GRANT AGREEMENT

NUMBER — 788047 — RiConfigure

This Agreement (‘the Agreement’) is between the following parties:

on the one part,

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, Spreading Excellence, Widening Participation, Science with and for Society, Peter VAN DER ZANDT,

and

on the other part,

1. ‘the coordinator’:

FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADDET (DBT), established in ARNOLD NIELSENS BOULEVARD 68 E, HVIDOVRE 2650, Denmark, VAT number: DK34577358, represented for the purposes of signing the Agreement by Lars KLUVER

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

2. INSTITUT FUER HOHERE STUDIEN - INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES (IHS), established in JOSEFSTAEDTER STRASSE 39, WIEN 1080, Austria,

3. WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY (WU), established in DROEVENDAALSESTEEG 4, WAGENINGEN 6708 PB, Netherlands, VAT number: NL811383696B01,

4. FRAUNHOFER GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V. (Fraunhofer), established in HANSASTRASSE 27C, MUNCHEN 80686, Germany, VAT number: DE129515865,

5. ASOCIACION COLOMBIANA PARA EL AVANCE DE LA CIENCIA - ACAC (ACAC), established in CARRERA 16 NR 31 A-36, BOGOTA 111311, Colombia, VAT number: CO8902039449,

6. FONDAZIONE ADRIANO OLIVETTI (FAO), established in STRADA PRIVATA BIDASIO 2, IVREA 10015, Italy,

7. BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (BCE), established in FOVAM TER 8, BUDAPEST 1093, Hungary, VAT number: HU15329743,
8. **CORO, CO-LAB ROSKILDE (CORO)**, established in JERNBANEVEJ 3A, ROSKILDE 4000, Denmark,

9. **LUDWIG BOLTZMANN GESELLSCHAFT GMBH (LBG)**, established in NUSSDORFER STRASSE 64 6 STOCK, WIEN 1090, Austria, VAT number: ATU61640503,

10. **STICHTING S-ISPT (S-ISPT)**, established in GROEN VAN PRINSTERERLAAN 37, AMERSFOORT 3818 JN, Netherlands, VAT number: NL816013664B01,

11. **UNIVERSIDAD POMPEU FABRA (UPF)**, established in PLACA DE LA MERCE, 10-12, BARCELONA 08002, Spain, VAT number: ESQ5850017D,

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

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 ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations’ — ‘RiConfigure’ (‘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 the first day of the month following the date the Agreement enters into force (see Article 58) (‘starting date of the action’).

ARTICLE 4 — ESTIMATED BUDGET AND BUDGET TRANSFERS

4.1 Estimated budget

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

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

4.2 Budget transfers

The estimated budget breakdown indicated in Annex 2 may be adjusted — 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 3,517,132.50 (three million five hundred and seventeen thousand one hundred and thirty two EURO and fifty 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 **3,517,132.50** (three million five hundred and seventeen thousand one hundred and thirty two EURO and fifty eurocents).

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

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

Personnel costs for SME owners or beneficiaries that are natural persons not receiving a salary (see Article 6.2, Points A.4 and A.5) must be declared on the basis of the amount per unit set out in Annex 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**:
   - for costs of internally invoiced goods and services: on the basis of an amount per unit calculated by the beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices (**unit costs**);
   - for all other 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 (see Article 20) and approved by the Agency (see Article 21).

5.3.2 Step 2 — Limit to the maximum grant amount

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

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

The grant must not produce a profit.

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

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

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

The following are considered receipts:

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

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

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

The following are however not considered receipts:

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

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

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

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

5.3.4 Step 4 — Reduction due to 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 and Article 6.2.D.5)}\}

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 (‘\text{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\(^1\) 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’ means any part of the remuneration which exceeds what the person would be paid for time worked in projects funded by national schemes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(a) the person works under conditions similar to those of an employee (in particular regarding the way the work is organised, the tasks that are performed and the premises where they are performed);

(b) the result of the work carried out belongs to the beneficiary (unless exceptionally agreed otherwise), and

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

\(^1\) 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.
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**

Personnel costs must be calculated by the beneficiaries as follows:

\[
\{\text{hourly rate} \\
\times \text{the number of actual hours worked on the action},
\]

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:

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

The ‘**hourly rate**’ is one of the following:

(a) for personnel costs declared as **actual costs** (i.e. budget categories A.1, A.2, A.3): the hourly rate is calculated *per full financial year*, as follows:

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

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)}.

‘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:

{actual monthly personnel cost (excluding additional remuneration) for the person divided by
{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** (i.e. budget categories A.1, A.2, A.4, A.5): 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’**

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);

(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.

---

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’.
D.5 Costs of internally invoiced goods and services directly used for the action are eligible, if:

(a) they are declared on the basis of a unit cost calculated in accordance with the beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices;

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

(c) the unit cost is calculated using the actual costs for the good or service recorded in the beneficiary’s accounts, excluding any ineligible cost or costs included in other budget categories.

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

(d) the unit cost excludes any costs of items which are not directly linked to the production of the invoiced goods or service.

‘Internally invoiced goods and services’ means goods or services which are provided by the beneficiary directly for the action and which the beneficiary values on the basis of its usual cost accounting practices.

E. Indirect costs

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

(a) costs of subcontracting and

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

(c) not applicable;

(d) not applicable.

Beneficiaries receiving an operating grant\(^4\) financed by the EU or Euratom budget cannot declare indirect costs for the period covered by the operating grant, unless they can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action.

F. Specific cost category(ies)

Not applicable

6.3 Conditions for costs of linked third parties to be eligible

Not applicable

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

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

6.5 Ineligible costs

‘Ineligible costs’ are:

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

(i) costs related to return on capital;
(ii) debt and debt service charges;
(iii) provisions for future losses or debts;
(iv) interest owed;
(v) doubtful debts;
(vi) currency exchange losses;
(vii) bank costs charged by the beneficiary’s bank for transfers from the Agency;
(viii) excessive or reckless expenditure;
(ix) deductible VAT;
(x) costs incurred during suspension of the implementation of the action (see Article 49);

(b) costs declared under another EU or Euratom grant (including grants awarded by a Member State and financed by the EU or Euratom budget and grants awarded by bodies other than the Agency for the purpose of implementing the EU or Euratom budget); in particular, indirect costs if the beneficiary is already receiving an operating grant financed by the EU or Euratom budget in the same period, unless it can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action.

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);
- call upon international partners to implement action tasks described in Annex 1 (see Article 14a).

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/EC5 (or 2014/24/EU6) or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC7 (or 2014/25/EU8) 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

Not applicable

ARTICLE 14a — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS

Not applicable

ARTICLE 15 — FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES

15.1 Rules for providing financial support to third parties

Not applicable

15.2 Financial support in the form of prizes

Not applicable

15.3 Consequences of non-compliance
Not applicable

ARTICLE 16 — PROVISION OF TRANS-NATIONAL OR VIRTUAL ACCESS TO RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE

16.1 Rules for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure

Not applicable

16.2 Rules for providing virtual access to research infrastructