system to track policy progress in a transparent, intuitive and appealing way. The Co-VAL policy tracker, based on the unique experience of The Lisbon Council policy trackers, will become a central point of reference to discover who is doing what. Perhaps most importantly, the tracker will provide incentives for government to adopt co-creation policy measures by providing a recognition system, again designed to empower innovators inside government. Governments will be assessed and ranked based on a set of “policy indicators”: binary variables about the implementation of the specific recommendations, corroborated by evidence.

In summary, Co-VAL aims to be not only a source of knowledge, but a service for change in public administration. To do so, it designs a set of tools and methods that provide both the knowledge and the incentives to support implementation, by bringing together some of the most advanced European experiences in this domain.

2. Impact

2.1. Expected impacts

Government modernisation has long been the focus of policy attention because of its recognized strategic role in the innovation ecosystem. However, the strategic objectives to foster modernisation have changed. The emphasis in the 1980s and 1990s on business culture and technology needs to be integrated with an equivalent focus on transparent and collaborative government, in particular with the emergence of the Open Government movement.

Co-VAL aims to deliver sustainable scientific and policy impacts that push the boundaries of scientific knowledge and policy practice of relevance to these trends. The synergy of the scientific and policy oriented activities is expected to increase the impacts in both scientific and policy areas, and to set the foundation for ongoing impacts after the project ends.

---

7 [www.scaleupeuropemanifesto.eu](http://www.scaleupeuropemanifesto.eu) presented to Commissioner Oettinger at the 2016 Digital Assembly in Bratislava.
The two strategic objectives to make significant contributions to both research and policy will be met by producing instruments to reach different target groups involved in co-creation and transformative public sector innovation, as outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Instruments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific impact</td>
<td>• Researchers • Public administration training institutes • Think tanks</td>
<td>• Scientific publications • Presentations at scientific conferences • Books • Scientific online communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy impact</td>
<td>• Practitioners at EU, national and local level • Policy-makers at EU, national and local level • NGOs and social innovators • Citizens • Developers</td>
<td>• Policy briefs • Policy events • Panel events • Practitioners online communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table below shows the link between expected impacts and the Co-Val pillars and WPs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call text about expected impact</th>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Working Package</th>
<th>Impact objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific-base related impacts: The actions will form the basis for new institutional strategies and mechanisms to enhance collaboration among government departments and with other actors to collaboratively design, produce and deliver public services and policies. The findings will help public administrations at all levels to rethink their</td>
<td>RESEARCH on Theoretical and metrics framework</td>
<td>Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL</td>
<td>To provide a comprehensive and holistic theoretical framework to understand value co-creation in public services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Digital transformation of public administrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Service design for public sector transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call text about expected impact</td>
<td>Pillar</td>
<td>Working Package</td>
<td>Impact objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roles in the European society.</td>
<td></td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Government innovation and living labs as a basis co-creation and co-innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The actions will also improve the understanding of the effectiveness of related public policies in different democratic models</td>
<td></td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Structural transformations: public-private innovation networks and social innovation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy related-impacts:**

Results will give guidance to governments and policy makers on how to transform public administrations to become open, innovative and collaborative and on the cultural, legal or procedural changes needed to facilitate the direct uptake of research and other insights by stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Working Package</th>
<th>Policy recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POLICY</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Policy recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To elaborate of policy briefs and high level events on policy recommendations including guidance to governments and policy makers at central, regional and local levels. To design a sustainability plan to enable the transformation of Co-VAL in a sustainable think tank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking up the policy recommendations will ultimately lead to improved public service delivery and policy effectiveness, higher quality services, improved societal evidence, improved user experiences and inclusiveness as well as increasing level of civic participation, [...] and good governance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Working Package</th>
<th>Sustainable policy impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Knowledge sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To deliver a knowledge base and strong peer-to-peer engagement of policy-makers in Co-VAL to maximise policy impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>Sustainable policy impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To develop a tracker system to monitor, assess and promote the follow-up to policy recommendations by government and identify best practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the scientific side, the project aims to move beyond the state of the art, mainly through the activities of the theoretical and empirical research WPs. Co-creation and service innovation are two still marginal but particularly dynamic fields of research that are in what Kuhn describes as a pre-paradigmatic phase, that is, a period in which a multitude of definitions and more or less contradictory theories compete with each other without one imposing itself on the others. Co-VAL will endeavor to establish a dialogue between these two fields of research, with mutually rewarding results for both. The fact that co-creation both a service innovation itself and an innovation in how to develop innovative services, makes this dialogue all the more desirable. As explained in Sections 1.1 and 1.2, new empirical evidence will be provided and, where appropriate, new original methodological approaches will be designed and used. The service-dominant logic and the service innovation multiagent framework will serve as the analytical bridge for that dialogue. Co-VAL will produce a range of important and novel empirical findings that will further understanding of co-creation, collaboration, and diffusion beyond the state-of-the-art. It will do this by combining statistics and case studies. Empirical evidence from statistical analysis and the analysis of
transformations in public administrations will be supplemented with qualitative data specifically collected for the purposes of the project. These require the use of methods that analyse information on critical events in the dynamics of co-creation processes. The expected scientific impacts are as follows:

- Foundations of a new comprehensive and holistic paradigm for understanding transformations of public administration from a co-creation perspective.
- Development and integration of a public service-dominant logic (PSDL) in the new public governance (NPG) paradigm. The conceptual development of the Co-VAL project will place the PSDL dominant logic at the heart of the NPG paradigm.
- Linkages and synergies between PSDL and NPG approaches and the multiagent service innovation framework applied to public services, including and evaluation of public-private-third sector innovation networks.
- Enrichment of existing innovation theories of innovation in public services, by providing a new perspective from the PSDL approach.
- Enrichment of theories of innovation in services in general, taking into account public services and also, more generally, enrichment of demand and user driven innovation theories and of the basis for demand driven innovation policies.
- New metrics and empirical evidence for value co-creation in public administration through the Co-VAL survey for understanding transformations in public administrations (WP2). Implications for further innovation surveys (e.g. the Community Innovation Survey) and an impact on future OECD work on public sector innovation can also be expected.
- An original data base of co-creation cases across Europe, based on the mapping exercise to be undertaken in the four co-creation WPs: digital transformations (WP3), service design (WP4), government living labs (WP5), and changing structural relationships for public-private-third sector innovation networks and social innovation (WP6).
- A collection of in-depth analyses on case studies in the four Co-VAL co-creations areas, representing different experiences in many European institutional and cultural environments. These cases will deliver insights on the impact assessment of selected initiatives and the multi-criteria evaluation methods for assessment. The goal is to identify what works and what does not work in value co-creation and why and how. WP2 will also be able to explore this issues, using survey data for over 500 service innovations developed through co-creation or collaboration. The four co-creation WPs will provide new models, toolboxes or service blueprinting to provide policy makers with a better understanding of the drivers of successful transformation in public administration agencies.

On the policy side, co-creation is today one of the key dimension of Open Government, a concept which has gradually taken center stage across all institutional levels and has become the single most important priority of eGovernment across Member States. The most recent eGovernment Action Plan 2016-2020 emphasizes the importance of “engaging citizens, businesses and civil society in the collaborative design, production and delivery of public services and to facilitate interaction between public administrations and businesses and citizens.” At the same time, public sector innovation remains a central piece of the EU innovation strategy, in particular in the context of open innovation.

Yet despite these intentions, recent research (PWC & Open Evidence 2016) shows that collaboration remains the exception rather than the rule. Adoption of co-creation practices remains spotty and one-off, rather than part of a strategic endeavor. In many cases, co-creation is launched as a goal in itself, rather than as a way to consistently improve public services. And it certainly has not managed to change public trust in government, as shown by the recent rise in populist parties. Co-VAL will increase the awareness of co-creation and the knowledge of implementation strategies among policy makers and practitioners, as well as put in place accountability mechanisms to track “who does what” in co-creation. Indeed, the concept of co-creation is contained in a wide variety of policy documents across all institutional levels. It is fair to assume that every country and region in Europe have an e-government strategy, which today typically includes open government, of which co-creation is one of the three main components:

- EU level: e-government is included in the e-government Action Plan and the EU Ministerial declaration. Moreover, The Annual Growth Survey 2016 shows that modern and efficient public administration is necessary to ensure fast and high-quality services for firms and citizens in the EU.
• National level: e-government is included in national e-government strategies and the Open Government Partnership action plans (for partner countries of the OGP).
• National and sub-national levels: all countries and regions that are beneficiaries of ERDF have to develop a strategic ICT plan which includes e-government components.

To design and achieve policy impact, we rely on existing studies and policy frameworks to provide a robust high-level intervention logic covering drivers and impacts that informs Co-VAL. The set of impacts and drivers reported by the literature and covered by Co-VAL are summarized in a high level intervention logic shown in the figure below. The main outcomes of collaborative government are considered cost savings, better quality of services, increased trust by citizens and innovation spillovers (such as through government-business collaboration for open data and reusable web services such as eID). The main drivers (and conversely bottlenecks) of adoption are the availability of evidence about the benefit, the awareness by both policy makers and citizens, the leadership and incentives to implement it, and the ability to adopt a long-term perspective to the realization of benefits. This conceptual model informs the impact analysis of Co-VAL. Co-VAL will address directly all of the main drivers of collaboration, leading indirectly to greater adoption of co-creation practices, which will ultimately lead to cost savings, better services, increased public trust and innovation. The scientific impact of the project is delivered by the WPs related to Framework and Research, while the policy impact by the Policy WPs.

With regard to understanding, there is still uncertainty in how to define collaborative government. Many different definitions co-exist. The Co-VAL “Framework WPs” will provide a clear overall definition of the concept, building on existing definitions and bringing together different literature streams. It will also provide a much needed measurement framework for supporting all the activities of collaborative government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding &amp; a state-of-the-art conceptual model</td>
<td>WP1, WP2</td>
<td>Conceptual model</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of best-practices (what works)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of existing data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of existing data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td></td>
<td>Metrics (10 to 20 from the survey, 10 from the evaluation of existing data).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific papers produced on theory and definition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Scientific papers produced on theory and definition</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite several years of policy focus, we still lack a robust evidence base on the benefits and mechanisms of collaboration. There are individual success stories and specific metrics, but we lack a comprehensive scientific base combining established theoretical frameworks with empirical data. The scientific WPs will provide a radical step forward in providing adequate evidence to policy makers and practitioners about the benefits of collaboration and about “what works” under different circumstances and for different types of services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>KPIs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of impacts</td>
<td>WP1 – WP6</td>
<td>Scientific papers produced</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Papers in reference database</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In terms of **awareness**, the main challenge is to ensure that the research findings reach policy-makers and practitioners throughout Europe and at different institutional levels. Co-VAL adopts a combination of online and offline dissemination activities, plus non-academic publications in professional and practitioner magazines. Because of the nature of the audience, the focus should be not so much on the quantity but on the quality of dissemination: ensuring high attention levels and engagement towards the project activities by key decision-makers. Moreover, communication activities will aim not only at “spreading the word” but at engaging stakeholders in a co-creation process of the main recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Number of participants to policy events</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of policy-makers in the project mailing list</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of papers in practitioner and professional magazines</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research findings by themselves will not lead automatically to change. The project will ensure **thought leadership** by translating the findings into actionable policy recommendations. Recent publications produced by project partners such as the Scale-Up Europe Manifesto\(^9\) show an effective approach, adopted by Co-VAL, to elaborate ambitious but actionable recommendations. The recommendations will be based on a triangulation of Co-VAL research findings, current policy priorities as defined in the main policy documents, and the engagement of stakeholders. The involvement of high profile stakeholders will reinforce the legitimacy of the recommendations and their policy impacts. In addition to the project events, it will be necessary to ensure active participation by Co-Val partners in the main policy-relevant conferences in this domain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Number of policy papers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of downloads of policy papers</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of presentations held at policy events</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of comments received in online discussion</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in public administration is notoriously difficult, and in many cases for well-founded reasons. Change can be supported through appropriate **incentives** to overcome a cultural resistance to innovation that is still present in many public administration agencies. There is the risk that Co-VAL remains “yet another research project” with good scientific results that are not translated into innovation – in this case, public sector innovation. Because of the strategic nature of the topic, the issue here is not to implement a set of pilots, but to drive systemic changes throughout public administration. There is a wealth of collaboration initiatives, as demonstrated by recent studies: what is needed is to scale up the results of existing collaborative initiatives. In order to promote this systemic innovation, Co-VAL will deliver a data-driven tracking system for assessing the implementation of recommendations throughout the EU member states. An online dashboard will allow for immediate comparison and benchmarking of the extent to which governments are implementing collaborative initiatives in line with the recommendations. This visual comparison and precise tracking will act as an incentive to implement collaborative government initiatives, and will also serve as a repository of good practices to help mutual learning and knowledge exchange between governments.\(^10\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incentives and guidelines</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Number of policy indicators</td>
<td>20 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of member states tracked</td>
<td>At least 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Last but not least, the project adopts a long-term perspective to driving change. The goal is to build, in the context of the project, the foundations for a sustainable think tank, able to exploit the achievements of the project and continue its activities in the years to come. To this end, WP7 will define a sustainability plan which will specifically aim to identify revenue sources and assess inspiring examples of good practices that reached sustainability after the end of the grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long term perspective</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Number of revenue sources investigated in depth</td>
<td>At least 10 (both public and private)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of good practices investigated</td>
<td>At least 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of meetings with potential funders</td>
<td>At least 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The impact of the project depends also on external variables and framework conditions. The main uncertainty is over the degree of policy priority attributed in the future to collaborative government. Several experts have voiced concerns over possible “disappointment effects” from open government initiatives that did not materialize. In this respect, the most recent e-government action plan reiterated the importance of collaboration. However, it is not yet known if future high-level policy documents, such as the outcome of the next e-government ministerial conference in Tallinn 2017, will continue this strong focus on collaboration. Nevertheless, co-creation and collaboration are not limited to e-government – they can play an important role in all forms of transformative innovation in the public sector. Other than that, due to the nature of Co-Val research and policy work, the project will not be affected by any barrier, obstacles and framework conditions such as regulations and standards. Instead, a full analysis of the internal risks is provided in section 3.2.4.

2.2. Measures to maximise impact

Co-VAL by design gives a prominent role to the maximization of impacts, as illustrated in the previous section. To achieve this, we adopt a ‘T’ shaped approach, combining in–depth and long-term policy impacts with wide and large scale awareness-raising. In section a) below we illustrate first the activities to achieve deep “policy impacts”; in the second part b) we address the more general and “wide” communication activities. Section a) covers, therefore, all the drivers illustrated in the initial section, while section b) deals only with the activities related to “awareness”.

2.2.1 Knowledge co-sharing with stakeholders, dissemination and exploitation of results

IPR and exploitation

Because of the nature of the project, Co-VAL envisages an exploitation strategy not built on IPR exploitation but on policy impact and sustainability. The achievement of an ideal exploitation of results would be that results are used by public administration and, for this reason, that the service provided becomes sustainable in the form of a think tank, as described in the previous section. Anyway, despite the project will not generate patents, Co-VAL will include measures to protect the knowledge generated by the project according to nature of the results such as standard copyrights related to scientific open access publications, trade-marks for the acronym and domains names for the Web site.

The Co-VAL project is aligned with the requirements for open access to research data and open access to scientific publications, as they are defined in the EC guidelines on Open Access to Scientific Publications and Research Data in Horizon 2020. A Data Management Plan (DMP) will be generated during the first six months of the project to define the specific standards of the databases in terms of formats, archiving and preservation. The DMP will be updated at month 18 to include potential deviations and a final one at month 36.

The datasets collected and produced by the project cover a new set of metrics and empirical evidence for value co-creations in public administrations and data with respect to the analysis of co-creation cases for digital transformations, public service design, government labs, and changing structural relationships in public private

partnerships. The afore-mentioned datasets comprise the project foreground knowledge of this research driven work and they will be considered by the Co-VAL project for participation in Open Research Data Pilot.

Although the project already considers international standards and initiatives to work with open data formats, we will make sure that the data used in the Open Research Data pilot will be structured in widely known and reusable formats, like CSV, XML or JSON. In any case, recommendations from international organizations and initiatives, like W3C and the OpenAire project, will be adopted and make sure that the selected format is rich enough to allow data be presented, according to categorical and numerical features, be interoperable for well-known tools in the field, and be independent so that they can be derived and presented, based on specific selection criteria. Any details on addressing how the Co-VAL project will preserve data to be compliant with data protection mechanisms will be documented in the relevant Data Management Plan, which is part of the project management activities.

With regards to open access to scientific publications, the Co-VAL project the project will include measures to provide open access to peer reviewed scientific publications resulting from the project. Open access costs are reflected in the overall budget of the project. Priority will be given to high-impact factor journals and conference proceedings, most of which now offer open-access publication by payment of a fee. Finally, in case that a non-open access publisher is selected due to its higher impact factor, pre-prints of the articles will be made available on the project website, and the published version will be provided as soon as the exclusivity period has expired.

For what concerns the tools developed by the project, such as the policy tracker and the database of good practices, they will be published as open source and the related content released under CC-BY 4.0.12

Other measures

Following the methodology described in section 1.3, knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders is essential for Co-VAL. The stakeholders’ panel will include 25 external members who will be part of the project and assist in the dissemination of results in their own organisation and countries. The stakeholders will be selected after a call of expression of interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>WPs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Co-work and co-production of Co-VAL results with stakeholders</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Number of stakeholders in the panel as members of Co-VAL</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of stakeholders as virtual observers and outside participants</td>
<td>At least 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of countries represented and public administration levels</td>
<td>At least the 9 countries represented by Co-VAL and from 3 government levels: central, regional and municipal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once the intermediate goal of establishing a stakeholders’ panel for the Co-VAL consortium is achieved, the first objective for supporting policy impacts is to ensure thought leadership, based on the results of the research findings. Co-VAL will deliver cutting edge and policy-relevant policy briefs, firmly placed in the context of the most important European policy debates. The policy briefs will include a set of concrete and bold policy recommendations, aimed at all levels of government: from the European Commission to Member States as well as the local level. The briefs will use the research findings as a starting point, but will be enriched and elaborated in view of the most recent policy debates.

The Lisbon Council will be the main editor of the briefs. It has a long-standing reputation for delivering high level papers that attract the attention of policy makers. One relevant example is the “Government Of The Future” paper,13 which was extremely well received by policy-makers and presented at key conferences such as the eGovernment ministerial conference in 2015.

12 https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/
The recommendations will be extensively discussed with stakeholders through online engagement tools. In particular, the recommendations will be published in draft format for public comment. Social media campaigns will be launched, mainly through Twitter and Facebook, to stir discussion on the recommendations. A dedicated service, developed by The Lisbon Council, will be to publish the recommendations in a commentable format.¹⁴

One way to increase the impact of the policy briefs is to present them at dedicated, high-profile policy events. These will take place in Brussels or in other locations, for instance linked to the relevant EU presidency. The Lisbon Council habitually delivers high-profile events, with recognized global speakers and Commissioners. These events require extensive work to compile an event programme, contact luminary speakers and top policy makers, and to host the event, including all logistics and necessary follow-up activities. Therefore, events will take place once every 12 months.

In order to deliver the appropriate incentives to action, the policy brief recommendations will be supported by a set of indicators to measure progress. Each recommendation will include a set of yes-no variables, illustrating the concrete policy measures to be put in place by the European Commission, the Member States and other stakeholders. The consortium will employ a visual, web-based and open approach to monitoring policy progress. The policy tracker tool will provide an easy-to-understand overview of the progress of each Member State in implementing the recommendations of the policy briefs. This has the potential to inform a wider group of people than would be the case with ordinary means, such as a report, but it also has the likely effect of initiating a healthy competition between Member States to improve their relative ranking.

The policy tracker tool will include the following elements:

- a) a central website where information can be directly updated on policy progress and immediately published;
- b) an intelligently crafted crowdsourcing approach, where information is uploaded directly on the website by a limited set of appointed authors, either officials from Member States, or a set of appointed experts;
- c) a checklist-based approach to policy monitoring. Each action point of the Manifesto is translated into 3-4 concrete measures with Yes or No answers, backed up by supporting text;
- d) a real time visualisation of the policy progress through a traffic light system.

This task will be carried out by The Lisbon Council, which personnel have developed unique tools for monitoring other flagship EU programmes, such as the progress of the Digital Agenda in the Member States, the eGovernment Action Plan and the Pledge Tracker of the Grand Coalition for Growth and Jobs. Thus The Lisbon Council is well qualified and uniquely positioned to realize this task in the most efficient and effective way and deliver a product of the highest quality standards and accessible to a wide audience.¹⁵

Once the incentives are set, Co-VAL envisages knowledge sharing activities to support implementation. It aims to enrich the research findings with a practice-led perspective on “what works”. Of note, what works will vary depending on specific set of conditions, such as the novelty of a service innovation, the presence of in-house capabilities, or the innovation culture and size of an organization. Combinations of good practice under different sets of conditions will be identified using Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). The results of QCA and case studies will be included in a database of good practices based on the “what works approach”. It will also feed the research output into a research database to make sure that there is easy access to specific expertise from both practitioners and researchers. The latter will be based on http://ogrx.org/, the research platform launched by TheGovLab. Both databases (good practice and research) will have a global approach by reaching out and involving top researchers and practitioners globally.

Co-VAL will manage peer-to-peer knowledge exchange through dedicated panel events or mutual learning workshops. Restricted events, dedicated to practitioners, will take place to ensure exchange of good practices. At the same time, they will ensure a solid contact base for the project activities. The events will focus on a few successful cases drawn from the database and entail structured presentations followed in-depth discussion. Co-VAL will ensure participation by practitioners and experts through dedicated funding for their travel. At least 7 events of this kind will take place: 5 meetings with the stakeholders’ panel and 3 meetings with a high-level policy group (in one of the meetings Co-VAL will gather together both groups).

¹⁴ See for example http://www.makingspeechestalk.com/ch/RIAHA/?id_speech=48
¹⁵ See for instance europeandigitalforum.eu/startup-manifest-policy-tracker/dashboard
In order to ensure that the impacts illustrated above will be maintained after the end of the project, Co-VAL will develop its own sustainability strategy and kick-start its activity during the project. The ultimate goal is for Co-VAL to evolve into a sustainable think tank, developing services for encouraging innovation by policy-makers and practitioners. The sustainability plan will describe the main services to be provided and an analysis of possible revenue streams from both the public and private sectors. Crucially, these revenue streams will be pursued during the project. Grant requests and pitches will be directed towards public funders, institutions, private companies and foundations. Using the words of Gerald Ralphs, “The essence of a business model is that it defines the manner by which the think tank delivers value to stakeholders, entices funders to pay for value, and converts those payments to research with the potential to influence policy: it thus reflects management’s hypothesis about what stakeholders want, how they want it, and how an think tank can use its resources to best meet those needs, get paid for doing so, and make a achieve its mission.”

The Lisbon Council is itself an example of a sustainable think tank and will build on its experience to develop the sustainability strategy. All partners will provide input into the plan. At the same time, the tools developed by The Lisbon Council as part of the project will be designed to minimize maintenance costs to facilitate continuation of service provision even with limited additional funding. In fact, all the policy dashboards built by The Lisbon Council have been used for years after the end of their respective projects. This combination of cost containment and proactive multi-source fundraising is at the core of the sustainability strategy.

2.2.2 Communication activities

In addition to the “policy impact” activities, Co-VAL will carry out traditional, large-scale communication activities targeted to the scientific and policy community and to stakeholders, practitioners and citizens. The operationalization of these activities is provided in WP10.

Online engagement

Online engagement will be a defining feature of the study. Throughout the project, the consortium will disseminate the intermediate project results and encourage discussion with stakeholders. The main goal of online engagement is twofold: to receive feedback and input from stakeholders on the main project results and to receive feedback and input from the scientific community. Online engagement includes the following activities:

- A website to collect and present project information and project results. It will also contain links to the project social media sites and updated feeds on the content. All the tools and dashboards produced by the project will be available on the website.
- In-line commentable publication of results for the main outputs such as the definition and policy recommendations, based on our own software Making Speeches Talk (see e.g. http://www.makingspeechestalk.com/ch/innovationICT)
- A blog to discuss the process and interim findings of the project

In addition to the creation of a website and discussion spaces, the project will also reach out to existing third party networks (mailing lists, communities, twitter hashtags). In particular, the research team is already active in the main online communities involved in the project activities, as shown in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU communities</th>
<th>National communities</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EpsiPlatform</td>
<td>Innovatori P.A.</td>
<td>W3C eGovernment Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join-Up Platform</td>
<td>Ambtenaar 2.0</td>
<td>Linkedin Open Government groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futurium</td>
<td>Novagob</td>
<td>#gov20, #opengov hashtag on Twitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU Open Data working group of the OKFN</td>
<td>Govloop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Key communities (where partners are involved) for validating the project’s findings

---

### Impact WPs Indicator KPI

**Awareness**

- WP10: Number of tweets and retweets with project hashtag
  - **KPI**: 1000+
- WP10: Number of tweeters using the specific hashtag
  - **KPI**: 200
- WP10: Number of tweet impressions using the hashtag
  - **KPI**: 50,000+
- WP10: Unique visits to project website
  - **KPI**: 5000

### Scientific publications

The Co-VAL research team is committed to peer-reviewed academic publications and conference presentations. Co-VAL involves pioneer research that will provide a radically new understanding of co-creation theory and empirical research on co-creation processes. The research consortium includes experts from different disciplinary research fields. One of the aims of the project is to have a large number of papers published in leading scientific journals. The publication of one or more books with some of the most relevant research results (to be produced by a recognized publisher) and presentations at academic conferences are also envisioned as methods for distributing the project’s scientific contributions. Other means for disseminating the results of Co-VAL to academic audiences include close contacts with other R&D-projects and Thematic Networks at national and EU-levels, and contacts with research colleagues and research organizations for which the Co-VAL agenda is relevant. The consortium will agree to meet the ‘Open Aire’ FP7 Project requirements and comply with the European Commission pilot initiative on ‘Open access’. Therefore, the research teams and, thus, their members commit to deposit peer-reviewed research articles or final manuscripts resulting from Co-VAL into a relevant institutional or subject-based online repository and make their best efforts to ensure open access to these articles within 12 months.

### Press releases

Press releases will be produced on a regular basis to highlight project results and for all policy briefs. They will be made available through the main network distributing EU relevant press statements. NGOs and Civil Society organizations within the EU member states will also receive them. Commercial press release distribution services (e.g., FastActor at EurActiv) will be employed to this end. These channels will allow the main Co-VAL messages to reach decision makers as well as industry associations, NGOs and other citizens’ organizations and stakeholders interested in public sector innovation or in social innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevant WPs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>Number of press releases</td>
<td>10+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Events

Beside the in-depth policy and panel events, the project will also take advantage of large-scale dissemination events. In particular, the project will organize one international conference and take part in several international conferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Relevant WPs</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>KPI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>Participants to final conference</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of policy or academic conferences attended by project participants</td>
<td>12+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants reached through policy or academic conferences</td>
<td>1000+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Implementation

#### 3.1. Work plan – Work packages, deliverables

##### 3.1.1. Overall structure of the work plan

The below Pert chart shows the structure of the project. As it is explained in details in section 1, the project is founded on three pillars. The first one is a conceptual framework based on a theoretical work for understanding
public service transformations (WP1) and on the metrics development for measuring and monitoring those transformations (W2). The second pillar is the mapping and new evidence on public sector transformations in 4 areas of value co-creation: digital transformations (WP3), service design (WP4), living labs (WP5) and structural transformations (WP6). Since WP3 is a cross-cutting and is useful to the other co-creation areas as well, it has been drawn under the same “horizontal” box next to WP1 and WP2. WP4-WP6 will work following the outcomes of a task force dedicated to develop common methodologies and approaches. The third pillar is about the policy research and policy work, including policy recommendations (WP7), knowledge exchange and co-work with the stakeholders (WP8) and a policy track following a crowdsourcing approach for public sector transformations. Interactions are expected be strong in within each of the pillars and between them.
### 3.1.2 Timing of the different Work packages and their components

| Task 3.1.1: Design of the range of approaches to public service reform and governance framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.2: Support the design and implementation of models, public service users, service delivery staff, management and politicians in public service reform through case study methodology | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.3: Test an emerging model of public service reform on the basis of the new framework, through experimental methods | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.4: Identify the key conditions of effective citizen-centered public service reform through the above cases studies and experiments | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.5: Use the above database and methodology and produce models of citizen-centred public service reform | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.6: Measuring and monitoring public service transformation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.7: Mapping of existing studies providing data on value creation in public administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.8: Design a questionnaire on value creation in public administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.9: Construct a comparable and representative sample of public sector and NGO managers to survey in each country | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.10: Survey administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.11: Analysis and report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.1.12: Validation workshop | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP3: Digital transformation of public administration | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.2.1: Brainstorm to define digital transformation in the public sector | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.2.2: Policy and process tracing of international digital transformation practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.2.3: International comparison of digital public management practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.2.4: Ethnographic methods to extract human-centered design processes of service design and innovation processes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.2.5: Preliminary results and report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP3: Service design for public service transformation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.4.1: Cross-country comparison of the use of service innovation in the public sector | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.4.2: In-depth studies of how service design approaches can be used for co-creation and co-evolution of service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.4.3: Developing strategies for service design approaches to enable co-creation of public service innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP3: Leaning how for co-creation and co-innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.5.1: Cross-country comparison of the use of management tools for public service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.5.2: In-depth studies of how learning tools approaches are an effective co-creation and co-innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 3.5.3: Developing a model of an experimental, participatory, shared learning approach to co-creation and co-innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP4: Structural transformation, public-private partnerships and social innovation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 4.1.1: Case selection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 4.1.2: Development of the case study framework | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 4.1.3: Data collection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 4.1.4: Empirical evidence and impact assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 4.1.5: Conclusions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP5: Social dimension for public service transformation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.1.1: Drafting of policy briefs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.1.2: Work plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.2.1: Knowledge sharing and production with stakeholders | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.2.2: Stakeholder panel | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.2.3: "Innovate" database of good practice | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 5.2.4: Innovation knowledge bank | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP6: Sustainable policy impact | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 6.1.1: Design of the roadmap | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 6.2.1: Development of the roadmap | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 6.2.2: Communication activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 6.2.3: Communication activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP7: Technology and Communication | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 7.1.1: Development of communication strategy | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 7.1.2: Communication activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 7.1.3: Communication activities | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WP9: Project Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 9.1.1: Project plan development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 9.1.2: Project control and risk management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Task 9.1.3: Quality management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
3.2. Management structure, milestones and procedures

The principal scope of the project management is to ensure the proper level of co-ordination and co-operation amongst the project Consortium participants. Thus, the management is to accomplish important responsibilities, including project administration, project organisation and progress monitoring in terms of activities, effort and budget-wise. All of the Consortium partners are fully committed and agree to work together with the utmost co-operation for the timely fulfilment of their responsibilities.

3.2.1 Organizational Structure

The Co-VAL management is structured in a way that it allows the project to address issues swiftly and effectively, taking into account the nature of this project and the target outcome.

As can be seen in Figure 4, a multi-tier management approach will be followed in order to facilitate the participants’ needs and ensure proper and efficient management. At the top of this structure, the Executive Board will maintain ultimate authority in the project. The Management Board will be the core organisational and decision-making body, reporting to the Executive Board for key decisions that affect the scope and the success of the project. The Project Scientific Committee will coordinate both the research and the policy work plan in close collaboration with the Work Package Leaders, and will be supervised by the Management Board for proper coordination between the different WPs. Finally, the Project Office will provide all the administrative support required by the above management entities to seamlessly perform their responsibilities.

The overall management and administration is undertaken by the Project Coordinator who ensures coordination in all different management tiers in the management structure. Both in the Strategy and the Implementation Layers, the Project Coordinator governs the procedures and the decisions to ensure the successful implementation of the project. Administration and collaborative work tools and instruments are tasks undertaken by the Project Office, which addresses the requirements to effectively orchestrate the available human resources. Such tools consist of infrastructure and resources as a combination of administration, financial management, project document repository, archive e-mail list administration and project on-line portal, which all support administration.

The clear separation of roles, responsibilities and jurisdiction between the different management entities is mandated for the successful project management. This separation is graphically outlined in Figure 4 above.

The Executive Board (EB), orchestrated by the Project Coordinator, is composed of high-ranking officials of each participant (one person per participant). This representative must have the legal authority to officially draw the strategy and conduct business on behalf of the legal entity they represent. The EB has the obligation to ensure that the Consortium functions properly. While the EB will not meet regularly, meetings may be called upon whenever necessary, as per provisions of the Consortium Agreement (CA). The EB decides on matters relating to: budget-related activities, the alteration of the CA, the strategic level directions of the project and the premature completion / termination of the project.
The Management Board (MB), chaired by the Project Coordinator, is the core organisational and decision-making body, providing overall direction and management. It will be responsible for the successful completion of the project and the exploitation of its results. The MB will report and be accountable to the EB for the efficient project execution. The MB consists of the Project Coordinator, the Quality Assurance, the Dissemination Manager, the Project Scientific Committee and the WP leader of each WP.

Decisions regarding the project will be made by the MB through simple majority, with each member of the MB having a single vote (and limited to one vote per participant). In cases of a tie, the Project Coordinator will have the casting vote. The MB will meet at least twice per year. In practical terms, the MB represents the Consortium in all related affairs. The responsibilities of the MB include, but are not limited to: a) supervising the overall project plan and work progress, b) monitoring the use of resources and budget, c) producing and maintaining the overall risk management and contingency plan, d) controlling the allocation of work and addressing changes in the work allocated to partners depending on change of circumstances, and e) resolving and arbitrating conflicts if and when these arise.

The Project Coordinator (PC) is designated by the coordinating participant (ATC) and has the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of both the EB and the MB committees, within the constraints set by these decision making bodies. The responsibilities of the PC span to: i) maintain a consolidated version of all project monitoring plans for effort, budget, tasks and issues, as they are provided from each WP leader, ii) coordinate the project office and financial management activities, iii) inform the MB for any deviations from the agreed guidelines of budget and effort that exceed the agreed thresholds defined by the EB, and iv) provide both the MB and the EB with the information required to assist in the decision making process.

Furthermore, PC is the primary and sole contact point between the Consortium and the European Commission. As such, PC is responsible for signing the Grant Agreement with the European Commission, ensuring access to the Grant Agreement by the other participants, ensuring the communication between the Consortium and Commission and receiving and distributing the EC grant. On top of that, the PC ensures prompt delivery of all software and data identified as deliverable items in the Grant Agreement, as soon as received from the WP Leaders or requested by the European Commission for reviews and audits, including the results of the financial audits prepared by independent auditors.

The Quality Assurance (QA) is appointed by the EB and drives the appropriate project quality assurance procedures, as part of the MB activities and in collaboration with the PC and the support of the Project Office.

The Dissemination Manager (DM) is again appointed by the EB to coordinate the dissemination and communication activities of the project lifecycle.

The Project Scientific Committee (PSC), chaired by the Research Coordinator and the Policy and prototype Coordinator, is comprised by one leader by each participant, and reports to the MB. This committee coordinates the scientific activities, both in the research and the policy pillar of the project, and supervises the work packages, planning and control of these activities towards effective coordination. The PSC will meet on a regular basis or whenever an issue within the project occurs.

Each Work Package Leader (WPL) is led by a single participant that assigns responsibilities for the work undertaken in the specific work package and reports to the PSC and MB. The WPL has a seat in the PSC and participates in the overall project work plan steering. The WPL: i) produces and maintains the work package project plan and resource allocation in collaboration with the PC, ii) proposes and justifies to the PSC, any changes in the work package composition in terms of effort and budget allocation, which should be communicated to the MB, and iii) liaises with other WPL and the PSC towards aligning and harmonising the work in the work package with other connecting work packages.

The Project Office (PO), being represented by the Financial and Administration Manager, serves infrastructure and resources supporting to the project management structure in the day to day management and coordination of the project. The PO is managed by the PC and is responsible for i) tracking of the plan, tasks issues, budget, partner and commission contacts, ii) updating and consolidating of work plans, in collaboration with the PSC towards producing project-wise task and issue lists, iii) providing the support tools to the PC, the MB and PSC, iv) facilitating the communication channel for the project, and v) assisting in the administration and facilitation of project meetings in terms of both the logistics and the organisation of the agendas before and minutes and task lists (action points) after the meetings.

3.2.2 Procedures and decision-making mechanisms

Conflict Resolution and decision making process: The decision making process is structured in multiple tiers based on the tolerances set by the EB. The following processes are defined with regards to the decision making process:
- The MB can take decisions based on the tolerances that have been set out by the EB. The tolerances can only be defined with regards to swift of budget and effort as well as redefinition of the work-plan (up to a predefined extent);
- Any decisions that exceed the tolerances are taken by the EB. Majority vote shall be sufficient. The EB members can cast a vote of “Approve”, “Not Approve” or “Abstain”;
- For a decision to be valid it will need to have 100% participation based on the number of the votes of the EB. EB members can vote by proxy only by communicating to the PC the appropriate mandate. If the first vote does not achieve 100% participation, a second ballot requiring 75% participation is organised. If that also proves unsuccessful in reaching a decision, then a third and final ballot will be undertaken with not minimum requirement for participation. It is at the discretion of the PC to define either longer time intervals between ballots in order to facilitate due diligence or short ones to address issues that require timely resolution.
- If all of the above steps have been followed and still a decision cannot be made (either because EB and the Consortium is divided) then the decision will go towards the option that produces no change in the status quo (i.e. if a decision on removing a partner is required and cannot be reached, then final outcome will be towards not removing the partner in question);
- The EB reserves the right to consult the Commission on the decision making process. Any decisions reached by the EB or the Consortium shall be legal and adhere to the Consortium Agreement.
- The EB has also the authority to arbitrate conflicts that arise between the participants at any level. Any participant has the right to challenge the decision of the PC, PSC and/or the WPL (one that was adhering to the tolerances set by the EB). However, the EB’s decision is final. All voting shall be public (unless otherwise agreed) and the vote of each party taking part in the ballot shall be made known to the ballot constituency only. For example, EB ballot votes that did not include the whole Consortium need only be made available to the EB, whereas only the final outcome need to be communicated to the Consortium, whereas in the case of Consortium wide.

**Consortium Agreement (CA):** It is foreseen that, should the proposal be successful, the PC initiates the process of drafting, circulating the DESCA template and having a CA signed, before the signature of the Grant Agreement, so possible limitations concerning Articles 25.2 & 25.3 could be included.

**Reports:** Reporting is planned at two levels; internal quarterly reports from the WPLs to the PC and external reports from the PC to the Commission. Reports will follow the Horizon 2020 reporting guidelines and will cover work and issues addressed for the period, resource and budget consumption and work for the next reporting period (if any). The work will clearly distinguish between achievements versus planning and will offer insight on how results have been communicated to each other and affected the work in progress.

**Tools and instruments:** The main vehicle for information exchange within the project will be an online application made available on M1 of the project, which will enable partners to communicate and exchange working papers, deliverables, etc. in a collaborative manner. Additionally, project meetings, workshops and online conferences will be also employed for effective communication among project partners. Electronic mail will also be used for information exchange between the partners. Particularly sensitive information will be exchanged more preferably by ordinary mail than by e-mail.

**Meetings:** Co-VAL has already planned the physical meetings, which include: i) the kick-off meeting as the formal initiation of the project, which should be attended by all participant representatives, and will lead to the appointment of the EB members, MB members and PSC members, assignment of people to roles in the management structure and definition of their responsibilities, ii) Consortium plenary meetings that will take place at least every six months, attended by the MB and PSC, including the PC and the WPL, while other members attend whenever necessary, iii) working meetings and workshops that will take place, as appropriate and upon request from the PSC, and iv) at least two review meetings, as per the agreement with the EC representatives.

### 3.2.3 Project Controls and Key Performance Indicators – milestones

Project Controls ensure that the project is producing the required product(s) and is being carried out within the agreed constraints of time, cost and quality. For Co-VAL, the following controls will be implemented: a) Management by Exception; the MB sets tolerances for time, cost and quality. Within these tolerances the PC is authorised to take corrective actions as necessary, b) Quality Management; quality plans describe the acceptance criteria for the deliverables of each WP, how conformance to these criteria will be measured, when quality checks will be performed and by whom and c) Change management will be considered in the produced quality plan. The work plan constitutes the primary target for the proper and adequate implementation of the project controls. As
part of this plan, Co-VAL should ensure that planning is progressing by meeting the milestones listed in Section 1.3.4 of Part A in Annex 1.

3.2.4 Risks and contingency plan

The project risk management plan will be produced on the basis of existing risk management practices and more specifically the Continuous Risk Management (CRM) paradigm developed by the Software Engineering Institute (SEI) of Carnegie Mellon University\(^\text{17}\). The plan will report risk identification, analysis and mitigation strategies for the project. Along these lines, the following Table outlines an indicative list of main risks, their impact on the project and some proposed solutions and mitigation strategy.

It must be noted that a dedicated task 11.3 has been specified to monitor risks and their impact in the smooth project progress, while a detailed Risk Management and Contingency Plan (as part of D11.1: Project Quality and Assessment Plan) will be elaborated in the beginning of the project and will be used as an internal living document to assist in the management processes and decisions.

3.3. Consortium as a whole

The Co-VAL consortium, formed by internationally recognised academics, researchers and managers of co-creation areas, has been shaped in order to achieve appropriate complementarities and balance in several terms such as knowledge, research, management, multidisciplinary, geographic, social, and experience. The joint work of such academics and stakeholders through specific connections established by the project will lead to the outcomes of knowledge creation, policy implications on co-creation and the role of citizens within it. The consortium is composed by 12 European partners from 11 different countries (Greece, Spain, Belgium, United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands, Denmark, Germany, Norway, Italy and Hungary). The consortium is composed by 9 universities, one non-profit think tank, one large company and one SME. The teams have been grouped together to get the best performance to achieve the proposed objective and based on previous research inter-linkages, geographical coverage, maximisation of synergies and complementarities according to different criteria and high performance and excellence criteria in terms of availability to successfully develop European projects.

The consortium is structured so as to achieve a high quality of cooperative working relationships necessary for the implementation of a complex research project such as Co-VAL. The composition of the consortium and of the teams within it is based on several research criteria:

Relevant knowledge and expertise complementarities: The consortium gathers together the specialised knowledge and skills of reputed researchers required to make Co-VAL a success. Some teams are coordinated by leading international scholars on New Public Governance (UEDIN, UKON, UB), and service innovation (USTL, UAH, RUC, INN). Other teams lie on the field of applied research and ICT excellence on open innovation and digital transformations for public administrations (LC, ATC). The team dealing with the measurement aspects of the project (UM-MERIT) is a world known research organisation in the field of issues connected with the empirical measurement of innovation in organisations, building indicators and metrics in many European projects on innovation. The respective team leaders have played an important role in the recent survey on innovation in public services in Europe. Another research team lies in the field of public management and performance measurement (CUB). Additionally, the project is supported by a sustainable think tank with a unique experience in delivering policy impact and a long-standing expertise in organising interesting and engaging high level policy events (LC) and one of the world’s largest providers of assurance, tax, and business consulting services with experience in design thinking, co-creation/co-design methodologies and private and public sector advisory, focusing on e-government services (PWC).

Geographical and socioeconomic complementarities: Since the project objectives are of European interest and the empirical and field work aim to draw a European picture of the sectors and themes treated, great attention has been paid in creating a geographically balanced consortium. Nordic (Norway, Denmark), Anglo-Saxon (United Kingdom), Central (France, Germany, Belgium, the Netherlands), Mediterranean (Spain, Italy and Greece) and Eastern (Hungary) European countries are represented as can be seen in Figure 5. This means much more than the mere geographical coverage of the EU. Diverse economic and, especially, social models are represented. It is well known that the social model varies across Europe and there is a large difference between Mediterranean, Central, Anglo-Saxon, Eastern and Northern models. The Co-VAL consortium composition allows for covering these diversities and exploiting them in order to produce outcomes of European and world relevance.

\(^{17}\) Continuous Risk Management (CRM) paradigm developed by the Software Engineering Institute (SEI) of Carnegie Mellon University
Multi and inter-disciplinary background complementarities: Some teams present a mainly economic oriented background, while others come from political science, sociology and social sciences environments, with particular specialisation in public management. Some other teams have their background mainly in ICT and digital computer science related to business administration, management and organisational dynamics as well as in applied economics and policy. The multidisciplinary complementarities are necessary in a topic such as co-creation, which by definition is multi-disciplinary. There is a need of bringing together different approaches for more comprehensive understanding of the research topics, for a rich quality exchange and debate on issues that are at the frontiers of the cited disciplines, and, lastly, for complementarity in the views expressed on the co-creation debate.

Excellence in research, policy and technology: The consortium combines unique, outstanding world class competences in:

- Research: combining expertise in key scientific areas for the topic such as public administration and open governance, e-government, and service innovation (e.g., excellence by UEDIN, UKON and USTL, respectively). The excellence on metrics is offered by, UM-MERIT, EU reference related to surveys about public sector innovation.
- Policy: delivering high-level strategic advice on government reform to European and global institutions, such as EC, World Bank, UNDP and OECD (as guaranteed by The Lisbon Council and UAH).
- Technology: consistently working at the cutting edge of R&I in H2020 (ATC, PWC and personnel from The Lisbon Council have delivered many high profile projects in relation to open government, such as the research roadmap on policy 2.0, the startup policy tracker.

Both the project coordinator (ATC) and the personnel belonging to the two scientific co-coordinators (UAH, LC) have an established record of participation in EU projects, including the coordination EU projects.

Joint work in previous EU projects: The complementarities of the consortium also emerge in fields other than the current and potential synergies explained above. Past collaborative experience in research projects as well as networking within associations is another factor strengthening the capabilities of the consortium as a whole. In general, all European partners know what it is to collaborate at the European level, and some have repeatedly been European project coordinators.

Involvement of Industry including SMEs

In addition to its highly skilled research-driven organisations participating in the project, Co-VAL demonstrates active involvement from industrial and technology partners who exhibit a particular interest in the public sector innovation and, thus, ensure that the project results will be well received by the policy makers and other relevant stakeholders in the public sector domain, strengthening the exploitation potential of project results. In particular, the industrial partners will monitor market developments in the public sector, formulate the project exploitation planning activities and help in validating the project results through the activities described in WP7, WP8 and WP10. Key to the project in that respect is the inclusion of one SME and one large company with strong presence in the public sector:

- ATC: an ICT SME based in Athens, Greece, with experience in technologies, services and tools for the public sector, delivering also software solutions for a variety of business domains.
- PWC: a large private company based in Rome, Italy, with experience in providing insights and research into best practice in government and public sector and helping businesses and public administrations change processes through the improvement of customer experience and co-creation activities.
- As part of WP8, TheGovLab (subcontractor) will provide full access to the services of the Open Governance Research Exchange [http://ogrx.org/](http://ogrx.org/), a global collaborative research effort to map quantitative and qualitative research on innovations in governance. Co-VAL will become a partner of the project, with the ability to upload, curate and browse the data, and make adaptation to the platform to ensure its alignment with the goal of the project. Co-VAL project output will benefit from the platform for dissemination of the project results.

**Other countries:** Not applicable. All partners are based in the EU Member States.

### 3.4. Resources to be committed

The following chapter gives details on how the project resources will be spent and will demonstrate that effort and costs are well balanced according to the involvement of each partner and the complexity of the activities.

#### Summary of staff effort

Effort for project management dedicated to the preparation and participation in review and consortium meetings, project monitoring and reporting tasks accounts for 8% of the total effort, which is commensurate to the scale of the project. Some of the management costs have been allocated to partners for administration activities and for supporting the coordinator partner to guarantee the quality assurance of the project activities.

In order to better illustrate the effort per partner and work package distribution, Figure 7 represents graphically the estimated effort per work package and Figure 8 represents graphically the estimated effort per partner.

**Figure 7: Total effort percentage per WP**

**Figure 8: Total effort percentage per partner**

**Personnel Costs:** Cover the major part of the overall project budget and account for **2,900,556, 96€**

**Other direct costs:** 648,650€ they are allocated as follows:

**Travel:** Travel resources have been allocated to cover six (6) project meetings, three (3) policy meetings, five (5) stakeholder panels, dissemination (conferences participation) as well as the international survey costs under WP2, totalling 267,400€

**Other goods and services:** 381,250€ have been allocated to cover the organisation of project meetings, organisation of the stakeholders’ panels, policy meetings, open international conference (including logistic costs like catering and rental rooms), the stakeholders’ participation costs for the panels (including travel and subsistence costs), policy meetings and advisory board as well as the organisation of the surveys under the WP2 & WP3. It also includes costs for audit certificates on financial statements of the partners: ATC, UAH, USTL, LC, and INN as their requested grand of the actual costs is 325,000€ or more and costs for translations and dissemination purposes (such as open access publication fees, dissemination material, and video implementation).

**Subcontracting costs:** 25,000€ have been allocated to LC for subcontracting specific activities of the Co-VAL project as described in Section 4.2.
From the analysis of the financial data is shown that ATC, UAH, UKON, LC, UM-MERIT and CUB other direct costs, including travel category, exceed the 15% of the personnel costs for these partners. The justification is presented in Table 3.

**Table 3: ‘Other direct cost’ items for partners ATC, UAH, UKON, LC, UM-MERIT and CUB**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. ATC</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>23,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings and dissemination trips (including 5k assigned to ATC INTER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>45,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for Stakeholders’ Participation (25k), Events Organisation (14k) and other direct cost including dissemination material (6k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,000.00 €</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. UAH</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>31,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings, dissemination trips, travel costs related to the international survey under WP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>49,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for Stakeholders’ Participation (25k), Events Organisation (14k) and other direct cost including open access publication fees, dissemination materials, translations and audit (10k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>80,000.00 €</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. UKON</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>25,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings, dissemination trips, travel costs related to the survey under WP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>63,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for Stakeholders’ Participation (25k), Events Organisation (4k) and other direct cost including open access publication fees, dissemination materials, expenses for transcripts, translations for the survey and interviews under WP3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>88,000.00 €</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. LC</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>29,400.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings and dissemination trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>101,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for Stakeholders' Participation (50k), Events Organisation (31k) and other direct cost including open access publication fees, dissemination materials, translations and audits (20k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130,400.00 €</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. UM-MERIT</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>26,500.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings, dissemination trips, travel costs related to the international survey under WP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>41,750.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for the international survey under WP2 including expenses for transcripts, translations, printing, postage etc. (36,750 Euros) and other direct cost including open access publication fees and dissemination materials (5k)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>68,250.00 €</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. CUB</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>13,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated travel costs for project meetings, reviews, policy meetings, dissemination trips travel costs related to the international survey under WP2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>34,000.00 €</td>
<td>Estimated costs for Stakeholders' Participation (25k), Events Organisation (4k) and other direct cost including open access publication fees, dissemination materials and translations (5k)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial Resources
The precise financial information for the Co-VAL project is given in Annex 2 – “Estimated budget of the action” of the Grand Agreement. However, in order to better illustrate the main financial aspects of the project, we have provided a graphical representation of the key financial indicators, which are representative of the resources required for the realization of the project objectives and vision. As such, the requested grant per participant is illustrated in the following figure.

4. Members of the consortium

The table below summarizes the Responsibilities and expertise of the Co-VAL partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | ATC        | Greece  | • IT solutions and services provider targeting specific sectors incl. the Media, Retail and Public Sector Organisations  
  • Extensive experience in the coordination of large-scale EU and National projects  
  • Custom service development and software integration  
  • Marketing and promotional activities | • Project coordinator  
  • WP10 (Disseminations ad communication) Leader  
  • Participant in several WPs  
  • Link between the research and the technology worlds, and between the academia and the business world in connection with public services developments.  
  • Views from a technology SME point of view with a wide EU perspective |
| 2   | UAH        | Spain   | • Expertise on service innovation and public services in particular. Recent works on social and open innovation.  
  • Expertise on the role of services in different and diverse European economies  
  • Coordinator role in past EU FP7 project on public-private innovation networks | • Scientific co-coordinator with past experience on this  
  • WP8 (Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders) leader  
  • Participant in several WPs  
  • Link between the academia and policy on service innovation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UEDIN</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>• Expertise on policy advice on innovation in services for governments and international organizations. • Extensive research skills and experience in public service reform, and particularly case study research. • Skilled in the application of service theory to public management.</td>
<td>• Partner and WP1 Leader on building the conceptual framework for Co-VAL. • Guidance of the theoretical inputs for the project including open governance and service-dominant logic. • Participant in several WPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UKON</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>• Digital transformation expertise transferred from the US to the European context. • Qualitative methods in e-Government research. • Especially, ethnographic methods, interview techniques, qualitative data analysis techniques. • Social network analysis.</td>
<td>• WP3 leader (digital transformations) and research partner for other WPs. • Guidance on ICT research-related issues. • Participant in several WPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>USTL</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>• Public and private Services economics and management • Innovation economics and management • Productivity, performance in services • Qualitative and quantitative approaches</td>
<td>• WP6 Leader (structural transformations, public private innovation networks and social innovation) • Guidance on theoretical inputs and methods for service innovation. • Participant in several WPs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>• Located in the heart of the EU district, very rich network of leading EU and European policymakers • More than a decade of experience in writing, launching and disseminating top-notched policy papers • More than a decade of experience in organising and hosting high-level events in Brussels, but also in external fora • Go-to point for modernisers in Europe</td>
<td>• Lead WP7, Policy implications for public sector transformation, and WP9, Sustainable policy impact • Link with EU policies affecting Co-VAL research and policy developments • Participant in several WPs. • Scientific co-ordinator mainly leading the policy pillar work • Presence in international fora and the latest open government developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UM-MERIT</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>• Extensive experience in the design and implementation of innovation surveys for both the private and public sectors</td>
<td>• Partner, Leader of WP2 • Guidance on everything related to metrics, data collection and statistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Short name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Role in project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8   | INN        | Norway  | • Cognitive testing of survey questions in face-to-face interviews  
      |            |         | • Descriptive and econometric analysis of survey data  
      |            |         | • Development and interpretation of innovation indicators  
      |            |         | building on lessons learned from the UM-MERIT-led surveys on innovation in public sector and others.  
      |            |         | • Participant in several WPs  
| 9   | RUC        | Denmark | • INN University is host for Centre for Innovation in Services. The scientific work within Centre for Innovation in Services has a national leading position within innovation in public services, and its network and scientific skills are highly relevant for the scope of Societal Challenges. INN University offers education at all levels within relevant subject areas, and a PhD program within Innovation in Services, public and private.  
      |            |         | • Partner, Leader of WP4, service design  
      |            |         | • Access to best practices and knowledge on public sector innovation and co-creation in Nordic countries.  
      |            |         | • Participant in several WPs  
| 10  | UB         | Italy   | • Extensive knowledge development and dissemination in the public sector, public value and digital transformation  
      |            |         | WPS Leader, government, living labs,  
      |            |         | • Link with service management and service experience scholars and practitioners  
      |            |         | • Participant in several WPs  
| 11  | CUB        | Hungary | • Research and teaching in general management and public management  
      |            |         | • Performance measurement  
      |            |         | • Sectorial knowledge and experience in health and social care, education and the civil sector  
      |            |         | Partner, Participant in several WPs  
      |            |         | • Coverage of the different realities of public sector in the Eastern European countries  
| 12  | PWC        | Italy   | • Experience in design thinking, co-creation/co-design methodologies, UX design, hosts an innovative Experience Centre at its own premises;  
      |            |         | • Private and public sector advisory, focusing on e-government services, ICT, digital solutions, for public sector, IT strategy change management, process reengineering, public procurement,  
      |            |         | • Partner  
      |            |         | • Specialised participation on living labs offering the own living lab for testing and design thinking  
      |            |         | • View from a multinational company  


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Role in project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>technical assistance to national and regional authorities in managing structural funds etc.;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy, programme and project impact assessment, monitoring, audit, reporting, evaluation at the EU, national or regional level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1. Participants (applicants)

4.1.1 Athens Technology Center SA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>SME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atc.gr">http://www.atc.gr</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Profile

Founded in 1987, ATC is an Information Technology Company (SME) offering solutions and services targeting specific sectors incl. the Media, Banking and Retail Sectors, Utilities and Public Sector Organisations as well as horizontal solutions focusing on Content Management, Enterprise Software, Web Applications, Human Capital Resource Management and eLearning, and Mobile Applications. The activities of the Company span among several countries in EU, Eastern Europe and CIS countries, as well as the Balkans.

Having acquired ISO 9001 certification since 2000, the company provides a broad spectrum of value-added products and services such as consulting, customer training, installation and maintenance, warranty and post-warranty services, SLA projects, project management, and professional support. ATC has also been certified with ISO 27001:2013 for our Information Security Management system applicable to Design, Development, Implementation and Support of ICT solutions and digital services, as well as for Technical, Business, Consulting and Project Management Services in the ICT domain and HCM domain specifically in synchronous and asynchronous e-learning and content development.

Central to the Company’s strategy is the conduction of vivid Research and Development, focusing both in improving current Products and Solutions, as well as in exploring new technologies for future growth. All ATC own products and services are based on early prototypes and/or “proof of concept” obtained through R&D Projects, whether funded by the Company, the Greek State or the European Commission. The ATC Innovation Lab (http://ilab.atc.gr/) carries more than 25 years of expertise in Research and Development. The focus is on innovation aspects, which are often overshadowed by research concerns, and on turning promising ideas into concrete and robust products, in a cost and time-efficient manner. Having incubated most of the current commercially oriented ATC business units we are committed to continue along this successful path: Discover or conceptualize Innovation first, then turn it into working systems through intense and continuous involvement in cutting-edge research projects. The focus is primarily given in areas that can offer the next big advance to ATC’s commercial offerings, but also in discovering new domains and create the next company targets.

ATC offers professional solutions for eGovernance portals based on popular Open Source and Open Platform Solutions. We support all popular platforms as DNN (Dot Net Nuke), WordPress, Joomla, Drupal and Liferay. Capitalizing on the technological know-how accumulated in several European eGovernance pilot projects, we are offering solutions for eGovernment and eParticipation based on our own open source platform. The platform comprises a set of modules supporting the interaction between public
bodies and citizens enabling the latter to actively participate in public affairs, in decision-making and in the shaping of policies with security, reliability and efficiency.

ATC has long experience in integrating applications related to the analysis of large scale data sets. Our experience lies both in the combination of different modules as well as in the setting up of large databases and search engines. ATC, is a partner in the NESSI ETP (www.nessi-europe.com) and a full member in the Big Data Value Association (www.bdva.eu).

In the framework of this project, ATC will utilize resources from its subsidiary company **ATC International**. These resources would assist ATC in optimizing the company’s involvement in the assigned dissemination and project management tasks as well as in the assigned WP7 & WP8 activities. **ATC international** is a newly established Belgian Company founded by ATC as its International arm aiming to focus on the most innovative domains among ATC R&D Agenda for productizing and marketing research outcomes in the Benelux and Northern Europe areas.

**Role in the Project**

ATC will act as the Project Coordinator and will lead the WP11 Project Management. ATC will also lead WP10 Dissemination and Communication. ATC will also have involvement in WP1, WP7, WP8 and WP9.

**CVs of key personnel**

**Mrs Anna Triantafillou, (Female)** is Deputy Head of ATC's Innovation Lab. She is a Master degree holder in Organizational Behavior & HR Management and a BSc Degree holder in Management & Systems Science from City University of London. She has more than 15 years of professional experience in the domain of Information Services as a Project Coordinator / Manager of European and National R&D projects. Mrs. Triantafillou has coordinated several European Consortia for building Thematic or Geography-based communities and for developing the necessary collaboration IT infrastructure to support their activities. Fields of application included transnational cooperation, e-governance, and policy-making support. In these activities, she has worked extensively with Parliaments, News Agencies, Media Companies, Municipal Authorities, Interest Groups and NGOs across Europe. Mrs. Triantafillou has been the Project Coordinators of the R&D projects: YDS, CROSSOVER, OURSPACE, eMPOWER, MOMENTUM, LEX-IS, WEB-DEP.

**Dr. Nikos Sarris (Male)** has been working in ATC as a Senior IT Consultant since 2004 and currently is the Head of Operations of the ATC Innovation Lab. He has been working since 1996 in R&D projects as a researcher, project manager and coordinator of large multinational consortia. He has received his PhD from the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and his Master of Engineering degree from the University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology. He has worked as a Researcher for the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and the Informatics and Telematics Institute, where he participated in several national and European projects. He has edited a book in 3D modelling and animation and authored numerous publications for international journals and conferences. Dr Sarris has been the coordinator of four 3-year multinational R&D projects and has been the technical leader of another four projects of such duration, with budgets ranging from 3M€ to 10M€. In the latest years he has mainly been involved in media related R&D, focusing in the semantic analysis and ‘understanding’ of multimedia news content and Big Data. Dr Sarris is a member of the Steering Committee of the NESSI European Technology Platform and the representative of ATC in the General Assembly of the Big Data Value Association.

**Dr. Antonis Ramfos (Male)** is currently the Director of the Innovation & Business Development activity of ATC International SPRL, based in Brussels. Dr. Ramfos has been the Director of the Research and Innovation Department of INTRASOFT International SA, based in Luxembourg, until April 2016. Up to April 1997, held the position of the Senior Consultant in INTRASOFT SA, based in Athens, in the area of centralized and distributed database information systems. Dr. Ramfos, up to January 1996, held the position of the Contract and Account Manager in the Marketing Division of Western Europe of INTRASOFT SA. Dr. Ramfos, up to December 1995, held the position of Project Leader in the Technical
Division of INTRASOFT SA. Finally, for the period covering June 1986 to December 1990 he held the position of Tutorial and Research Fellow at University of Wales, College of Cardiff, UK.

**Mrs. Garifalia Sebou (Female)** has been working with ATC since 2007. She holds a BSc Degree in Political Science & Public Administration from the University of Athens. She is working in the ATC Innovation Lab as a Project Dissemination Manager overseeing the unit's dissemination, marketing and internet marketing activities. She has been involved in EU R&D and National funded projects since 2008. She is currently involved in the field of business applications, user requirements capture, specifications analysis, project management and dissemination/marketing activities in European and National R&D projects.

### Relevant publications, products and services


### Relevant previous projects and activities

ATC’s has served as a Major technology provider in the following H2020 & FP7 related projects:

- **H2020-INSO1-2014 YDS [645886]** “Your Data Stories”: YDS envisions to combine and fuse the two “suppliers” of open data (traditional producers and user-generated content) and to exploit the added value from this amalgamation in order to better satisfy the needs of the “demand side” – meaning citizens, journalists and others. YourDataStories wants to develop the required software stack that will enable the Open Government Data (OGD) to reach citizens in their everyday online life, inside the digital social interaction they are already familiar with, acquiring a significant role in citizen’s social activity; ATC is the project coordinator of the project as well as responsible for the implementation of the platform and the mobile applications. More information at [http://yourdatastories.eu](http://yourdatastories.eu)

- **CIP-ICT-PSP-2009-3bis Puzzled by Policy [256261]** Puzzled by Policy aimed to address the specific issue of immigration in a manner that likewise addressed the broader issue of widespread confusion about and disengagement from the policymaking process by providing all citizens – regardless of their subject matter knowledge, IT or literacy skills – an informative and easy-to-use platform to engage with topical policy issues. Puzzled by Policy combined tried and tested eParticipation concepts and tools such as EU Profiler and u-debate with new widget applications to reduce the complexity of decision making at the EU level and ‘push’ the platform to popular social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter as well as to their own desk top and mobile devices– in effect bringing policymaking ‘to the people’ rather than relying on them to come to a specific site. ATC was responsible for the implementation of the ePartcipation platform. More information at [http://www.puzzledbypolicy.eu/](http://www.puzzledbypolicy.eu/)

- **FP7-ICT-2011-7 CROSSOVER [288828]** “Bridging Communities for Next Generation Policy-Making”: CROSSOVER was about establishing the basis for long-lasting interest & commitment to next generation policy-making. CROSSOVER aimed of reaching out & raising the awareness of non-experts and potential users, with special regard to high-level policy makers and policy advisors as well as bringing together and reinforcing the links between the different global communities of policy-makers and practitioners. ATC was the Project Coordinator, Dissemination Manager and Technical Provider. More information at [http://www.crossover-project.eu/](http://www.crossover-project.eu/)

- **FP7-ICT-2009-4 PADGETS [248920]** “Policy Gadgets Mashing Underlying Group Knowledge in Web 2.0 Media”: PADGETS uses publicly available APIs for interconnecting, publishing and retrieving
content from underlying social media platforms. The information and user activities that are collected in a privacy-preserving manner and used by policy gadgets are categorized using semantic tags in order to help the policy maker form an opinion about what the users think about relevant issues and policies. ATC was the Dissemination WP Leader, Technical provider and Integrator (responsible for ‘gadgets’ developments and mobile extensions). More information at http://www.padgets.eu/

- FP7-ICT-2009-4 COCKPIT [248222] “Citizens Collaboration and Co-Creation in Public Sector Service Provision”: The fundamental idea of COCKPIT was that Web 2.0 social media constitute the emerging and de facto mass collaboration and cooperation platform between citizens themselves, and between citizens and public administrations. Therefore, Web 2.0 social media will very soon establish themselves as a very effective means for creating, sharing and tracking knowledge about citizens’ opinions and wishes on public service delivery. ATC’s main responsibility was the implementation of the engine for the sentiment analysis as well as for the Collaboration platform. More information at http://www.cockpit-project.eu

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

ATC has implemented a cloud infrastructure combining with virtualization for all its production services as well as development needs. Our software stack for providing cloud infrastructure includes, but not limited to, OpenStack, Hyper-V 2012 R2 and VMware products.

In the above described infrastructure, ATC has integrated an open source portal for Cloud Computing to automate the provisioning of a full suite of services on Windows servers that also supports provisioning of Windows and Linux Virtual Machines. We use a combination of Orchestrators based on the cloud provision suitable to the infrastructure be provided with commercial and open-source software.

ATC’s private cloud, consists of powerful Intel platform servers, suitable high-performance storage devices, firewall hardware and software and networking equipment combining technologies to provide performance and flexibility. ATC’s cloud solutions offers flexible, dynamic and efficient configuration to provide the best solution according to specific computing needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1.2</th>
<th><strong>Universidad de Alcalá</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participant Short Name:</strong></td>
<td>UAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Organisation:</strong></td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong></td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Site:</strong></td>
<td><a href="https://www.uah.es/es/">https://www.uah.es/es/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Profile**

The Department of Economics and Business Administration at the University of Alcalá promotes several research lines, among which innovation in public services is an important area. The institution has achieved more than 40 international projects since 1990. It presents a large experience in European research project participation (FP4, FP5, and FP7) and recently it has been project coordinator of two FP7 projects: on innovation in public and private services in 2008-2011 and one on policy impact evaluation in 2011-2015.

The department has extensive experience in EU and national research projects, developing instruments for public and private policy makers in the use and production of service innovation. These include the FP 4 (KISSIN); FP 5 (PUBLIN) related to innovation in both private and public services -with other participants of the consortium- and directed other research projects at national and international level. The experience in PUBLIN, Innovation in public services, will be particularly useful for Co-VAL. Besides, the team has coordinated the FP7 (SERVPPIN) project on the role of services in European performance and welfare and the role public-private innovation networks. Other EU projects are: Foresight innovation
in services (DG Research, 2005), Evaluation of R&D needs of business-related services (DG Internal Market and Services, 2006) and Europe-Innova, Sectoral Innovation Watch (DG Enterprise, 2007-2011).

The research and studies directed belong to the horizontal analysis of all the activities making up the services activities (macroeconomics of services, employment, internationalization, regulation, consumption, regional dimension and support policies) as well as to the vertical or sectoral analysis of services (trade and distribution, tourism and leisure, financial markets, transport and communication, advanced business services, education, health and other public services). However, its recent expertise is focusing on innovation and service innovation (innovation drivers and impacts, statistics, policy rationales and policy design).

**Role in the Project**

Within the Co-VAL project, UAH aims to collaborate in the production and diffusion of knowledge on value co-creation in public administrations at local, national and international levels, which allow for better policy-making implications to be drawn. The team will participate in all CO-VAL working packages as a way to effectively guarantee its role as overall scientific co-ordination. A particular role will have for the knowledge sharing working package and the creation and implementation of a stakeholders’ panel.

**CVs of key personnel**

**Luis Rubalcaba (Male)** is a Professor of Economics, Department of Economics and Business Administration, University of Alcalá (Madrid-Spain; 2008-). Previous academic positions include: visiting Fulbright Schuman Scholar at Boston University, (US, 2012-13), distinguished professor at VTT-Tekes (Finland, 2012-14), honorary scholar at the University of Birmingham (UK, 2010-12) and president of the RESER scientific association (European Association for Services Research, 2004-2008). He has also worked as staff member at international institutions for The World Bank Group, Washington, DC, USA (2012-2016) (as Senior Private Sector Development Specialist in the Latin-America and Caribbean Region within the Trade and Competitiveness Global Practice), and for the European Commission, Brussels, Belgium (2002-2004) (as Policy officer in DG Enterprise and Industry and previously, analyst at Eurostat based in Luxembourg, 1989-1990).

He has been extensively working giving policy advice for the European Commission, the OECD, the United Nations the Inter-American Development Bank and the World Bank Group, drafting policy reports, official documents and working papers. Scientific advisor, project leader and expert in around 50 projects. At EU level, his economic and statistical works include projects for Eurostat, DG Enterprise and Industry, DG Single Market and Services, DG Trade, DG Regio, DG Research and the European Economic and Social Committee. In developing economies, he has been working in countries such as Ecuador, Uruguay, Kazakhstan, Dominican Republic, Jordan, and Jamaica.

As manager, he has led and coordinated international research teams and projects including the project management coordination of the ServPPIN 7FP project and a Europe-Innova project on organizational innovation (both starting in 2008 and ending in 2011). He has also been task-teak leader (TTL) in World Bank projects based in Washington DC, US, co-founder of one NGO (CESAL) for international development, and one research institute at the university (Servilab). He has also been manager of R&D program at the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology and President of the RESER European association. He is currently the founder and director of the research and consultancy group INSERA.

Teaching and research in the areas of Services, Innovation, Business Services, Public Services, Urban and Regional Studies, Economic Policy, Knowledge Economy, Competitiveness, Globalisation and International. He is author or co-author of about 150 publications, mainly in international publishing houses and journals and mainly on private and public services, service innovation and internationalisation. Recent publications are mainly on service innovation and social innovation.
Cristina Suarez (Female) is an associate professor at UAH. Member of the research team as econometrician, she has been working on efficiency and productivity, services and innovation.

Oscar Montes (Male): Visiting lecturer of economics, UAH, expert on innovation in public services.

Justo de Jorge (Male): Associate professor of Business Administration, UAH, and expert on efficiency, services and entrepreneurship.

Jose Maria Arranz (Male): Associate professor of Econometrics, UAH, and expert on econometric modeling, statistics and data analysis.

Carlos Iglesias (Male): Associate professor of Economics, UAH, and expert on labor markets, skills and services.

Elena Mañas (Female): Associate professor of Economics, UAH, and expert on services and CSR.

Relevant publications, products and services


Relevant previous projects and activities

- **The contribution of public and private services to European growth and welfare, and the role of public-private innovation networks (SERVPPIN) (2008-2011, 7FP, Coordinated by UAH).** It is a 7FP project on the importance and role of services, service innovation and public-private-third sector service networks for Europe. It served to understand how public-private sector interactions work and how they can be better managed by policy-makers to increase welfare and growth. A summary of the results was published by Gallouj, F., Rubalcaba, L. and Windrum, P. (Eds) (2013) *Public Private Innovation Networks in Services*. Edward Elgar.

- **Innovation in Public Services (PUBLIN) (2003-2005, 5FP, Coordinated by UCL, London).** PUBLIN developed a consistent and general understanding of public sector innovation and policy learning. PUBLIN study focused on networks, knowledge flows and sources and drivers of learning and innovation in public organisations.

- **Customer Excellence in Services (CEOS) (20110, TEKES, Finland, Coordinated by SC-Research (Laaperanta University) together with the IAO-Fraunhofer (Stuttgart, Germany) and the MIT (Boston, US). The project explored the different levels and modes of users engagement for service innovation.

- **Europe-Innova, Sectoral Innovation Watch (EU, DG Enterprise, 2007-2011, Coordinated by TNO, The Netherlands).** In acting as the focal point for innovation networking in Europe, Europe INNOVA and the SIW aspired to inform, assist, mobilise and network the key stakeholders in the field of entrepreneurial innovation. The SIW provided the analytical bases for that.

- **Knowledge intensive services in Europe (KISSIN).** The project examined the regional incidence of ‘knowledge-intensive business services’ (KIBS) across European countries, with a focus both on demand and supply of KIBS.

Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

The Department of Economics and Business Administration is in the Faculty of Economics, Business and Tourism. The Faculty comprises all facilities needed for research activities, such as working space,
libraries, computing systems, etc. Library services include a search engine for finding materials within the university’s resources and beyond, and also allows remote access to documents and publications (electronic and physically supported as well). The Faculty has also large experience in organizing international meetings and conferences providing its facilities.

4.1.3 The University of Edinburgh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>UEDIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="https://www.business-school.ed.ac.uk/">https://www.business-school.ed.ac.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Profile

The University is the leading research university in Scotland and is amongst the top ten in the United Kingdom. Results of the 2014 Research Excellence Framework reveal that 83% the University’s research activity is in the highest categories - 4* and 3*- which are classified as ‘world leading’ or ‘internationally excellent’. Based on the quality and breadth of its research, Edinburgh has been rated fourth in the UK and by far the most successful university in Scotland. Each of the University’s three Colleges has at least one research area ranked top in the UK.

Role in the Project

UEDIN is the lead and will manage WP1 and supervise ESR 1, 2 and 3. UEDIN is also involved in WP2, WP4, WP8, WP10 and WP11.

CVs of key personnel

**Professor Stephen Osborne (Male)** (30% of full time) has fifteen years’ experience of working as a social work practitioner and manager before moving to work in the higher education sector in 1990. Since then, his research has focused on four areas: the role of the third sector in delivering public services, co-production, innovation in public services and public services reform, and latterly the development of the theories of the New Public Governance and a Public Service-Dominant Logic for Public Service Organisations. This latter work has shifted public management theory and practice away from a manufacturing and Product-Dominant business logic and towards one that recognises the special challenges of services management for public services. Director of the Centre for Service Excellence in the School, and Co-Director of the EU FP7 Programme ‘Learning from Innovation in Public Sector Environments’ (LIPSE).

He was the Founding Editor and is the current Editor of the ABS 3* journal Public Management Review and the founder and Immediate Past-President of the International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPM). As the project lead he will have full responsibility for the project and lead the support as outlined below. He will spend 40% of his time on the project. As the project lead he will be supported by a dedicated administrator and research fellow.

**Dr. Sophie Fleming (Female)** (10% of full time) is an early career researcher and will provide mentoring support.

Relevant publications, products and services


Relevant previous projects and activities

During the 6th Framework Programme the University collaborated in some 180 projects, with a total award value of approximately €74M. In the 7th Framework Programme the University participates in 442 projects with an award value of €269.5M. This includes 115 Marie Curie Awards of which they are partner in 26 ITNS and lead 5.

Currently in Horizon 2020 the University participates in 147 projects (award value €100.5M) including 33 Individual Fellowships and 10 ITNs.

Some indicative projects that UEDIN was involved in are the following:

- **FP7 Programme – Learning from innovation in Public Service Environments (LIPSE)** – part of the FP7 programme topic: SSH.2012.3.2-3. Social innovation in the public sector. This programme explored the dynamics of innovation across a number of dimensions, including co-production, regulation, risk and social networks. Osborne coordinated the Risk WP and contributed to 3 others.
- **H2020 Programme - SOLIDUS: “Solidarity in European societies: empowerment, social justice and citizenship”** – part of H2020-EURO-SOCIETY-2014, Topic EURO-3-2014. This programme explored the dynamics of solidarity in European societies in the aftermath of the recent recession. UEDIN was part of 4 Work Packages with a focus of exploring the impact of public services upon social solidarity.

Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

UEDIN has independent and world leading research premises.

### 4.1.4 Universitat Konstanz

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>UKON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uni-konstanz.de">www.uni-konstanz.de</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Profile

The University of Konstanz is a public, medium-sized campus university with more than 11,000 students located in the very south of Germany on Lake Constance. It is one of eleven universities whose institutional strategies are funded by the federal and state governments to expand top-level research. Research at the University of Konstanz reflects four key priorities: In the Humanities and Social Sciences, Cultural Studies and Decision Sciences; in the Life and Natural Sciences, Chemical Biology and Ecology, along with Nano and Materials Sciences. The University has a strong record in acquiring national and international third-party funding; it contributes to numerous EU networks and projects.
Ever since its foundation as a reform university in 1966, it has put emphasis on offering space for innovation and creativity. Creativity is enhanced by flat hierarchies and interdisciplinary collaboration. Diversity, communication and integration, the support of young scientists and researchers as well as flexible and adaptable structures serve as a basis for international top-level research. The university's location on Lake Constance and its proximity to Switzerland and Austria facilitate international collaboration and have resulted in close collaboration in numerous projects across borders.

The Department of Politics and Public Administration is unique in Germany in its combination of politics, public administration and management science. It has been ranked consistently highly in national and international rankings. The department is one of the most internationally active departments on campus with a variety of international degree programs and international collaborations in research and teaching. Ines Mergel's Chair is conducting research on the use of new technologies and digital innovation management in the public sector.

### Role in the Project

UKON will be partner in this project. Prof. Mergel will devote 20% of her working time to the working package on digital transformation of public administration. For this working package, she will serve as the lead research and will design the stages of data collection, triangulation of the data, and the qualitative data analysis. She will be responsible for the expert interviews and the case studies of countries including Germany, Denmark, UK, Italy, and the Netherlands. In addition, she will contribute to WP1 Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL, WP5 Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation and WP7 Policy implications for public sector transformation. UKON will be also involved in WP8, WP10 and WP11.

### CVs of key personnel

**Professor Ines Mergel (Female)** is full professor of Public Administration. She has vast international research and teaching experience in the U.S. and Switzerland. She advised nine PhD students and focuses her research and teaching on digital transformation in the public sector. She has published four books, 33 peer-reviewed articles in the top 10 Public administration journals, 17 book chapters, and 12 practitioner reports. She serves as Associate Editor of Government Information Quarterly and is on the Board of Directors of the Public Management Research Association. Her core research area is digital transformation of public administrations. She is conducting international comparative research on the use of new technologies to transform public administration processes.

### Relevant publications, products and services


### Relevant previous projects and activities
UKON is dedicated to providing high-quality training for doctoral and postdoctoral researchers and offers closely supervised PhD programs. Ines Mergel has been involved in the PhD program at Syracuse University (2008-2016), actively advised and co-adviced doctoral students at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs and the iSchool. She has provided over 40 training sessions to the Executive Master of Public Administration program, worked with international public managers, and taught in SU’s and Harvard’s MPA and MBA programs.

Ines Mergel received several competitive grants and awards including the National Science Foundation, IBM’s Center for the Business of Government, as well as internal grants to study the adoption of non-traditional technologies in the public sector.

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

UKON and the Department of Politics and Public Administration offer all resources and infrastructure that is needed to successfully conduct the proposed project. The University has a fully equipped library, which participates in various international collaborative projects, including the OpenAIRE project, funded by the EU. Professor Mergel, full professor at the Department of Politics and Public Administration, will provide workspace and if necessary computer equipment and research analysis software to the researchers working on this project.

### 4.1.5 Universite des Sciences et Technologies de Lille - LILLE I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>USTL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>Public Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Profile**

**Lille 1 University – Sciences and Technologies (USTL)**

The University was created in 1562 and moved to a new campus in 1971. Lille 1 University is a State University and has over 20,000 students, 1,600 researchers, professors and associate professors and 1,300 BIATOSS (library staff, engineers, administrative, technical, social and health). The University is a key centre for science and technology. 30 out of the 35 laboratories of the University are joint research units with CNRS, INSERM, INRIA and INRA. Lille 1 University ambition is to lead high level research around 8 scientific areas: Information and Communication Technologies and Sciences, Mechanics and Civil Engineering, Chemistry and Materials, Mathematics, Physics, Environmental Sciences, Biology and Biotechnologies and Social Sciences. The University offers PhD students a training in research at the highest level, helping them to develop their talents and to start a professional career. The University is involved in more than 70 European research projects and hosts 80 visiting professors/year and offers 120 post-doctoral positions/year. In 2018, Lille 1 University will merge into Lille University as a result of a common desire of the three Universities of Lille (Lille 1, Lille 2 and Lille 3) to develop a leading European University, recognized worldwide for its research, the excellence of its teaching and its innovation in lifelong training. Today Lille University is working toward becoming one of the top ten French universities and among the top 50 European higher education institutions by 2025.

**The Centre Lillois d’Etudes et de Recherches Sociologiques et Economiques (CLERSE)**

CLERSE is a Joint Research Unit (UMR 8019) between Lille 1 University (USTL: Université de Lille 1 - Sciences et Technologies) and the National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS). It combines three disciplines - sociology, economy, and anthropology - and has more than a hundred of researchers (7 researchers from
CNRS, 125 teaching-researchers and assimilated researchers, 7 research engineers et technicians, 75 doctoral students).

CLERSE has been founded in 1982 and has a long tradition of research in the field of public policy, urban sociology, deviance delinquency, as well as in other research activities such as work, post-industrial economies, occupational studies, sustainable development, the history of economic thought and socioeconomy. The laboratory is also contributing to the scientific program of the European House of Humanities and Social Sciences (MESHS : Maison Européenne des Sciences de l’Homme et de la Société - a service unit for research laboratories from several universities of the Nord Pas-de Calais Area and Picardy).

CLERSE conducts sociological, economic and anthropological research by promoting dialogue and exchanges between disciplines with share issues (work, social economy, development ...). The scientific agenda currently revolves around three key research areas: (Area 1) Comparative political anchor points and dynamics, (Area 2) Working worlds and private worlds, and (Area 3) Economies and societies: development, wealth, innovation and regulation.

Within Area 3 of CLERSE the « Services and Innovation » group comprises approximately twenty researchers whose main research themes are the following ones:
- Services in the history of economic thought
- Productivity and performance measurement and strategies in services
- R&D, innovation, entrepreneurship and learning in services and through services
- Services, regional development and international trade
- Employment systems and human resources management in the service sector.

**Role in the Project**

USTL will be the leader of WP6. USTL will also participate in the following WPs:
- WP1: Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL
- WP2: Measuring and monitoring public sector transformation
- WP3: Digital transformation of public administrations
- WP4: Service design for public sector transformation
- WP5: Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation
- WP7: Policy implications for public sector transformation
- WP8: Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders
- WP10: Dissemination and Communication
- WP11: Project Management

**CVs of key personnel**

**Team leaders:**

**Professor Faïz Gallouj (Male)** is Professor of Economics, Director of a master degrees in innovation economics and management and member of the scientific Council of Lille 1 University. He is member of RESER (European Association for Research on Services) and of RNI (Research Network on Innovation). He is the Editor-in-Chief of the European Review of Service Economics and Management (formerly « Economies et Sociétés » Economics and Management of Services Series) and of the Journal of Inspiration Economy. He is member of the editorial or scientific boards of 14 journals mainly devoted to services or innovation (including Research Policy, Service Science, the Journal of Innovation Economics, the European Journal of Innovation management). He has authored or co-authored 149 articles that have been published in scientific journals and books and 35 research reports. Faiz Gallouj is also the author, co-author or editor of 15 books on services and innovation.
Professor Faridah Djellal (Female), is Professor of Economics, former Dean of the Faculty of economics and sociology, Director of a master degree in services economics and management and member of the academic council of Lille 1 University. She is currently President of the “Innovation, Labour” Committee at ANR, the French National Research Agency. She is member of RESER (European Association for Research on Services) and Vice-President (in charge of cooperation) of RNI (Research Network on Innovation). She is associate editor of the European Review of Service Economics and Management and member of the editorial boards of several scientific journals (including Journal of Innovation Economics and Management, Busines and Innovation, Review of Business and Economics Studies, Bulgarian Economic Papers). Faridah Djellal is the author or co-author of 80 articles in scientific journals or books and of 10 books.

Other participants:

Permanent staff at Clerc-Lille 1 University:

Céline Merlin-Brogniart (Female): Associate Professor in Economics, Clercé, Lille 1 University

Simon Nadel (Male): Associate Professor in Economics, Clercé, Lille 1 University

Olivier Mazade (Male): Associate Professor in Sociology, Clerc Lille1 University

Benoit Desmarchelier (Male): Assistant Professor in Economics, Xi’an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou (China)

Other experts:

Valérie François (Female): Associate Professor in Business Science, LEM, Lille 1 University

Camal Gallouj (Male): Professor in Business Science, CEPN, Paris 13 University

All of them are very active in the field of services and innovation studies from various scientific perspectives: economics, sociology, business science.

Relevant publications, products and services


Relevant previous projects and activities

Previous Projects:

Previous projects include: innovation and R&D in insurance companies, the measurement of R-D in service industries, innovation in public services, productivity evaluation in Family Allowance Offices, models of tourism and local development, Performance and innovation in the French Post Office, innovation in hospitals, ICT in Education, productivity in public services, Ageing in a service economy, Public-Private innovation networks in services. The members of « Services and Innovation » group carried out researches on services issues for the following institutions: Ministries of Research and Technology, of Education, of Employment and Solidarity, of SMEs, Department of Commerce, Direction of Tourism, Commissariat Général du Plan, Regional Council, Chamber of Commerce and Industry, European Commission (several projects including the SI4S project, TSER programme; DG Entreprise, “ Innovation and SMEs programme; Dynamo project, 6th FP, ServPPIN project 7th FP), OECD, etc.

Other expertise:
The researchers involved in the project participate in various institutions interested by the dynamics of public and private services: French Committee for Service Accounts, French Council for Statistical information, piloting committees dedicated to services measurement problems within INSEE, OECD, and within different Ministries, etc. They are members of several international scientific networks on services and on innovation. One of the researchers is expert within ANR, the French National Research Agency.

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

A newly constructed facility, LILLIAD (Learning Center Innovation: [https://lilliad.univ-lille.fr/welcome](https://lilliad.univ-lille.fr/welcome)), located on the Lille 1 University Campus, offers services such as open spaces for training, event and exhibition facilities and documentary resources (e.g. on-line library). Lille 1 University Campus also has an international hall of residence (Reeflex: [http://reeflex.univ-lille.fr/home/Researcher/International-Residence-Hall](http://reeflex.univ-lille.fr/home/Researcher/International-Residence-Hall)). Intended especially for doctoral and post-doctoral students, researchers and professors from abroad (affiliated or on sabbatical) visiting the University's various research centres, it will also provide accommodation for researchers invited or recruited in the course of the project.

Lille 1 University has a department dedicated to European research projects called the “Service ingénierie de projets” (Project Engineering Department) and a SAIC (Service d’Activités Industrielles et Commerciales/Industrial and Commercial Activities Department). The SAIC is responsible for the non-academic aspects of the project (preparation of cost statements, for instance, compliance with financial regulations, etc.) and will work with the CLERSE team of the Co-VAL project and CLERSE administrative staff has already participated in European projects in the past as well.

### 4.1.6 The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal asbl

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>LC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>Non-profit association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lisboncouncil.net">www.lisboncouncil.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Profile**

The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal was founded on 06 October, 2003 as a non-profit association, constituted under Belgian law (asbl/vzw).

It was set up to intellectually accompany the Lisbon Agenda, Europe’s original growth and jobs programme. The organisation quickly positioned itself as a “go-to-place” for unconventional, out-of-the-box thinking and research, attracting senior leaders from its very early days. Among the speakers at Lisbon Council events have been the following leaders:

- Jean-Claude Juncker, president of the European Commission (as prime minister of Luxembourg);
- Carlos Moedas, European commissioner for research, science and innovation;
- Andrus Ansip, European Commission vice-president for the digital single market;
- Günther Oettinger, (then) European commissioner for the digital economy and society;
- Enda Kenny, Taoiseach of Ireland and head of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2013;
- Helle Thorning-Schmidt, (then) prime minister of Denmark and head of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2012;
- Brian Hayes, (then) Irish minister of state for public service reform and the office of public works, and representative of the Presidency of the Council of the European Union in 2013;
Over time, a pronounced focus on innovation, innovation in the public sector, digital technologies, human capital and skills developed, all couched in the broader context of “growth and jobs”. In particular, back in 2008, when most of the policymaking debate was focusing on innovation in the private sector, the Lisbon Council was one of the first to focus on innovation in the public sector, which represents in Europe half of the economy.

The organisation’s main activities are as follows:

1) **High-Level Events**

The Lisbon Council has a long-standing expertise in organising interesting and engaging events that attract great speakers and participants – and that often place issues squarely on the policy agenda. The events are often underpinned by

2) **World-Class Research**

The Lisbon Council has an active and vibrant research programme, operating at the leading-edge of thought leadership, warmly embraced by many policymakers who value the evidence provided and also often triggering press coverage in major outlets (*Financial Times*, *The Economist*, as well as the key publications at member state level)

3) **Community-Building and Outreach**

The Lisbon Council has a very active and dedicated “community” of friends and supporters throughout Europe. Numbering in the thousands, the Lisbon Council employs state-of-the-art means to keep connected with this group and inform them about its activities and programmes.

4) **Public Speaking and Advisory**

The Lisbon Council is in great demand for speaking at third party events, which gives the organisation very high-powered additional outlets for its work and thought leadership. In addition, Lisbon Council principals often serve as advisers and experts to leading bodies, such as for rotating presidencies of the Council of the EU.

Furthermore, the personnel that recently joined The Lisbon Council (Osimo, Mureddu, Jakimowicz, Verona), with regard to the particular domain of this project, provides the following methodological and domains specific expertise:

- **Open Government:** delivery of studies on Pricing of Public Sector Information (POPSIS); Collaborative e-government services; Science 2.0; EU Data Market study. Its staff authored the research roadmap on ICT for Governance (CROSSOVER).

- **eGovernment:** some of the team members have worked on eGovernment topics ever since 2005 as contractors in Commission funded studies (i.e. eGEP projects, eGovernment Benchlearning Pilots, between 2006 and 2008 three pilot studies to improve the Commission eGovernment benchmarking, a study on collaborative production of eGovernment services, one study to analyse the data of the 2012 users survey), as part of FP6 and Fp7 funded projects (i.e. eGov2020, Cross-Roads, Cross-Over), and while working as contractual agents or Grant Holders at JRC-IPTS. The team members have full knowledge, understanding, and experience with eGovernment benchmarking and indicators construction, with eGovernment impact measurement, and with eGovernment evaluation;

- **Stakeholder engagement:** the team members are able to design, build and manage web-based services for meaningful online discussions and collaboration. The team is specialized both in offline (stakeholder enquiry, focus groups, workshops, experts’ panel) and online engagement (online focus groups, opinion poll survey, web-based questionnaires). The team has led the
online engagement for the Digital Agenda Assembly in the last 4 years, has led and has developed innovative tools, such as the GIPO demonstration website;

Role in the Project

The Lisbon Council will lead the WP7 on Policy implications for public sector transformation and the WP9 Sustainable policy impact. The Lisbon Council will bring to the project unique knowledge in the domain of open government as well as in developing online policy tools. It will have a major role in all policy work packages to ensure uptake of the research findings of the study. Additionally, it will support the following WPs:

- WP1 Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL
- WP3 Digital transformation of public administrations
- WP5 Living labs for co-creation and co-innovation
- WP8 Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders
- WP10 Dissemination and Communication
- WP11 Project Management

CVs of key personnel

**Paul Hofheinz (Male)** is president of the Lisbon Council, which he co-founded in 2003. After a distinguished career in journalism, Mr Hofheinz co-founded the Lisbon Council, where he researches, supervises research and hosts events on topics ranging from innovation, knowledge-economy, human capital and financial-market reform to economic development and European politics. He frequently appears on CNBC, Bloomberg and BBC, and has written for or been quoted in more than four dozen leading newspapers and academic journals. Mr Hofheinz also oversees daily management of the Lisbon Council, where he is in charge of the organisation’s growth and expansion. In 2011, he served as adviser to the Polish government, providing strategic input into the country’s first-ever European Union Presidency in the second half of 2011. Before leaving journalism, Mr Hofheinz worked as a writer and editor at *The Wall Street Journal*, covering such diverse topics as European integration, financial-market regulation, emerging markets and Russian politics. In 1998-1999, he was managing editor of Central European Economic Review, published by *The Wall Street Journal Europe*. Prior to that, Mr Hofheinz served as associate editor of *Fortune*, America’s leading business magazine, including stints as bureau chief in Bonn and Moscow. He began his journalism career in London as a reporter for *Time* magazine. Mr Hofheinz holds a Master of Science (MSc) degree in Russian politics from London School of Economics and a Bachelor of Arts (BA) in history from Yale, where he received the prestigious John Addison Porter and Dean Henry P. Wright prizes upon graduation. In 1992, he received the Olive Branch Award from New York University’s Center for War, Peace and Media Studies for a three-part series of articles in *Fortune* on the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union. He speaks fluent English, French and Russian.

**Mr. David Osimo (Male)** is Chief Policy Analyst at The Lisbon Council, and has 20 years of experience as advisor on information society and innovation policies, inside and outside government, at local and international level (Open Evidence, Tech4i2 Ltd, European Commission Joint research centre, IPTS, Regione Emilia-Romagna). David is able to combine research and practitioners skills: as a researcher, he is mostly known for his pioneering work on web 2.0 in government and science, on which he advised the European Commission and the United Nations Development programme. He also published articles on e-government, future science, research and innovation policy and ICT statistics and he is an experienced keynote speaker at high-level events such as Ministerial Conferences and the Digital Agenda Assembly. As a practitioner, he created web- platforms for policy-making (CommentNeelie.eu, Daemplementation.eu, and the Grand Coalition Pledge Tracker) and inducement prizes for innovation (iMinds INCA awards and Ideamocracy.it). David is an Italian native speaker and is able to work and interact in English, Spanish and French. He works across Spain and Belgium. David blogs at http://egov20.wordpress.com and tweets @osimod.
Dr. Francesco Mureddu (Male) is Associate Director at the Lisbon Council. During his career Francesco has been primarily involved in designing and delivering consultancy and research projects for the European Institutions in a wide variety of topics including Information Society and ICT, e-government, Smart Cities, ICT-enabled social innovation, future science, research and innovation policies. His specific fields of expertise include evaluation of policy initiatives and programmes, impact assessments, policy monitoring and benchmarking, policy development, counterfactual impact evaluation, technology roadmapping and scenario development, economic and econometric modelling, cost/benefit and sensitivity analysis, stakeholders’ consultation and engagement. Francesco is currently Scientific Director at the Catalan Company Osimo Associates, Associated Researcher at the Centre for North South Economic Research (CRENoS) of the University of Cagliari, as well as co-founder of the cyber security startup Intelligence Framework Inc. He has also professional experience in international institutions such as the European Commission and the European Central Bank. Francesco holds an MA in Economics from the Catholic University of Louvain and a PhD in Economics from the University of Cagliari, and is able to work and interact in English and Spanish.

Ms. Katarzyna Jakimowicz (Female) is Associate Director at the Lisbon Council. Katarzyna combines the worlds of policy and business. She is a policy analyst, marketing professional and entrepreneur with experience from EU Commission, non-profit & private sector (consumer goods, food, pharmaceuticals, creative arts, education). She successfully managed portfolio of brands at such companies as PepsiCo, L’oreal, Mars, Pernrod Ricard and Omega Pharma. In European Commission, DG Growth (former Enterprise and Industry), she dealt with SME policy development and monitoring, economic analysis & digital entrepreneurship. She has also cooperated with European Young Innovators Forum. At the Lisbon Council she focuses on horizontal policy analysis and strategic outreach in the field of information and knowledge society. She holds M.Sc. degree in EU Business and Law with specialization in EC Competition Law, master degree in Marketing and Management and postgraduate degree in Market Research and Psychology of Consumers’ Behaviour. She has also obtained additional degree in Data and System Analysis from University of Oxford.

Mr. Marcello Verona (Male) is Associated Director for IT and Platforms at The Lisbon Council. He graduated as work and organizational psychologist in Cagliari in 2000, with a specialization in online human resource management at the University of Florence in 2001, and human resources management (Catholic University of Milan / Cagliari Industrial Association) in 2003. He deals with web application development and online collaborative environments as a consultant for several Universities and public administrations. He has worked for various Italian ministries, government agencies and local authorities (Department of Public Service, Ministry of Culture, FORMEZ, Region Sardinia) and he has made numerous sites and online services for the European Commission (DG Connect, DG Enterprise). He is interested in online participation, writes open source software and has collaborated on projects of civic hacking. Among these, in 2011, he implemented the project “commentneelie.eu” (with David Osimo), a publication of the speeches of Commissioner Neelie Kroes in commentable format, sentence by sentence. In 2012 he won first prize at the international contest Apps4Italy (category visualizations) with the project “mappeelettorali.it” georeferencing of the elections in Italy.

Stéphanie Lepczynski (Female) is associate director at the Lisbon Council, where she oversees the think tank initiatives on public sector innovation and web startups. She is also the co-founder and president of Bouge asbl, a non-profit organisation active on the cultural scene. Prior to this, she worked at the European Commission for the Directorate-General Competition, where she contributed to the design of state aid legislations (General Block Exemption Regulation, State Aid in the Form of Guarantees). A French citizen with Polish roots, she worked for a private company in Warsaw and as an assistant for the French Cultural Department of the French Embassy in Wroclaw. She holds a Masters degree in European Politics from the Institut d’Etudes Politiques (Strasbourg) and a Masters degree in European Law from Robert Schuman University. She speaks French, English, Spanish, Polish and German.

Relevant publications, products and services

Relevant previous projects and activities

The Lisbon Council has a rich history of conducting successful projects, among the most relevant for Co-VAL are the following:

- **European Centre for Government Transformation**

  Founded in 2009 as a leading research centre and practitioner-driven community, the European Centre for Government Transformation is dedicated to providing pragmatic and actionable solutions designed to help government agencies and other public-service organisations improve the social, economic and health outcomes of the people they serve through delivery of increased and improved public services. At the heart of the Centre’s activities has always been to use the public sector itself to promote innovation not only from within but particularly in view of society-at-large. A landmark publication, dubbed Delivering Public Service for the Future: How Europe Can Lead Public-Sector Transformation, highlighted a wide range of best practice in the field of state transformation, setting out the cutting-edge vision, motivation and experience of top academics and practitioners in the field.

- **European Digital Forum**

  The European Digital Forum is a think tank led by the Lisbon Council and Nesta, in collaboration with the European Commission’s Startup Europe Initiative. It is a first-of-its kind think tank dedicated to empowering tech entrepreneurs and growing Europe’s digital economy, by giving a voice in public policy to the continent’s most enterprising and innovative entrepreneurs. A key part of the reflection refers to technology and the public sector, which was analysed in a milestone publication, dubbed Government of the Future: How Digital Technology Will Change the Way We Live, Work and Govern. It was launched at the eGovernment Conference Luxembourg 2015, a minister-level informal gathering hosted by the
Government of Luxembourg, acting as Presidency of the Council of the European Union. It imagines a world where citizens and governments collaborate to "co-create" public services through the use of radically enhanced approaches, such as "government as a platform"-based services and blockchain technology. It analyses “best-in-class” e-government initiatives in an array of countries and speculates on how Europe would look if today’s best practices were broadly disseminated and embraced at scale.

- **The Jean Monnet’s Founding Fathers Lecture Series**

The Lisbon Council runs annual lectures named after the European Union’s founding fathers, which each emphasis a key theme. The Jean Monnet Lecture focuses on the transformative power of governance and government in the 21st century. Among the laureates who delivered inspiring speeches were: Brian Hayes TD, then minister of state for public service reform and the Office of Public Works (while Ireland was holding the Presidency of the Council of the EU); Helle Thorning-Schmidt, then prime minister of Denmark (while Denmark was holding the Presidency of the Council of the EU); Jean-Claude Juncker, then prime minister of Luxembourg; and Jean-Claude Trichet, then president of the European Central Bank.

Furthermore the personnel that recently joined The Lisbon Council has carried out the following relevant projects:

- Study on the New Generation of eGovernment Services
- Digital Agenda for Europe - engagement for growth and jobs (Lot 1 – ICT and Public services for eBusiness)
- CROSSOVER - Bridging communities for Policy Making 2.0
- CROSSROAD – A Participative Roadmap for ICT Research in Electronic Governance and Policy Modelling

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

The Lisbon Council is perfectly equipped to execute the project in terms of significant infrastructure. Next to state-of-the-art computers and software, it possesses the following:

- **Database**

The Lisbon Council’s database consists of 5,000+ people, made up of a very diverse community that includes pertinent leaders from business, academia, associations, policy makers, central and regional governments, international organisations, journalists and other actors based in Brussels, all 28 members states and worldwide. This database is the result of over ten years of scouting for top leaders in Europe and elsewhere. The database is based on Salesforce.com, the best cloud-based Customer Relationship Management (CRM) tool, that allows for tailored and targeted communications.

- **Website**

Sleek informative website – [www.lisboncouncil.net](http://www.lisboncouncil.net) – that receives on average over 13,000 hits a day. The website is Web 2.0-friendly, enabling sharing content, featuring exciting social networking tools and responsive to all types of mobile devices. It is now also available as an app, free of charge on iTunes app store or Google Play.

- **Social media**

The Lisbon Council twitter channel (@lisboncouncil) has more than 4300 followers. The think tank has its own dedicated YouTube Channel – Lisbon Council TV ([http://youtube.com/thelisboncouncil](http://youtube.com/thelisboncouncil)) that features short videos convincingly delivering summaries of key events that the Lisbon Council hosts, reaching a wide audience in Europe and more globally. These videos are widely circulated over social media channels, such as Facebook and Twitter. The most successful example is “What is innovation?”, a video that has been watched 114,864 times. The Lisbon Council has also building up a strong presence on social media platforms such as LinkedIn, Google+ and Flickr.
Universiteit Maastricht

Participant Short Name: UM-MERIT
Type of Organisation: Higher education
Country: Netherlands
Web Site: http://www.merit.unu.edu

Organisation Profile

UM-MERIT (Maastricht University) focuses on the social, political and economic factors that drive innovation and the effects of innovation, broadly defined, on social welfare and economic outcomes such as productivity and competitiveness. It addresses how individuals, private and public organizations, institutions, and countries at all stages of development, can make better use of knowledge to create and enhance growth and development opportunities. MERIT’s research mission is to provide more insights into the social, political and economic international and local context within which innovation and technological change is created, adapted, selected, diffused, and improved upon. The Institute’s research and training programmes address a broad range of relevant policy questions dealing with the national and international governance of innovation and intellectual property protection, and the creation and diffusion of knowledge.

With a research staff of app. 50 persons, including 16 professors, plus 80 PhD researchers, MERIT is a leading research institute on innovation and technology. In April 2013, it was ranked worldwide at the first place of the REPEC ranking of institutions in the field of Innovation. Of specific interest for the proposal is the work on scoreboards and survey design. The MERIT research team has almost 15 years of work experience on the Innovation Union Scoreboard since its introduction in 2000 and its work on redesigning the Community Innovation Survey and surveying knowledge transfer activities of universities and public research organizations. The MERIT research team has also published several refereed journal articles on innovation in the public sector, several of which are based on analyses of survey data.

Role in the Project

MERIT will be responsible for WP2, which consists of methods for measuring and monitoring transformative innovations and the use of co-creation and collaboration by public sector agencies. WP2 involves two substantive objectives: 1) mapping currently available data that can be used to construct indicators for transformative innovation and the use of co-creation/collaboration and 2) a survey of these activities in public sector agencies in six partner countries. The survey results will be used both to construct additional indicators and for in-depth analysis of the role of co-creation in transformative innovations. Hugo Hollanders will be responsible for the first substantive objective of developing indicators while Anthony Arundel will be responsible for the survey design, implementation and analysis. UM-MERIT will be also involved in WP1, WP8, WP10 and WP11.

CVs of key personnel

Anthony Arundel (Male) is a Professorial Fellow at UNU-MERIT and concurrently a Professor of Innovation at the Australian Innovation Research Centre, University of Tasmania, Australia. In 1999 he obtained an MA in the economics of technological change from the University of Limburg (now called Maastricht University) in Maastricht, the Netherlands. His expertise is in the design and analysis of innovation surveys, including question design, cognitive testing, sampling, implementation methodology, indicator construction, and econometric analysis. His current research focuses on the use of survey and interview research methods to identify and evaluate innovation activities in the public and private sectors. Recent research topics include knowledge flows and collaboration between the public and private sectors, innovation complexity, barriers to innovation in the public sector, and the influence of national cultures and workplace conditions on innovative activities. He has done consulting work on the topic of public sector innovation for the OECD, the European Commission, the Department of Industry in...
Hugo Hollanders (Male) is a Senior Researcher at MERIT. Before joining MERIT in 1992, he worked as a researcher at Statistics Netherlands. His research interests include growth theory, the measurement of Science, Technology & Innovation, composite indicators, and economics of regional innovation. Current and past research focuses on innovation and S&T statistics. He has been involved in the design of the questionnaires for the 2014 and 2016 Community Innovation Survey and the 2010 Innobarometer on innovation in public administration agencies. He is a member of the Netherlands Observatory of Science and Technology (NOWT), of the Advisory Steering Committee for the South-African Centre for Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators (CeSTII) and of the Advisory Board of the Global Innovation Index. He has been a member of the 2007 EC Expert Group on Innovation in Services, of NESTA's expert group for the UK innovation index, of the 2010 EC High-Level Panel on the Measurement of Innovation and the 2013 EC Expert Group on Public Sector Innovation (for which he was the rapporteur). He has done consultancy work on innovation topics for the EC, OECD, UNESCO, UNIDO and national governments (including Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Norway and Switzerland).

Relevant publications, products and services


Relevant previous projects and activities

- Commercialisation indicators of public funded research: Funded by the Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research. Developed and administered a questionnaire of knowledge transfer activities of European public research organisations and analysed the results. Years 2014-2015.
- Knowledge Transfer Study 2010-2012: http://www.knowledge-transfer-study.eu/home/ Funded by European Commission, DG Research and Innovation. Developed and administered a
questionnaire of knowledge transfer activities of European public research organisations: the European Knowledge Transfer Indicators Survey (EKTIS) and analyzed the results. Years 2010 – 2013.

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

MERIT has the necessary infrastructure and resources needed to host young researchers. MERIT recently moved to its highly modern new premises in a stand-alone building located at Boschstraat 24 in Maastricht; MERIT makes use of two networks and two internet domains, one hosted by Maastricht University (UM) and one by the United Nations University (UNU-MERIT). Researchers have free access (also online) to University Library (University Maastricht) and library of UNU-MERIT. Statistical Packages used include SPSS 20, SAS, SAS 9.1.3, STATA 8, STATA 10, R. Access to the following databases: SourceOECD, World Development Indicators Online, Global Development Finance Online, UNSTATS Common Database, COMTRADE, MERIT CATI (Cooperative Agreements and Technology Indicators), ISI Web of Science.

### 4.1.8 Høgskolen i Innlandet (Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name</th>
<th>INN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Organisation</strong></td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Site</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.inn.no">http://www.inn.no</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Profile**

Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences (INN University) was established on 01.01.2017 as a fusion between the formal Lillehammer University College (first established 1970) and Hedmark University College (established as a fusion in 1994). The merger was formally approved by the Cabinet of Norway on 14 October 2016, and effective 1 January 2017.

INN University operates on six campuses in south-eastern Norway: Lillehammer, Hamar, Blæstad, Elverum, Rena and Evenstad and have approximately 13 000 students and 952 employees. INN University offers 35 one-year study programs, 52 Bachelor programs, 31 Master programs and 4 PhD programs (plus one in cooperation with the Norwegian University of Science and Technology) in addition to a number of Teacher education and further education programs.

Our academic offer covers a vast number of subject areas: ecology and agricultural sciences, psychology, sports, law, music, pedagogy, health sciences, social sciences, teacher education, language and literature, biotechnology, film, tv and culture, tourism, animation and game sciences and economics.

INN University is host for Centre for Innovation in Services, a scientific research centre with many partners and collaborators with high skills within relevant research areas. The scientific work within Centre for Innovation in Services has a national leading position within innovation in public services, and its network and scientific skills are highly relevant for the scope of Societal Challenges. INN University offers education at all levels within relevant subject areas, and a PhD program within Innovation in Services, public and private.

**Role in the Project**

INN University will be a Project partner in Co-VAL, and responsible for WP4. Prof. Rønning will be leading the work at INN and will devote 30% of his working time to the work on WP 4, and he will also contribute in WP 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10 and 11. For WP4 he will be responsible for the organization, the data collection, and the co-ordination of the work. He will be assisted in this work by Toril Ringholm and Maria Røhnebæk, and INN plans to engage a postdoc in addition, to work part time at Co-VAL.
CVs of key personnel

**Professor Rolf Rønning (Male)** has been professor at Lillehammer University College (now INN University) since 1990. He has been visiting scholar at Harvard, York (UK) and Maquarie (Aus), and the Norwegian member in the Steering Committee for Nordic Centres of Excellence in Welfare. From 2000-2007 he was adjunct professor at the Norwegian University of science and technology. He has been involved in several large projects as coordinator and leader. He was leader of the Norwegian part of **Public-private innovation networks** in services (ServPPIN) 2008-2011 (EU), and responsible leader for the Nordic project **Social factors contributing to sickness absence** (2010-2015). His background is in public administration and welfare policies, but since 2005 he has worked with public innovation, and he was responsible for developing a PhD-program at the University college (**Innovation in services – public and private**), and the establishing of a research centre (**Centre for innovation in services**). INN University is now the leading Norwegian institution for public innovation, and is going to host a world conference for public innovation in November 2017.

**Maria Taivalsaari Røhnebæk (Female)** is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Innovation in Services (CIS). She holds a PhD in Technology, Innovation and Culture, and a MA in Social Anthropology. She has worked with several research projects that address innovation and organizational transformation in public services, especially within health, welfare and social services. Her PhD research investigated how digitalization processes relate to individualization and enhanced user-orientation in the Norwegian employment- and welfare services. She works currently with research on public-private innovation in health and social services, and with collaborative innovation in integration of refugees. Her research brings together insights, perspectives and approaches within Science and technology studies (STS) with theories from services innovation and the public sector innovation literature.

**Associate professor Toril Ringholm (Female)**, Dr. polit, associate professor, Norway Inland University of Applied Sciences, has carried out research on participation and local societal innovation and development since 1990, in projects financed by the EU, The Norwegian Research Council and other sources. She leads the research group on public innovation at CIS (Center for Innovation in Services). Ringholm has published in a number of journals and books, and has also edited a book on municipal innovation and a special issue of Local Government Studies. She has also disseminated her research through different medias; written, film and oral. She has led several research projects, of which are particularly relevant: “The municipality as a social developer” and “Innovation processes in Norwegian municipalities”. She is currently involved in two Research Council-financed projects: “Employee-driven innovation in the municipalities” and “Evaluation of the Norwegian Planning and Building Act”. In the latter she leads WP3 “Participation”.

Relevant publications, products and services

5. Røhnebæk, M. (2014):Translating Client-Orientation through ICT. In Fuglsang, Rønning & Enquist (eds.) Framing innovation in Public Service Sectors. Routledge

Relevant previous projects and activities

- **H2020-MSCA-RISE-2016**: (2017-2019) EDUHEALTH – Educating for Equitable Health Outcomes – the Promise of School Health and Physical Education. EDUHEALTH is a collaborative research project that will build on an existing working relationship and create long-lasting networks between three universities in Sweden, Norway and New Zealand. The project’s primary goal is to make a meaningful contribution to the European Union (EU) strategy to promote physical activity and health for all citizens.


- **The Municipality as a local societal developer**. The first broad mapping in Norway of the municipal activities in the field of societal developing. This was carried out by a national survey and case studies. The project was financed by the Association of Local and Regional Authorities in Norway.

- **Success factors and barriers for municipal innovation**. A set of case studies to investigate the dynamics of municipal innovation-processes in different sectors, and with different groups of actors involved. The project was financed by the Association of Local and Regional Authorities in Norway.

### Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

The most important research infrastructure is the INN library, offering high-quality services to researchers (e.g. search and open repository). The library’s collection includes approximately 300,000 volumes and 35,000 printed and electronic journals. The library actively collaborates with other national research libraries, giving the research staff access to national library resources. In addition, participation in international networks gives staff access to library resources from all over the world.

*INN Research data management service* provides assistance to develop research data management plans in line with the FAIR-principle (findable, accessible, interoperable and reusable). INN IT-service also support for collection, secure sharing and secure storage of research data, as well as good computing resources and licenses for softwares for survey-, data sampling - and analysis purposes.

INN University also gives access to administrative personnel and back-up scientific personnel for the project.

---

### 4.1.9 Roskilde Universitet (Roskilde University)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>RUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Organisation:</strong></td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country:</strong></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Web Site:</strong></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ruc.dk">www.ruc.dk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organisation Profile**

Roskilde University’s (RUC) primary objective is to contribute to experimental, innovative forms of research, learning and problem-solving that contribute to society's development. RUC was originally established in order to challenge academic traditions and to experiment with new ways to create and acquire knowledge. At RUC we cultivate a project and problem oriented approach to knowledge creation, because we believe that the most relevant results are obtained by solving real problems in collaboration with others. We employ an interdisciplinary approach because no major problems are ever resolved on the basis of any single academic discipline alone. We also cultivate transparency, because we passionately believe that participation and knowledge-sharing are prerequisites for freedom of thought, democracy, tolerance and development.
The Department of Social Sciences and Business (ISE) is one of four departments at Roskilde University. ISE specializes in interdisciplinary research and teaching within the areas of international development, public administration, social sciences, global studies and international studies.

The research group on Innovation in Service and Experience is one of nine research groups at the Department of Social Sciences and Business at Roskilde University. The research group has participated in many research projects on service innovation (public/private) and experiences funded, among others, by the EU FR7 and the Danish Innovation Fund (previously the Danish Strategic Research Council). The main research area is how the innovation approach, including entrepreneurship, can be used to understand development problems in public and private organizations, the society and the economy. The group has a particular focus on services (public and private), experiences (experience economy) and public-private collaboration. The research also focuses on digital developments as carriers of innovation and change in public and private organizations. Innovation is a concept that is used theoretically and empirically to understand change and development processes.

Role in the Project

RUC will be the leader of WP5. RUC will also participate in the following WPs:

- WP1: Developing the conceptual framework for Co-VAL
- WP3: Digital transformation of public administrations
- WP6: Structural transformations, public-private networks and social innovation
- WP8: Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders
- WP10: Dissemination and Communication
- WP11: Project Management

CVs of key personnel

**Lars Fuglsang (Male)** is full Professor at the Department of Social Sciences and Business at Roskilde University. He is heading the Department’s Research Group on Innovation in Service and Experience. He has previously been employed as full Professor at Lillehammer University College (now Innland Norway University of Applied Science) where he currently holds a part time professorship. His main research interest is how institutional and organizational frameworks are created to deal with the impact of innovation, technology and other forms of change on in public and private services and society. His current research is focusing on a practice-based understanding of the innovation process in services, i.e. innovation is seen as closely connected with practices and routines. Lars Fuglsang has participated in numerous projects about service innovation, experience economy, cooperation between public and private organizations, public innovation, the service encounter between employees and users, and trust within and between organizations, funded among others by EU FP7, NordForsk, the Nordic Innovation Center, Regional Research Funds in Norway, Danish Strategic Research Council, and the Danish Innovation Fund.

**Ada Scupola (Female)** is an associate professor at the Department of Social Sciences and Business, Roskilde University, Denmark. Her main research interests include user driven innovation, digital innovation, adoption and diffusion of information and communication technologies (ICT). She has been investigated both the private and the public sector with particular focus on the library sector, facility management service sector and consulting services. She has been visiting scholar in several universities including University of Texas at Austin, University of Michigan, Queensland University of Technology and University of Maryland at College Park.

Relevant publications, products and services


### Relevant previous projects and activities

The Research Group of *Innovation in Service and Experience* at Roskilde University has participated in relevant strategic national, Nordic and EU (FP7 & H2020) research projects, including:

- **FP7-SSH (217247) ServPINN 2008-2011**: "The Contribution of Public and Private Services to European Growth and Welfare, and the Role of Public-Private Innovation Networks". ServPINN was a 4 year research project under FP7 under the topic: The implications of developments in the service economy for the European economy. It was coordinated among 13 universities. The project focused on the role of public and private services on growth and welfare and the particular role of public-private innovation networks (PPIN).

- **KINO** (The Danish Council for Strategic Research/ The Innovation Fund Denmark), 2009-2012. Project title: When the customer encounters the employee. Interactive user-based innovation in services. The Danish Council for Strategic Research, 2009-2012. The project investigated how innovation could emerge from interactions of employees and users in public and private services.


- **NORDFORSK**: Nordic Researcher Network on Trust in and between Organizations. 2010-2015.

- **H2020-MSCA-RISE-2014 (645471) DiasporaLink** is a 4-year exchange program between 25 universities and research institutes representing EU, the Americas, Africa and Asia and will investigate, evaluate and facilitate transnational diaspora entrepreneurship, TDE as driver of development and wealth creation in countries of origin and residence. [http://diasporalink.com/](http://diasporalink.com/)

### Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

The Department of Social Sciences and Business is located within the campus of Roskilde University and occupies three buildings; all nicely, modern and fully equipped providing a suitable and stimulating environment for hosting and supervising the relevant researchers and its partners in this actual project.

### 4.1.10 Universita Commerciale Luigi Bocconi (Bocconi University)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>UB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unibocconi.it">www.unibocconi.it</a> &lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.sdabocconi.it">www.sdabocconi.it</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Profile

[Logo of Universita Commerciale Luigi Bocconi]
SDA Bocconi is the School of Management of Università Commerciale “L. Bocconi” and has been creating and sharing knowledge since 1971. The School’s commitment to research and education has enabled it, over the years, to contribute significantly to the development of many industries, both in Italy and abroad.

SDA Bocconi considers its people as the main resource in pursuing its mission. It invests in their personal development and gives them the opportunity to carry out meaningful roles in its governance activities. In creating and disseminating knowledge, SDA Bocconi aims at finding a balance between the opinion of the academic community and the relevance of that knowledge for the management community. Its Mission is to contribute to the development of individuals and organizations by creating and disseminating innovative managerial knowledge. The application of the School’s Mission is made through the following guiding principles:

- Offering programmes emphasizing critical thinking, entrepreneurship, social responsibility, integrity, respect for diversity, and global orientation;
- Educating high-talented individuals at every stage of their career, i.e. from young graduate students to senior executives;
- Developing a bridge between academic managerial research and its relevant applications in different business contexts.

SDA Bocconi is one of the few business schools in the world to hold the “triple crown” accreditation, which is awarded by three of the most prestigious school accreditation associations worldwide: AACSB, EQUIS and AMBA. In addition SDA Bocconi in the only school in Italy to have earned this accreditation, which is a further testimony to the outstanding quality of its academic offering and firmly places the School among the most accredited in Europe.

In particular only 5% of business schools worldwide have earned the prestigious AACSB (Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) and, in 1998, SDA Bocconi was the first school in Italy to be awarded EQUIS (European Quality Improvement System) and only school to be re-accredited three consecutive times.

Role in the Project

The role in the project is to actively contribute to the design of the framework of this project and to the development of the digital transformation working package, as part of the large research tradition at Bocconi on co-creation of value in the public sector and ICT innovation. In addition we will also actively contribute to the dissemination of the output of the overall project not only through the activities organized as part of the project but also through our executive education programs. UB will be also involved in WP8 and WP11.

CVs of key personnel

Dr. Maria Cucciniello (Female) is an Assistant Professor at SDA Bocconi School of Management. Her main research interests include innovation in the public sector, e-health, e-government and change management in the public sector. She is also a Research Assistant in Local Government Studies at the Research Center for Innovation in Governments and a Research Assistant in e-Health Studies. She has published several articles and contributions to books regarding transparency in government processes, e-government and transparency, and public innovation in the healthcare sector.

Dr. Greta Nasi (Female) who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the proposed research, is an Associate Professor at UB. Her fields of interest concern e-government, change management in the public sector, collaborative public management, and the impact of technology in the public sector and healthcare. She published several articles about the impact of personnel policies in government, public management in Italy and innovations in accounting.

Prof. Giovanni Valotti (Male) is the Delegate of the Rector for institutional relations of Bocconi University and Director of the Observatory on Change in Public Administration (OCAP, SDA Bocconi School of
Management). He is also Professor of Public Management. He is a consultant to the Minister of Public Administration and Innovation, regarding matters related to the assessment of performance and productivity of public agencies.

### Relevant publications, products and services


### Relevant previous projects and activities

- **2013-2015: EU FP 7 LIPSE Learning from Innovation in Public Sector Environments** – Theme Social innovation in the public sector
  

  The rationale behind LIPSE is to systematically identify significant drivers and barriers, and to scientifically study the outcomes of social innovation, within 11 EU countries and 7 policy sectors.

  LIPSE aims at (i) exploring future trends in social innovation, developing a (ii) comprehensive set of public sector social innovation indicators and (iii) policy guidelines for public decision-makers aimed at improving adoption, diffusion and upscaling of ICT-driven innovations.

  Its relevance to the Project lies not merely in its objective (to define a framework to study the outcomes of a specific object/initiative) but also in its specificity (institutional features of the public sector).

- **2012-2014: EU FP 7 COCOPS Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future** – Theme: The public sector of the future; Socio-economic sciences and Humanities
  
  [http://www.cocops.eu/](http://www.cocops.eu/)

  COCOPS’ main purpose was, drawing on existing large-scale datasets and innovative data collection in ten countries, to comparatively and quantitatively assess the impact of New Public Management (NPM) reforms in Europe and its member States.

  In particular, COCOPS aimed at (i) exploring trends and studying emerging public sector coordination practices, (ii) mapping and analyzing innovative mechanisms related to social and policy coordination and (iii) providing a comprehensive picture of the challenges facing the European public sector of the future to facilitate and promote the transfer of innovative best practices.

  Its relevance to the project lies in the development of a tool kit for assessing performance of a specific initiative and in the applied method to determine existing knowledge.

### Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

SDA Bocconi has an infrastructure capable of supporting the full range of its activities. SDA Bocconi School of Management is located at n° 8 Via Bocconi in Milan. The building contains classrooms for Executive Education courses and some Master Programmes, as well as working facilities for course participants, Department offices, Division offices, Administrative Services and the Faculty’s, Dean’s and Managing Director’s offices. SDA Bocconi is located within the Bocconi city campus and benefits from the full array of university-wide services. SDA Bocconi uses its own dedicated premises and equipment: 32 classrooms.
Plus 1 experiential Lab, 1,496 seats, 127 cubicles with 762 seats for group work, 12 meeting rooms. All facilities are equipped with an up-to-date information system including a full wi-fi coverage. Since 2012 a new classroom called “X-periential Lab” has been hosting SDA Bocconi Participants and Students to enhance their learning experience. The Library, which is shared with Università Bocconi, offers a wide range of resources, both print and online, such as books, journals, working papers, statistics and research databases focused on economics, business, law and social sciences.

4.1.11 Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem (Corvinus University of Budapest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>CUB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uni-corvinus.hu">http://www.uni-corvinus.hu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisation Profile

Corvinus University 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 business administration, economics, and social sciences, and most 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.

The Faculty of Business Administration is the centre for education and research in economics, financial management, management and organization, business, management sciences and management practice. The high quality of education offered by the Faculty is guaranteed by the fact that each subject is taught by lecturers who are specialists in the given science or discipline, equipped with the necessary academic and practical knowledge. A sign of the international recognition of our educational and research activity was the fact that in November 1996 the University became a member of the CEMS (Community of European Management Schools). The Faculty of Business Administration is also member of PIM, EDAMBA, EFMD and CEE MAN.

The Institute of Management is involved in teaching, research, and consulting in the field of management and leadership. The Institute, which is one of the biggest organizational unit at the Faculty of Business Administration, consists of four departments and four research centers: Department of Management and Organization; Department of Management Control; Department of Organizational Behaviour; Department of Strategic Management; Budapest Research Centre of Performance Management; Research Centre of Human Resource & Organization Development, and Culture; Research Centre of Information Resources Management; Research Centre of Strategic and International Management. While the focus is on the business sector, the institute has been active in teaching and research activities in the field of public management for two decades. Several faculty members are experts of the health care sector, public education, higher education, or the non-profit sector.

Role in the Project

CUB will participate in several research-oriented WPs, carrying out research activities as well as providing access to Hungarian (and other Central-Eastern European) cases. Specifically, CUB contributes to research in WP2, WP4, and WP6, and also participates in Policy implications for public sector transformation (WP7), knowledge sharing (WP8), dissemination activities (WP10) and WP11.
CVs of key personnel

**György Drótos (Male)** is a professor of and head of Department of Management Control at Corvinus University of Budapest. He holds a PhD degree in Business Administration. His research interest cover such topics as perspectives of information systems, process management and IT, strategy and IT of public service organizations, outsourcing and shared service centres, strategic information systems, knowledge management, performance management, inter-organizational networks and virtual organizations, and he has an extensive list of publications in Hungarian journals. In 2003 he was IT Lecturer of the Year, awarded by the Hungarian Chief Information Officers’ Association. He puts much emphasis on providing consulting services as well: he participated in, managed and sponsored over 200 consulting projects mainly for top 200 companies and public sector organizations in the field of Strategy and Performance Management, Organization Design, Process Management, IT Strategy and Project Management. He has worked or studied in Belgium, Germany, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Romania, Russia, Spain, the UK, and the US.

**Miklós Rosta (Male)** is a professor of and head of Department of Comparative Economics. He has research experience in public administration reforms, new public management and post-NPM approaches as well as co-production. He is also a managing director of the Back & Rosta IT company specializing in business consulting and innovative IT services (information security, e-learning, mobile phone marketing, telecommunication, integrated platforms and business process consulting). The company has two offices, one in Budapest, and one in Shanghai.

**Norbert Kiss (Male)** holds a PhD degree in Business Administration but has been involved in public administration, public management and health care management research and expert work for fifteen years. Between 2007 and 2010 he was the head of Department of Analysis and IT of the Hungarian Health Insurance Supervisory Authority. Between 2008 and 2014 he was the Hungarian academic coordinator of the Erasmus Mundus Master in Sustainable Regional Health Systems.

**Éva Révész (Female)** focuses her research interest on performance management of public administration as well as the civil sector. Beyond her university position she is the manager of a EU-funded project (as part of the EU Programme for Employment and Social Innovation), aimed at social enterprise development in Hungary.

**Relevant publications, products and services**

5. Drótos György (innovations): responsibility based performance management system in higher education; municipal holding concept; innovative use if IT in public services.

**Relevant previous projects and activities**

Researchers from the Department of Management Control has been involved in several projects:

- **2006-2008 - EURO-URHIS (FP6, 2005119)** European system of urban health indicators: the project aimed to develop a comprehensive urban health information and knowledge system to (a) help to identify and prioritize urban health problems, (b) enable the monitoring of the effects of actions taken to address them, (c) ensure timely access to information, (d) contribute in building advocacy, communication and education strategies, and (e) use standardized methodology for data collection,
processing and dissemination, allowing transnational comparisons and time trend analysis. CUB was providing data about Hungary.

- **2006-2009 - OECD Improving School Leadership**: the department was the coordinator and participated in the research activities of the Hungarian country study of this international school leadership project. The activity aimed to support policy development by providing in-depth analyses of different approaches to school leadership, by investigating questions as follows: What are the roles and responsibilities of school leaders under different governance structures? What seem to be promising policies and conditions for making school leaders most effective in improving school outcomes? How can effective school leadership be best developed and supported? What policies and practices would be most conducive to these ends?

- **2008-2014 - Erasmus Mundus Master in Sustainable Regional Health Systems** was a two-year-long interdisciplinary programme of 120 ECTS that aimed to give vision, knowledge and tools to develop and manage coherent health systems that contribute both to health and sustainable regional development in their regional communities. The Master Programme aimed to fill the gap in health management by approaching the theme of health system management and planning on a regional level. The master was carried out as a cooperation of Deusto University (Bilbao), Vilnius University, University of Verona, and Corvinus University.

### Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment

CUB has its main campus in Budapest (and a smaller one in Székesfehérvár). The on-site library provides access to a wide range of printed and electronic resources that support the learning, teaching and research activities of students and faculty. The collection focusing on economics, business studies, social sciences and related applied sciences is unique in Hungary. The library is the depository library of the OECD. The library provides access to a variety of electronic resources which become more and more important besides the print documents. These involve thousands of full-text journal articles, economic, business, legal and statistical information databases and electronic repositories containing research produced by faculty.

### 4.1.12 PricewaterhouseCoopers Advisory SpA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Short Name:</th>
<th>PWC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of Organisation:</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Site:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pwc.com">www.pwc.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organisation Profile

**PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC)** is one of the world’s largest providers of assurance, tax, and business consulting services assisting governmental and non-governmental organizations and private companies in reaching their goals. It is a network of member firms located in 158 countries and 776 cities. PwC Advisory SpA, the Italian member firm of this network, supports clients with management consulting services and with deals-related advisory services such as governance optimization, strategy formulation and review, business model transformation, business planning and independence review, organizational alignment, change and talent management, support to strategy implementation, innovation, internationalization, performance improvement as well as valuations and M&A, top line review, operational and financial due diligence, debt advisory and business recovery.

PwC has proven and extensive experience in providing independent professional services to EU institutions and related Clients for over 25 years. Service offering includes:
Policy advice and development services (policy studies; feasibility studies; project development and structuring; strategic, technical, legal and financial appraisal (expertise in cost-benefit analysis, cost-effectiveness analysis, multi-criteria analysis, etc.);
Policy, programme and project impact assessment, monitoring, audit, reporting, evaluation and impact assessment at the EU, national or regional level;
Advice in financial management, regulatory compliance, internal control, audit, project management and implementation, business process and performance improvement, IT effectiveness;
Projects for EU institutions and local Italian and EU member states public administrations focusing on the planning and implementation of e-government services (e.g electronic procurement invoicing and ordering, implementation of open data, e-tax services)
Training and human resources management.

A well-established presence and network of local offices in all EU Member States - and also through the whole globe - enables to provide our clients with multi-lingual, multi-national service teams combining Europe-wide consistency with an excellent knowledge of local markets. This ensures both the consistency and quality of the services we deliver in all European countries and a capability to communicate and work with all types of local stakeholders across the continent.

PwC also runs its own Centre for Technology and Innovation (CTI), providing leading-edge research and analysis of technology trends and their effects on organisations, industries and markets. The CTI comprises technology veterans who have extensive experience in advanced applications of existing technologies and knowledge of potential uses of emerging technologies. CTI is widely known for its quarterly ‘Technology Forecast’ publications (www.pwc.com/techforecast) and for delivering insightful briefings on technology trends to PwC clients and industry leaders around the world.

Furthermore, the PwC Public Sector Research Centre is a key player providing insights and research into best practice in government and the public sector, including the interface between the public and private sectors. Based in the UK, the Public Sector Research Centre has a particular focus on how to achieve the more effective delivery of better public services and infrastructure. The objective of the Public Sector Research Centre is to stimulate informed debate on public services and make effective, practical contributions on a wide range of issues.

Furthermore, PwC enjoys the presence of a new Experience Centre, hosted in Rome. The Centre was created at the end of 2016 and was born with the precise aim of helping business and PA change processes through the improvement of customer experience and co-creation activities. These include the involvement of both, Public Sector and private actors (consumers, citizens, users, etc.) which will achieve the final desired product in shorter times. The Experience Centre provides access to the newest innovative technologies which include Internet of Things, Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics and Blockchain. In the Experience Centre people become the focus of innovation and, through the help of technology, their ideas can become concrete.

### Role in the Project

PWC will be mainly involved in WP5 to support the mapping and reviewing existing examples of innovation and living labs. Conducting some case studies in Italy and provide input to develop a model and theorize the role of innovation and living labs in the public sector. PWC will test some of the new approaches the Co-VAL project will propose. PWC will be also involved in WP8, WP10 and WP11.

### CVs of key personnel

**Giovanna Galasso (Female)** is a Director within PwC, part of the team since February 2013, specialized in researching on Innovation in technology and organizations. She has been involved over the last 10 years, in several EU Commission (DG Information Society and Media) projects on ICT for public services: eGEP, benchmarking Framework (e-government indicators, e-procurement, Review of the 20 basic services), benchmarking, e-government awards, Future technology needs for future e-Government
Giovanna Galasso has a considerable expertise as Project Manager. She has developed a notable experience in stakeholder relationship management and in contractor relationship management both in international contexts and in national environments. In EY (2011-2013) she was also responsible for managing a study on Business and Financing Models for ICT and Ageing Well. Giovanna lead a project for DG CONNECT, Innovation Unit aimed at stakeholder awareness raising and community building around open ICT standards in public procurement to foster public administrations in order to prevent and reduce lock-in. She has also been project manager for a study focusing on the analysis of the potential for wide scale roll out of integrated Smart Cities and Communities integrated solutions for DG ENERGY and for a study on analysis of the value of New Generation of eGovernment Services and how can the public sector become and agent of innovation through ICT for DG CONNECT. (giovanna.galasso@it.pwc.com)

Gianpiero di Gianvittorio (Male) is a Director within PwC. His rich background consists in over 20 years of Design Strategy, UX Design theory and practice and Brand Strategy, Development and Management in the UK, Central Europe and the Middle East. He is a hands on designer specialising in Brand & User Centric Design and Digital Transformation. Prior to joining the firm, Gianpiero was a Creative UX Lead at a Global Airline working on the mobile-first. Digital Design Transformation. He was the visual standards guardian for the desktop site and created the mobile visual standards and UX guidelines currently in use on both the Native App and Mobile Web. In the previous 15 years, he held roles as Creative Director and Senior Art Director at Saatchi & Saatchi, Inarea Strategic Design & Minale Tattersfield Digital Design. His areas of expertise include: UX Design & research; Creative direction; Branding & communication; Design thinking & strategy; Mobile integration. (gianpiero.di.gianvittorio@it.pwc.com)

Relevant publications, products and services


Relevant previous projects and activities

Relevant projects and activities carried out by the PwC network:

- **Analysis of the value of New Generation of eGovernment Services and how can the public sector become an agent of innovation through ICT**: The current social, economic and technological developments are leading towards the emergence of a new generation of eGovernment Services, defined within the scope of the study as Open eGovernment Services (OGS). Such OGS are open, collaborative and digital based services characterised by a deliberate, declared and purposeful effort to increase openness and collaboration through technology in order to deliver increased public value. These open, collaborative and co-creation features exist in all phases of the design, deployment, implementation and delivery of the service. In this regard the objective of the study was to better understand what OGS are, what is their value for society and how the public sector should innovate to foster their use and maximize their impact on society.

- **Analysing the potential for wide scale roll out of integrated Smart Cities and Communities solutions**: The objective of this study is to support the European Commission in contributing to the knowledge base of the European Innovation Partnership. One of the main focus of the study has been the identification of 80 best practice examples of SCC solutions and provide an in-depth analysis of 10 case studies, putting particular emphasis on their business model. While analysing the solution
A strong emphasis has been put on the co-creation aspects especially in relation to the participation of citizens, private institutions and other actors in the planning and designing of the solution.

- **Framework contract SPC (public connectivity system) – CONSIP**: PwC along with Almaviva won section 3 (data interoperability – Open/Big data – and applied cooperation) and 4 (portals and web services – online portals, mobile App, content management) of the framework contract with the aim of supporting the Italian public administrations in the deployment of innovative key services for the realization of the Italian Digital Agenda.

- **Framework contract for the provision of integrated management systems to public administrations – CONSIP**: The project includes the provision of organizational consulting and the implementation of management systems applied to different fields: human resources, logistics, procurement, etc. PwC activities are mostly related to consulting services, other partners involved in the project focus on software development and implementation.

- **Co-creation workshops carried out in the UK**: PwC conducted several state-of-the-art workshops and activities in the co-creation domain with different clients across the UK. Among the most relevant examples it can be accounted a session with Bedford Borough Council focusing on the transformation of the municipality’s way of operation through “digital” to 2020 and beyond. Thanks to the event employees from across the Council had the chance to come together and align around the digital agenda. A similar event was also carried out with Lancashire County Council related to the delivery of 21st century public services. In addition a design forum was also conducted with a social housing client in the United Kingdom aiming at improving the efficiency of the business and deliver better outcomes for customers.

**Significant infrastructure and any major items of technical equipment**

PwC’s Experience Centre aims to realize the perfect link between the imagination of a creative agency and business consulting strategy. Inside the Centre, creation, project and testing of physical prototypes takes place. The final aim is to link clients/firms to the expectations of the final consumers and transform them into innovation.

The chosen approach is BXT, a method for business change and growth. By breaking down the divisions that exist within companies, and focusing on approaching challenges by looking at them through multiple lenses and perspectives, BXT considers the essentials of Business, Experience (such as user or customer experience and its creative design), and Technology before setting up strategies or solutions. BXT brings big thinkers and innovators to the table to come up with a solution that is truly transformative.

The methodology applied by the Experience Centre comprises five main stages, these can be put into action thanks to the Experience Centre’s infrastructure and innovative technical equipment:

- **Research**: This first step is addressed towards a deep knowledge of the clients through users testing and on the basis of quantitative (data analytics) and qualitative (ethnographic research);
- **Model**: This phase includes Co-design thinking sessions. All spaces have been projected to be moveable and scalable. When co-creation sessions are hosted, writeable panels can be opened to give space to groups of many. In the case of smaller working groups the room can be resized and changed into a more private environment. PwC has also created a Sandbox, a large open space with large touch screens, moveable walls, a reconfigurable classroom space, an electronics workshop for building devices on demand, and a 3D printer for improvising cases for the gadgets.

- **Architect and Design**: At this stage, the sketches are refined thanks to specific prototyping tools. The Centre enjoys a quick prototyping lab where not only 3D prototyping is made. The lab also enjoys tools such as a 3D scanner which is able to analyse the morphology of objects to be improved and other innovative digital project tools such as Axure, Invision, Rhinoceros and more. The Centre also enjoys an Auditorium, a space for presentations.

- **Test**: During the testing phase, through the Observatory Lab and the Usability Testing Lab, the interaction occurring between users and product/service is monitored and observed. The usability lab consist of two areas, the testing room and the observation room. The testing room accommodates 1-3 individuals, typically a test participant and a moderator. One of the most used techniques is Eye tracking, a sensor technology that enables a device to know exactly where your eyes are focused. This information can be used to gain deep insights into consumer behavior or to design new user interfaces across various devices. Another technique that is used is the Think Aloud Method, used to understand participants’ thoughts as they interact with a product by having them think aloud while they use it. The observation room holds up to nine individuals. It is used to observe testing or focus-group.

- **Optimisation**: This is an iterative phase that aims at improving the product/service through A/B Testing, a comparative process between two versions of a page with the aim of verifying the best performing one (reaches the best conversion), and Multivariate Testing. The softwares include Camtasia, Morae and Mr Tappy.

The technologies offered by the Experience Centre concerns a wide number of sectors, which include Internet of Things, Virtual Reality, Augmented Reality, 3D printing, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics and Blockchain and many more in a developing phases.

### 4.2. Third parties involved in the project (including use of third party resources)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the project should not be sub-contracted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATC will utilize resources from its subsidiary company **ATC International**. These resources would assist ATC in optimizing the company’s involvement in the assigned dissemination and project management tasks (WP10 & WP11) as well as in the assigned WP7 & WP8 activities. **ATC International** has been founded and fully supported financially by ATC to serve as its international arm in Central and Northern Europe. ATC International is a newly established Belgian Company founded by ATC as its International arm aiming to focus on the most innovative domains among ATC R&D Agenda for productizing and marketing research outcomes in the Benelux and Northern Europe areas. The company is a subsidiary, fully supported financially by ATC.

Staff involved: Dr. Antonis Ramflos (CV is included as part of ATC’s Key personnel). Overall, 7PMs are allocated to ATC International. Two (2) PMs under WP7: Policy implications for public sector transformation, three (3) PMs under WP8: Knowledge sharing and co-production with stakeholders, one (1) PM under WP10: Dissemination and Communication and one (1) PM under WP11: Project Management.

Total allocated resources: 41.250€

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</th>
<th>YES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATC will utilize resources from its subsidiary company <strong>ATC International</strong>. These resources would assist ATC in optimizing the company’s involvement in the assigned dissemination and project management tasks (WP10 &amp; WP11) as well as in the assigned WP7 &amp; WP8 activities. <strong>ATC International</strong> has been founded and fully supported financially by ATC to serve as its international arm in Central and Northern Europe. ATC International is a newly established Belgian Company founded by ATC as its International arm aiming to focus on the most innovative domains among ATC R&amp;D Agenda for productizing and marketing research outcomes in the Benelux and Northern Europe areas. The company is a subsidiary, fully supported financially by ATC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the project should not be sub-contracted)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of WP8, TheGovLab will be subcontracted to provide full access to the services of the Open Governance Research Exchange <a href="http://ogrx.org/">http://ogrx.org/</a>, a global collaborative research effort to map quantitative and qualitative research on innovations in governance. Co-VAL partners will be able to use the platform (by uploading, curating and accessing the data), and make adaptations to the platform to ensure its alignment with the goal of the project. Co-VAL project output will benefit from the platform for dissemination of the project results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from the above, no other third parties are involved.

---

18 A third party that is an affiliated entity or has a legal link to a participant implying a collaboration not limited to the action. (Article 14 of the Model Grant Agreement).

19 A third party that is an affiliated entity or has a legal link to a participant implying a collaboration not limited to the action. (Article 14 of the Model Grant Agreement).
5. Ethics and Security

5.1. Ethics

The project methods include desk and internet-based research, cognitive interviews with ten (10) public sector managers and two (2) NGO managers; and a representative survey of approximately 1,350 managers of public administration agencies and 120 NGOs or other non-governmental collaboration partners.

As the survey aims to understand the characteristics of service innovations introduced in the previous three years, the project will not collect any personal data on the managers participating in the survey.

Participation in the survey involves no psychological, social, economic or other form of risk for respondents. Participation will also be completely voluntary and informed consent will be obtained for interviews. A response to a survey will be understood as informed consent for the use of the data for analyses that do not breach confidentiality. More specifically, for the recruitment of participants and informed consent:

The research will involve healthy adult volunteers that participate in the cognitive interviews and survey. It will be ensured that recruitment procedures do not result in any discriminatory practice. Informed consent will be obtained by describing the procedure and its objectives to participants in advance, and then requesting a signed statement of understanding and consent. Informed consent forms will be written in a clear and plain language and in terms fully understandable to the participants truly enabling data subjects to exercise their rights. Consent forms will describe the aims, methods and implications of the research, the nature of the participation and any benefits, risks or discomforts that might be involved. The form will explicitly state that participation is voluntary and that anyone has the right to refuse to participate and to withdraw at any time without giving a reason and without any disadvantage. Participants will also be debriefed and it will be made clear that they are able to withdraw their consent at any point, including retrospectively. No deception will be used. Materials will be chosen so as to avoid content that could cause genuine distress (e.g., graphic images or violence) and participants will be fully briefed on the expected content in advance. In addition, where appropriate, ethics approval will be obtained by national partners for all countries that require ethics approval for a business survey.

These types of data collected are not ‘sensitive’ (e.g. they do not cover health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction, or other sensitive issues). We do not foresee any potential misuse of research results or any potential adverse effects for participants in these studies.

Given that the data is not of a sensitive nature, the only ethical issue of relevance for these studies is the proper use and storage of the data collected. Use here comprise issues around “term of engagement” – does the respondent know what the project is for, what will be done with their answers, how they will be referred to in an publications or outputs etc., and whether their line manager or organisation gets a copy of the report/results etc. Co-VAL will ensure respect for the ethical principles and fundamental rights embedded in the regulatory framework of the European Union. It will ensure respect for the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union as well as the European Convention on Human Rights. Any data processing activities within the project will be carried out in accordance with the updated privacy rules as specified in Regulation (EU) 2016/679 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 April 2016 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data and repealing Directive 95/46/EC (hence: GDPR) in combination with the ePrivacy Directive 2002/58/EC. Specifically, Co-VAL will comply with all the requirements specified by the Regulation, with regard indicatively to purpose specification, data minimisation, and data controllership, following the so called risk approach.

The project will ensure that personal data are kept securely and that publication does not breach confidentiality or anonymity. Data will be stored on local disks, encrypted if necessary, without any personal information other than date of birth and gender. All data will be processed anonymously. Participants will only be identified by a coded number. The collected data will not be used for commercial purposes. As is normal practice in user-based research any data will be archived and stored for a minimum of 5 years following publication of any research results.
5.2. Security

Apart from the above considerations, the project does not involve any activities or results raising security issues or any 'EU-classified information' as background or results.

- Activities or results raising security issues: NO
  'EU-classified information' as background or results: NO

6. References


20 See article 37 of the Model Grant Agreement


Letter of support for the project CO-VAL

H2020 CULT-COOP-11-2017: “Understanding the transformation of European public administrations”

I hereby declare the intention of Government Office of the Republic of Estonia to collaborate with the proposed Project “CO-VAL”, to be submitted on 2 February 2017 by a consortium including Open Evidence and The Lisbon Council, and coordinated by ATC, under the H2020 CULT-COOP-11-2017: “Understanding the transformation of European public administrations”, in case of successful evaluation by the European Commission.

Government Office of Estonia looks forward to the project outputs, in particular in the context of the forthcoming Estonian presidency of the Council of the European Union.

Sincerely,

Sünn Siikut
Digital Policy Adviser to the Government / Prime Minister
Government Office of the Republic of Estonia

Riigikantselei

30 January 2017

Mr David Osimo
Open Evidence
Av. Tibidabo 39
08013 Barcelona
Spain
### ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR THE ACTION (page 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Direct personnel costs</th>
<th>Estimated eligible(^1) costs (per budget category)</th>
<th>EU contribution</th>
<th>Additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Natural persons under direct contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Seconded persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 SME owners without salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.5 Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2 Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3 Other goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4 Costs of large research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Direct costs of fin. support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other direct costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement rate (^2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution(^3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum grant amount(^4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Form of costs\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit(^6)</th>
<th>Total (b)</th>
<th>No hours</th>
<th>Total (c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
<th>(e)</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>(g)=0.25x ((a)+(b)+(c)+(d)+(e)+(f)+(m)) ((j))</th>
<th>(k)</th>
<th>(l)</th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>Yea/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ATC 252880.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>64000.00</td>
<td>56750.00</td>
<td>190750.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>221000.00</td>
<td>61250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. LC 294800.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80000.00</td>
<td>75750.00</td>
<td>253250.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. USTL 208880.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>629250.00</td>
<td>216750.00</td>
<td>846000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. UKON 225480.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80000.00</td>
<td>75000.00</td>
<td>250000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. UEDIN 231200.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>62625.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>375000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. UAH 206480.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>82500.00</td>
<td>250000.00</td>
<td>332500.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. USTL 210960.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>80750.00</td>
<td>252000.00</td>
<td>332500.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. LC 210880.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>130400.00</td>
<td>375000.00</td>
<td>505400.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. UEDIN 176080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>645250.00</td>
<td>435125.00</td>
<td>1080375.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>365125.00</td>
<td>365125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. USTL 164160.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>47000.00</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>224500.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. UKON 160080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>227500.00</td>
<td>133750.00</td>
<td>351250.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>313125.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total consortium 260080.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>485250.00</td>
<td>146125.00</td>
<td>631375.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>4461508.75</td>
<td>177500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Estimated costs include costs on which the beneficiary’s contribution will be calculated.

\(^2\) Reimbursement rate \(\text{rate}\%\) = \((\text{estimated eligible costs} ÷ \text{total costs}) × 100\%\)

\(^3\) The maximum EU contribution \(\text{contribution}\) is based on the maximum eligible costs\((\text{total costs})\) and the maximum reimbursement rate \(\text{reimbursement rate}\%\)

\(^4\) The maximum grant amount \(\text{grant amount}\) is the maximum EU contribution \(\text{contribution}\) divided by the maximum contribution rate \(\text{reimbursement rate}\%\)

\(^5\) Costs are identified with the contractions listed in the Action Code.

\(^6\) Costs are identified with the contractions listed in the Action Code.

\(a\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(b\) Costs of persons without salary

\(c\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(d\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(e\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(f\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(m\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(k\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(l\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(m\) Costs of personnel without salary

\(A.5\) Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary

\(A.4\) SME owners without salary

\(A.3\) Seconded persons

\(A.2\) Natural persons under direct contract

\(A.1\) Employees (or equivalent)

\(D.5\) Total costs

\(D.4\) Costs of in-kind contributions not used on premises

\(D.3\) Other goods

\(D.2\) Equipment

\(D.1\) Travel

\(C.\) Direct costs of fin. support

\(B.\) Direct costs of subcontracting

\(A.\) Estimated eligible costs (per budget category)

\(g\) = \(0.25 \times \left( (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) + (f) + (m) \right)\)

\(j\) = \(g \times (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e) + (f) + (m)\)

\(k\) = \(j \times \text{reimbursement rate}\%\)

\(l\) = \(k \times \text{maximum contribution rate}\%\)

\(m\) = \(l \times \text{maximum grant rate}\%\)

\(A.5\) Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary

\(A.4\) SME owners without salary

\(A.3\) Seconded persons

\(A.2\) Natural persons under direct contract

\(A.1\) Employees (or equivalent)
(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 6.2).
(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 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.
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE ESTIMATED BUDGET

Unit cost for SME owners/natural beneficiaries without salary

1. Costs for a /SME owner//beneficiary that is a natural person/ not receiving a salary

Units: hours worked on the action

Amount per unit (‘hourly rate’): calculated according to the following formula:

\[
\text{EUR 4,650} / 143 \text{ hours} \times \text{country-specific correction coefficient of the country where the beneficiary is established}
\]

Country-specific correction coefficient (in force at the time of the call):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU Member States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H2020 associated countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
[additional OPTION for beneficiaries/linked third parties that have opted to use the unit cost (in the proposal/with an amendment):] For the following beneficiaries/linked third parties, the amounts per unit (hourly rate) are fixed as follows:

- Beneficiary/linked third party [short name]: EUR [insert amount]
- Beneficiary/linked third party [short name]: EUR [insert amount]
  [same for other beneficiaries/linked third parties, if necessary]

Estimated number of units: see Annex 2

**Energy efficiency measures unit cost**

**OPTION if specific unit cost applicable to the grant:** 2. Costs for energy efficiency measures in buildings

Unit: m² of eligible ‘conditioned’ (i.e. built or refurbished) floor area

Amount per unit*: see (for each beneficiary/linked third party and BEST table) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

* Amount calculated as follows:
  \( \text{EUR}0.1 \times \text{estimated total kWh saved per m}^2 \text{ per year} \times 10 \)

Estimated number of units: see (for each beneficiary/linked third party and BEST table) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

Unit cost table (energy efficiency measures unit cost)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short name beneficiary/linked third party</th>
<th>BEST No</th>
<th>Cost Amount per unit</th>
<th>Estimated No of units</th>
<th>Total unit cost (cost per unit x estimated no of units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research infrastructure unit cost

**OPTION if specific unit cost applicable to the grant:** 3. Access costs for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure

Units²: see (for each access provider and installation) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

---

¹ Data from the ‘building energy specification table (BEST)’ that is part of the proposal and Annex 1.
Amount per unit*: see (for each access provider and installation) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

* Amount calculated as follows:
  average annual total access cost to the installation (over past two years)
  average annual total quantity of access to the installation (over past two years)

Estimated number of units: see (for each access provider and installation) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

Unit cost table (access to research infrastructure unit cost)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short name access provider</th>
<th>Short name infrastructure</th>
<th>Installation No</th>
<th>Short name</th>
<th>Unit of access</th>
<th>Amount per unit</th>
<th>Estimated No of units</th>
<th>Total unit cost (cost per unit x estimated no of units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Clinical studies unit cost

[OPTION if specific unit cost is applicable to the grant: 4. Costs for clinical studies

Units: patients/subjects that participate in the clinical study

Amount per unit*: see (for each clinical study and beneficiary/linked third party) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

Estimated number of units: see (for each clinical study and beneficiary/linked third party) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

* Amount calculated, for each task described in the protocol, as follows:

  {Task 1
   + unit cost component ‘personnel costs’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of consumables’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of medical equipment’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of other specific services’
   + unit cost component ‘indirect costs’}

  + Task 2
   + unit cost component ‘personnel costs’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of consumables’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of medical equipment’
   + unit cost component ‘costs of other specific services’

2 Unit of access (e.g. beam hours, weeks of access, sample analysis) fixed by the access provider in proposal.
3 In exceptional and duly justified cases, the Commission/Agency may agree to a different reference period.
4 In exceptional and duly justified cases, the Commission/Agency may agree to a different reference period.
5 Data from the ‘table on estimated costs/quantity of access to be provided’ that is part of the proposal and Annex 1.
Unit cost components calculated as follows:

Unit cost component ‘personnel costs’ (i.e. ‘personnel costs of doctors’ + ‘personnel costs of other medical personnel’ + ‘personnel costs of technical personnel’)

For unit cost component ‘personnel costs of doctors’:

\[
\{ \text{average hourly cost for doctors}, \text{i.e.:} \\
\{ \text{certified or auditable total personnel costs for doctors for year } N-1 \\
\{1720 \times \text{number of full-time equivalent for the personnel category doctors for year } N-1 \}
\times \text{estimated number of hours worked by doctors for the task (per patient/subject)} \}\]

For unit cost component ‘personnel costs of other medical personnel’:

\[
\{ \text{average hourly cost for other medical personnel}, \text{i.e.:} \\
\{ \text{certified or auditable total personnel costs for other medical personnel for year } N-1 \\
\{1720 \times \text{number of full-time equivalent for the personnel category other medical personnel for year } N-1 \}
\times \text{estimated number of hours worked by other medical personnel for the task (per patient/subject)} \}\]

For unit cost component ‘personnel costs of technical personnel’:

\[
\{ \text{average hourly cost for technical personnel}, \text{i.e.:} \\
\{ \text{certified or auditable total personnel costs for technical personnel for year } N-1 \\
\{1720 \times \text{number of full-time equivalent for the personnel category technical personnel for year } N-1 \}
\times \text{estimated number of hours worked by technical personnel for the task (per patient/subject)} \}\]

‘total personnel costs’ means actual salaries + actual social security contributions + actual taxes and other costs included in the remuneration, provided they arise from national law or the employment contract or equivalent appointing act

Unit cost component ‘costs of consumables’ (i.e. ‘costs of consumables category 1’ + ‘costs of consumables category 2’ + ‘costs of consumables category 3’, etc)

For each category of consumables:

\[
\{ \text{average price per item}, \text{i.e.:} \\
\{ \text{certified or auditable total costs of purchase of the consumables in year } N-1 \text{ for the category of consumables concerned} \\
\text{total number of items purchased in year } N-1 \text{ for the category of consumables concerned} \}
\times \text{estimated number of items used for the task (per patient/subject)} \}\]

‘total costs of purchase of the consumables’ means total value of the supply contracts (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible VAT) concluded by the beneficiary for consumables delivered in year N-1, provided the contracts were awarded according to the principle of best value-for-money and without any conflict of interests

Unit cost component ‘costs of medical equipment’ (i.e. ‘costs of medical equipment category 1’ + ‘costs of medical equipment category 2’ + ‘costs of medical equipment category 3’, etc.)

For each category of medical equipment:

\[
\{ \text{average cost of depreciation and directly related services per unit of use}, \text{i.e.:} \\
\{ \text{certified or auditable total costs of purchase of the medical equipment in year } N-1 \text{ for the category of medical equipment concerned} \\
\text{total number of items purchased in year } N-1 \text{ for the category of medical equipment concerned} \}
\times \text{estimated number of items used for the task (per patient/subject)} \}\]
Grant Agreement number: [insert number] [insert acronym] [insert call identifier]


{certified or auditable total depreciation costs in year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned + certified or auditable total costs of purchase of services in year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned} 

multiplied by
estimated number of units of use of the equipment for the task (per patient/subject)

‘total depreciation costs’ means total depreciation allowances as recorded in the beneficiary’s accounts of year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned, provided the equipment was purchased according to the principle of best value-for-money and without any conflict of interests + total costs of renting or leasing contracts (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible VAT) in year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned, provided they do not exceed the depreciation costs of similar equipment and do not include finance fees

Unit cost component ‘costs of other specific services’ (i.e. ‘costs of contracts for specific service 1’ + ‘costs of contracts for specific service 2’ + ‘costs of contracts for specific service 3’, etc.)

For each category of specific service:

‘average cost of a specific service per patient or subject’, i.e.:
certified or auditable total costs of purchase of a service in year N-1 for the category of specific services necessary for the conduct of clinical studies 
total number of patients or subjects included in the clinical studies for which the specific service was delivered in year N-1

‘total costs of purchase of a service’ means total value of the contracts concluded by the beneficiary (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible VAT) for the specific service delivered in year N-1 for the conduct of clinical studies, provided the contracts were awarded according to the principle of best value-for-money and without any conflict of interests

Unit cost component ‘indirect costs’

{25% 
multiplied by
{unit cost component ‘personnel costs’ + unit cost component ‘costs of consumables’ + unit cost component ‘costs of medical equipment’}}

The following must be excluded:
- costs of in-kind contributions provided by third parties which are not used on the beneficiary’s premises and
- costs of providing financial support to third parties (if any).

Unit cost table: clinical studies unit cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[Insert name of clinical study]</th>
<th>Resources per patient</th>
<th>Amount per unit for beneficiary/linked third party</th>
<th>Amount per unit for beneficiary/linked third party</th>
<th>Amount per unit for beneficiary/linked third party</th>
<th>...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6 Same table as in proposal and Annex 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No. 1 Blood sample</th>
<th>1 [insert short name]</th>
<th>2 [insert short name]</th>
<th>in-kind contributions by third party*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>doctors</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other medical personnel</td>
<td>Phlebotomy (nurse), 10 minutes</td>
<td>8,33 EUR 11,59 EUR 10,55 EUR 9,76 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>technical personnel</td>
<td>Sample Processing (lab technician), 15 minutes</td>
<td>9,51 EUR 15,68 EUR 13,77 EUR 12,35 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of consumables</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Syringe, 1</td>
<td>XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Cannula, 1</td>
<td>XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Blood container, 1</td>
<td>XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of medical equipment</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>Use of -80° deep freezer, 60 days</td>
<td>XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>Use of centrifuge, 15 minutes</td>
<td>XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs of other specific services</td>
<td>Category 1</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Category 2</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Task No. 2 | ... | ... | ... |... |

| Total amount per unit | XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR** |
| Estimated No of units (patients/subjects participating in the study) | XX XX XX XX |
| Total unit cost for beneficiary/linked third party (total cost per unit x estimated no of units) | XX EUR XX EUR XX EUR |

* Use costs of third party making in-kind contribution.
** Capped at payment to third party, if any.
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSIDAD DE ALCALA (UAH), established in PLAZA DE SAN DIEGO, ALCALA DE HENARES/MADRID 28801, Spain, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘2’)
in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Maria Luisa MARINA ALEGRE with ECAS id rminaama
signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 12:32:23
(transaction id SigId-6727-
fezi2YN47euvaarkHrWizG6WeoPqO1fu084Q2EbrT6NH
zWU1xGuYTDBzbiHlMs9pQ2KBrUSkSWaXuvCdVz6Y0-
PHeiUMVSXCYXmz7L2v2jQ-
NTyiz3c3uJUVHpypzq6SW8sbnFUYMwLu24Q7iKIEad1
m). Timestamp by third party at
Mon Sep 25 13:32:33 CEST 2017
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH (UEDIN), established in OLD COLLEGE, SOUTH BRIDGE, EDINBURGH EH8 9YL, United Kingdom, VAT number: GB592950700, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘3’)

in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Alan KENNEDY with ECAS id nkenneak signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 11:35:00 (transaction id SigId-5929-
 sbDQNZWZrHzbF80DxrlUFIEIT0k14q4bP0DqNRvOuldBV
 UxVs4Qx3PsE6xWQX9Njd1BZuS89YjeGHAn5KNMZnJ-
PHeiUVMSXYCSnZlv2j2Q-
 f7veQNKtpxi2OjJTea4XaGEHkoWd5kzioTzv4U7cSO8m).
Timestamp by third party at
Mon Sep 25 12:35:12 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITAT KONSTANZ (UKON), established in UNIVERSITATSSTRASSE 10, KONSTANZ 78457, Germany, VAT number: DE142316505, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘4’)
in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Stefanie PREUSS with ECAS id npreuss signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 08:46:36 (transaction id SigID-2185-11N9bc3fPeakixz5yFXbc2acnaabTERzuNeullIR3fHSbztKrSJMI7M5UNhS5CCkdrFj2lmcZHS4VpyziCVyKfA-KPHelUMVXYSxHxZLTz2i2Q-f5q3Wbzzm2FkKo8a19p26L19f9yMcokv7mzHWnibW).
Timestamp by third party at Mon Sep 25 09:46:47 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITE DES SCIENCES ET TECHNOLOGIES DE LILLE - LILLE I (USTL), established in CITE SCIENTIFIQUE BATIMENT A3, VILLENEUVE D'ASCQ 59655, France, VAT number: N/A, ('the beneficiary'), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No ('5')

in Grant Agreement No 770356 ('the Agreement')

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the powers delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’. 

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Jean-Christophe CAMART with ECAS id ncamartj signed in the Participant Portal on 29/09/2017 at 11:53:51 (transaction id SigId-18078-pN6Z2i5MeVvY9aBDzRcHGIiSyxZ2oLqiwQasqo54VNYR7L3-3GijzzH6t97YqXpRiSe2DoXJnXJXjZ3DcPUJZvYAc-Jj71zYxYbgYrEuJFpPo0Dp0-qnWGEYSFKdqIFyqzJWqFy623J4vQVU8WY69q2MIXn)
. Timestamp by third party at Fri Sep 29 12:54:02 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

The Lisbon Council for Economic Competitiveness and Social Renewal asbl (LC), established in rue de la Loi 155, Brussels 1040, Belgium, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘6’)

in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Paul HOFFHEINZ with ECAS id nhfhepa signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 08:26:05 (transaction id SigId-1859- yZoEVOO7yCyUpu346h7F93tMThXEBRkeFqAVzczHlxwRb HsqYDXNOkoXeeS9TtnO8qY4lnmvf6WLhsiSj9hmD0- PHs0UmvXyc5h5v2j2jQ- 7Kqk0wczsngbreOxRugwOFzO3U3Lntt1oKEW8BJJqpgi). Timestamp by third party at Mon Sep 25 09:26:16 CEST 2017
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT (UM-MERIT), established in Minderbroedersberg 4-6, MAASTRICHT 6200 MD, Netherlands, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘7’)
in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

bart VERSPAGEN with ECAS id nverspba signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 09:56:54 (transaction id SigId-3670-B68KYaq7p5F9Za0KWXQrzaWu3Xqlzym1sWwJmO7jznS-cG3X3Pw9OPgFczg2eskFZgu7EfCJzimKO5NdrvW-PHeUMV SX5nZjLvl2jZG-S1bKMcM2PbW8ZaLiY556WLDgcHeFCzSkSDOm9n9mCJm), Timestamp by third party at Mon Sep 25 10:57:04 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

HOGSKOLEN I INNLANDET (INN), established in HAMARVEGEN 112, ELVERUM 2418, Norway, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘8’)

in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Katharine SKRETTING with ECAS id nskrkath signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 20:45:45 (transaction id SigId-13230-VcGioKwKzYubOxktd0JFmrhpHQ6OJddt1AVwcRufnflSlt7zkgma49XlzzosiC1PaOF2YXnsdMUlGKYp13XxG9wR-PHeiUMVSXYCSnzIlLv2jgQ-8zpSMllyRRePdSgsJlnI5MuOFzOKjk8nmltyMsD5JZwW) . Timestamp by third party at Mon Sep 25 21:45:54 CEST 2017
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

ROSKILDE UNIVERSITET (RUC), established in Universitetsvej 1, ROSKILDE 4000, Denmark, VAT number: DK29057559, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘9’) in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Peter KRAGELUND with ECAS id nkragel signed in the Participant Portal on 25/09/2017 at 09:48:09 (transaction id SigId-3424-FVlp2GlIekZL6PDhK1kK2CcTISQjZzaHnNl1lzqYpcRnx8D8x6WvOE1zrgs7TZp2GR3MJKcg1VrD2HmVXx0-PHaUUMVXYC5hxZjLr2JqQ-R08gqm2W0UEy6GzwxTCyQWQjHhxCMefALzVWRCV39 KGO), Timestamp by third party at Mon Sep 25 10:48:19 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSITA COMMERCIALE LUIGI BOCCONI (UB), established in VIA SARFATTI 25, MILANO 20136, Italy, VAT number: IT03628350153, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘10’)
in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Bruno PAVESI with ECAS id npavebru signed in the Participant Portal on 27/09/2017 at 10:06:17 (transaction id Sigld-29921-
IVVznlPSMLJwLFAVrVjHssqZ5bFbIKJAGOeQwL-SKIIHuLwq5FVSOvR8Z3jzLz2A677OrR90aQATVA67b-PHskUVMVXCY5xhZilV22jO-
c22B3mozcct9ywvM78e4dCRI0g96KjpMTDVWL0aUKzfW)
. Timestamp by third party at Wed Sep 27 11:06:27 CEST 2017
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (CUB), established in FOVAM TER 8, BUDAPEST 1093, Hungary, VAT number: HU15329743, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘11’)

in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

András LÁNCZI with ECAS id rnostozs signed in the Participant Portal on 27/09/2017 at 13:30:30 (transaction id Sigld-33484-qwqcO9GtiHyjOMmzX201ULLb5ISexo0ScabB381Rzfg9MGJGM5gnPnT7BNCv0F3up5x5mEM2HmipwWJqV1m- PHsiUMV5sXCY5mL3lVzjzQ-MzWL3sL7 fronts4qzGtV1ewfDxnhkX1tbKknaXvJhm). Timestamp by third party at Wed Sep 27 14:30:41 CEST 2017
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS ADVISORY SPA (PWC), established in VIALE MONTE ROSA 91, MILANO 20149, Italy, VAT number: IT03230150967, (‘the beneficiary’), represented for the purpose of signing this Accession Form by the undersigned,

hereby agrees

to become beneficiary No (‘12’)

in Grant Agreement No 770356 (‘the Agreement’)

between ATHENS TECHNOLOGY CENTER SA and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Understanding value co-creation in public services for transforming European public administrations (Co-VAL)’.

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 it in accordance with the Agreement, with all the obligations and conditions it sets out.

SIGNATURE

For the beneficiary

Giancarlo SENATORE with ECAS id nsenagia signed in the Participant Portal on 03/10/2017 at 11:23:27

(transaction id SigId-43659-bZnrNqszwZwckbRPQqZxL2qiuOaggzLoAzkjeqEgpo6ZQurez
zvJloQ8gcfzye9M9hrt7PjZ63vXh8jrcqzzbEzm-J71xzYb8yrqXrFnP0oDp0-E5KAT1PiqOidT7xbluxzG879AOcTCrToXf9DYvhoDc70)

Timestamp by third party at
Tue Oct 03 12:23:37 CEST 2017
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>Eligible costs (per budget category)</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Direct personnel costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Natural persons under direct contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Seconded persons (A.6 Personnel for providing access)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Direct costs of fin. support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Other direct costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Indirect costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Costs of ...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Form of costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EU contribution</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Flat-rate</th>
<th>[Unit] [Lump sum]</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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).

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 lateron, in order to replace other costs that are found to be ineligible.

1 See Article 6 for the eligibility conditions
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 be less
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 *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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INDEPENDENT REPORT OF FACTUAL FINDINGS ON COSTS DECLARED UNDER A GRANT AGREEMENT FINANCED UNDER THE HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
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) 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’).

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

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;

---

1 By which costs under the Agreement are declared (see template ‘Model Financial Statements’ in Annex 4 to the Grant Agreement).
- 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:\n
- 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[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 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[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].

1.6 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.]

Supreme Audit Institutions applying INTOSAIs-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.
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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.

³ By which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement (see template ‘Model Financial Statement’ in Annex 4 to the Agreement).
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.

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:

**Explanation (to be removed from the Report):**

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.

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 the related Finding(s) and those Procedure(s) are not applicable. For instance, for ‘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.

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 interest 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</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1</strong></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>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>
</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>2) Personnel costs were recorded in the Beneficiary’s accounts/payroll system.</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>3) Costs were adequately supported and reconciled with the accounts and payroll records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the payslips of the employees included in the sample;</td>
<td>4) Personnel costs did not contain any ineligible elements.</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>5) There were no discrepancies between the personnel costs charged to the action and the costs recalculated by the Auditor.</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>o the Beneficiary’s usual policy regarding payroll matters (e.g. salary policy, overtime policy, variable pay);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o applicable national law on taxes, labour and social security and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o any other document that supports the personnel costs declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further procedures if ‘additional remuneration’ is paid</td>
<td>6) The Beneficiary paying “additional remuneration” was a non-profit legal entity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>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>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>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF ANY PART OF THE REMUNERATION PAID TO THE EMPLOYEE IS NOT MANDATORY ACCORDING TO THE NATIONAL LAW OR THE EMPLOYMENT CONTRACT (“ADDITIONAL REMUNERATION”) 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: (A) IF THE PERSON WORKS FULL TIME AND EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION DURING THE FULL YEAR: UP TO EUR 8 000/YEAR; (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 IN ACCORDANCE TO ARTICLE 6.2.A.1.</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>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</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>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</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>factual findings 10-13 listed in the next column:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o obtained a description of the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice to calculate unit costs;</td>
<td></td>
<td>used in all H2020 actions.</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></td>
<td>11) The employees were charged under the correct category.</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></td>
<td>12) Total personnel costs used in calculating the unit costs were consistent with the expenses recorded in the statutory accounts.</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>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>
</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).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 14-18 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 the contracts, especially the cost, contract duration, work description, place of work, ownership of the results and reporting obligations to the Beneficiary;</td>
<td></td>
<td>14) The natural persons reported to the Beneficiary (worked under the Beneficiary’s instructions).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the employment conditions of staff in the same category to compare costs and;</td>
<td></td>
<td>15) They worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o any other document that supports the costs declared and its registration (e.g. invoices,</td>
<td></td>
<td>16) The results of work carried out belong to the Beneficiary.</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>accounting records, etc.).</td>
<td>17) Their costs were not significantly different from those for staff who performed similar tasks under an employment contract with the Beneficiary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18) The costs were supported by audit evidence and registered in the accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 the following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:

- their secondment contract(s) notably regarding costs, duration, work description, place of work and ownership of the results;

- 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;

- 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.).

19) Seconded personnel reported to the Beneficiary and worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary).

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 Beneficiary’s accounts. The third party did not include any profit.

**If personnel is seconded free of charge:**

22) The costs declared did not exceed the third party's cost as...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A.2 | **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:  
o the annual productive hours applied were calculated in accordance with one of the methods described below,  
o the full-time equivalent (FTEs) ratios for employees not working full-time were correctly calculated.  
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 productive 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 |
| 23) | The Beneficiary applied method [choose one option and delete the others]  
[A: 1720 hours]  
[B: the ‘total number of hours worked’]  
[C: ‘standard annual productive hours’ used correspond to usual accounting practices] |
| 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. |
<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.3</td>
<td><strong>HOURLY PERSONNEL RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I)</strong> For unit costs calculated in accordance to the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice (unit costs):</td>
<td>26.1) The Beneficiary calculates the hourly rates per full financial year following procedure A.3 (method B is not allowed for beneficiaries calculating hourly rates per month).</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If the Beneficiary applied method C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27) The calculation of the number of ‘standard annual workable hours’ was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29) The Beneficiary applied [choose one option and delete the other]:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Option I: “Unit costs (hourly rates) were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTRACT, APPLICABLE LABOUR AGREEMENT OR NATIONAL LAW PLUS OVERTIME WORKED MINUS ABSENCES (SUCH AS SICK LEAVE OR SPECIAL LEAVE).**

**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 ’STANDARD ANNUAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS’ IN THE NEXT COLUMN). THIS NUMBER MUST BE AT LEAST 90% OF THE STANDARD ANNUAL WORKABLE HOURS.**

‘**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.

**A.3**

<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>CONTRACT, APPLICABLE LABOUR AGREEMENT OR NATIONAL LAW PLUS OVERTIME WORKED MINUS ABSENCES (SUCH AS SICK LEAVE OR SPECIAL LEAVE).</strong></td>
<td>26.1) The Beneficiary calculates the hourly rates per full financial year following procedure A.3 (method B is not allowed for beneficiaries calculating hourly rates per month).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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 ’STANDARD ANNUAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS’ IN THE NEXT COLUMN). THIS NUMBER MUST BE AT LEAST 90% OF THE STANDARD ANNUAL WORKABLE HOURS.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘<strong>ANNUAL WORKABLE HOURS</strong>’ 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A.3</strong> <strong>HOURLY PERSONNEL RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>I)</strong> For unit costs calculated in accordance to the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice (unit costs):</td>
<td>26.1) The Beneficiary calculates the hourly rates per full financial year following procedure A.3 (method B is not allowed for beneficiaries calculating hourly rates per month).</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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If the Beneficiary applied method C.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27) The calculation of the number of ‘standard annual workable hours’ was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29) The Beneficiary applied [choose one option and delete the other]:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Option I: “Unit costs (hourly rates) were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost</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>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | **Beneficiary has indeed used the methodology approved. If so, no further verification is necessary.**  
If the Beneficiary does not have a "Certificate on Methodology" (CoMUC) approved by the 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. | accounting practices”]  
[Option II: Individual hourly rates were applied]                                                                                                                                  | 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:  
32) The individual rates re- |
|     | **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 (recalculation of all hourly rates if the Beneficiary uses annual rates, recalculation of three months selected randomly for every year and person if the Beneficiary uses monthly rates) following the results of the procedures carried out in A.1 and A.2;  
  - (only in case of monthly rates) confirmed that the time spent on parental leave is not deducted, and that, if parts of the basic remuneration are generated over a period longer than a month, the Beneficiary has included only the share which is generated in the month. |                                                                                                               |                                                                                                           |                                                                                                           |
<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>Hourly rate for individual actual personal costs:</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;It is calculated following one of the two options below:**&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;A) [Option by default] by dividing the actual annual amount of personnel costs of an employee verified in line with procedure A.1 by the number of annual productive hours verified in line with procedure A.2 (full financial year hourly rate);&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;B) by dividing the actual monthly amount of personnel costs of an employee verified in line with procedure A.1 by 1/12 of the number of annual productive hours verified in line with procedure A.2. (Monthly hourly rate).</td>
<td>calculated by the Auditor were the same as the rates applied by the Beneficiary.&lt;br&gt;32.1) The Beneficiary used only one option (per full financial year or per month) throughout each financial year examined.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A.4 Time recording system</strong>&lt;br&gt;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:&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;o description of the time recording system provided by the Beneficiary (registration, authorisation, processing in the HR-system);&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;o its actual implementation;&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;o time records were signed at least monthly by the employees (on paper or electronically) and authorised by the project manager or another manager;&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;o the hours declared were worked within the project period;&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;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);&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;o the hours charged to the action matched those in the time recording system.</td>
<td>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)&lt;br&gt;34) Their time-records were authorised at least monthly by the project manager or other superior.&lt;br&gt;35) Hours declared were worked within the project period and were consistent with the presences/absences recorded in HR-records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B. COSTS OF SUBCONTRACTING

#### B.1  
**The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of subcontracting costs 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 items, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).

To confirm standard factual findings 38-42 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed the following for the items included in the sample:

- o the use of subcontractors was foreseen in Annex 1;
- o subcontracting costs were declared in the subcontracting category of the Financial Statement;
- o supporting documents on the selection and award procedure were followed;
- 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).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ONLY THE HOURS WORKED ON THE ACTION CAN BE CHARGED. ALL WORKING TIME TO BE CHARGED SHOULD BE RECORDED THROUGHOUT THE DURATION OF THE PROJECT, ADEQUATELY SUPPORTED BY EVIDENCE OF THEIR REALITY AND RELIABILITY (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></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></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37) The exclusive dedication is supported by a declaration signed by the Beneficiary’s and by any other evidence gathered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38) The use of claimed subcontracting costs was foreseen in Annex 1 and costs were declared in the Financial Statements under the subcontracting category.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In particular,

i. if the Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC (or 2014/24/EU) or of Directive 2004/17/EC (or 2014/25/EU), 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.

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.

For the items included in the sample the Auditor also verified that:

- the subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries in the consortium;
- there were signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor;
- there was evidence that the services were provided by subcontractor;

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40) The subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries of the consortium.

41) All subcontracts were supported by signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor.

42) There was evidence that the services were provided by the subcontractors.

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.
<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>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 respected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>OTHER ACTUAL DIRECT COSTS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.1</strong></td>
<td>COSTS OF TRAVEL AND RELATED SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Auditor sampled _____ cost items selected randomly</strong> (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 the highest).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Auditor inspected the sample and verified that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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></td>
<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></td>
<td>o no ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44)</td>
<td>Costs were incurred, approved and reimbursed in line with the Beneficiary's usual policy for travels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45)</td>
<td>There was a link between the trip and the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46)</td>
<td>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>47)</td>
<td>No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D.2</strong></td>
<td>DEPRECIATION COSTS FOR EQUIPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE OR OTHER ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Auditor sampled _____ cost items selected randomly</strong> (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 the highest).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For “equipment, infrastructure or other assets” [from now on called “asset(s)”] selected in the sample the Auditor verified that:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the assets were acquired in conformity with the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o they were correctly allocated to the action (with supporting documents such as delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48)</td>
<td>Procurement rules, principles and guides were followed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49)</td>
<td>There was a link between the grant agreement and the asset charged to the action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50)</td>
<td>The asset charged to the action was traceable to the accounting records and the underlying documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### D.3 COSTS OF OTHER GOODS AND SERVICES

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 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;
- 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);
- the goods were not placed in the inventory of durable equipment;
- the costs charged to the action were accounted in line with the Beneficiary’s usual accounting practices;
- no ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared (see Article 6 GA).

In addition, the Auditor verified that these goods and services were acquired in conformity with the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures, in particular:

- if Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>51)</th>
<th>The depreciation method used to charge the asset to the action was in line with the applicable rules of the Beneficiary's country and the Beneficiary's usual accounting policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>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>
2004/18/EC (or 2014/24/EU) or of Directive 2004/17/EC (or 2014/25/EU), 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.

- 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.

For the items included in the sample the Auditor also verified that:

- 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);

\[ \text{Such goods and services include, for instance, consumables and supplies, dissemination (including open access), protection of results, specific evaluation of the action if it is required by the agreement, certificates on the financial statements if they are required by the agreement and certificates on the methodology, translations, reproduction.} \]

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.

\[ \text{In the cases that a positive ex-ante assessment has been issued (see the standard factual findings 59-60 on the next column),} \]

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.

\[ \text{(When different offers were not collected the Auditor explains the reasons provided by the Beneficiary under the caption “Exceptions” of the Report. The Commission will analyse this information to evaluate whether these costs might be accepted as eligible)} \]

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.
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;

**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.

### USE OF EXCHANGE RATES

#### E.1

**a) For Beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euros**

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**):


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.

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.
b) For Beneficiaries with accounts established in euros

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):

*COSTS INCURRED IN ANOTHER CURRENCY SHALL BE CONVERTED INTO EURO BY APPLYING THE BENEFICIARY’S USUAL ACCOUNTING PRACTICES.*

63) The Beneficiary applied its usual accounting practices.

[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 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]:

- 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 with 1:

- 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 declared 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].

1.6 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.]

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.
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],

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 Statement\(^1\) 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 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.*

*Exception explanation in the form of examples (to be removed from the Report):*

\begin{itemize}
  \item i. the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] did not agree with the standard Statement number … because…;
  \item 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);
  \item iii. the Auditor could not confirm or corroborate the standard Finding number … because ….
\end{itemize}

**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:

*Annexes*

Please provide the following documents to the auditor and annex them to the report when submitting this CoMUC to the Commission:

---

\(^1\) Financial Statement in this context refers solely to Annex 4 of the Agreement by which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement.
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\(^2\) 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).

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

\(^2\) 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.
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’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Use of the Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The cost accounting practice described below has been in use since [dd Month yyyy].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The next planned alteration to the methodology used by the Beneficiary will be from [dd Month yyyy].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor checked these dates against the documentation the Beneficiary has provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factual finding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The dates provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with the documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Statements to be made by Beneficiary                        |
| Procedure:                                                  |
| B. Description of the Methodology                           |
|   III. The methodology to calculate unit costs is being used in a consistent manner and is reflected in the relevant procedures. |
|   [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] |
|   [If the statement of section “B. Description of the methodology” cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary or there is no written methodology to calculate unit costs it should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor in the main Report of Factual Findings:] |
| Procedure:                                                  |
|   The Auditor reviewed the description, the relevant manuals and/or internal guidance documents describing the methodology. |
| Factual finding:                                             |
|   2. The brief description was consistent with the relevant manuals, internal guidance and/or other documentary evidence the Auditor has reviewed. |
|   3. The methodology was generally applied by the Beneficiary as part of its usual costs accounting practices. |

| Statements to be made by Beneficiary                        |
| Procedure:                                                  |
| C. Personnel costs                                          |
|   General                                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor draws a sample of employees to carry out the procedures indicated in</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>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;</td>
<td>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.]. For this sample:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Employees are hired directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with national law, and work under its sole supervision and responsibility;</td>
<td>✓ 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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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);</td>
<td>✓ in particular, the Auditor reviewed the employment contracts of the employees in the sample to verify that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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;</td>
<td>i. they were employed directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable national legislation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Personnel costs are based on the payroll system and accounting system.</td>
<td>ii. they were working under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Any exceptional adjustments of actual personnel costs resulted from relevant budgeted or estimated elements and were based on objective and verifiable information.</td>
<td>iii. they were remunerated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 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>✓ 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 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>
</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>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 8,000 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 8,000 per full-time equivalent (reduced proportionately if the employee is not assigned exclusively to the action).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If certain statement(s) of section “C. Personnel costs” cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor in the main Report of Factual Findings:*...
**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>D. Productive hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedure (same sample basis as for Section C: Personnel costs):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. The number of productive hours per full-time employee applied is [delete as appropriate]:</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor verified that the number of productive hours applied is in accordance with method A, B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 1720 productive hours per year for a person working full-time (corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time).</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor checked that the number of productive hours per full-time employee is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. the total number of hours worked in the year by a person for the Beneficiary</td>
<td>✓ If method B is applied the Auditor verified i) the manner in which the total number of hours worked was done and ii) that the contract specified the annual workable hours by inspecting all the relevant documents, national legislation, labour agreements and contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>✓ If method C is applied the Auditor reviewed the manner in which the standard number of working hours per year has been calculated by inspecting all the relevant documents, national legislation, labour agreements and contracts and verified that the number of productive hours per year used for these calculations was at least 90% of the standard number of working hours per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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). | **Factual finding:** |
| XVIII. ‘Annual workable hours’ are hours 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. | **General** |
| XIX. The contract (applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation) do specify the working time enabling to calculate the annual workable hours. | 12. The Beneficiary applied a number of productive hours consistent with method A, B or C detailed in the left-hand column. |

If method C is applied

| XX. The standard number of productive hours per year is that of a full-time equivalent. | 13. The number of productive hours per year per full-time employee was accurate. |
| 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. | **If method B is applied** |
| XXII. Standard workable (working) hours are hours during which personnel are at | 14. The number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary and the calculation of the total number of hours worked was accurate. |
| | 15. The contract specified the working time enabling to calculate the annual workable hours. |
| | **If method C is applied** |
| | 16. The calculation of the number of productive hours per year corresponded to the usual costs accounting practice of the Beneficiary. |
### 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>
</table>
| 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. | 17. The calculation of the standard number of workable (working) hours per year was corroborated by the documents presented by the Beneficiary.  
18. The number of productive hours per year used for the calculation of the hourly rate was at least 90% of the number of workable (working) hours per year. |

**E. Hourly rates**

The hourly rates are correct because:

XXIII. Hourly rates are correctly calculated since they result from dividing annual personnel 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.

**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

**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:
**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>Beneficiary has either signed a declaration to that effect or has put arrangements in place to record their working time;</td>
<td>✓ that time records were available for all persons with not exclusive assignment to the action;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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;</td>
<td>✓ 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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXVII. Measures are in place to prevent staff from:</td>
<td>✓ that time records were signed and approved in due time and that all minimum requirements were fulfilled;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ that the persons worked for the action in the periods claimed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ that no more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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></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>
<tr>
<td>XXVIII. No working time was recorded outside the action period;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIX. No more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates.</td>
<td></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.

---

1 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</td>
<td>Auditor: reports/records and other documents reviewed and were generally applied by the Beneficiary to produce the financial statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22. For the random sample the time records were signed by the employee and the action manager/line manager, at least monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23. Working time claimed for the action occurred in the periods claimed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24. No more hours were claimed than the number productive hours used to calculate the hourly 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]  
[official name of the Auditor]  
[dd Month yyyy]  
<Signature of the Beneficiary>  
<Signature of the Auditor>
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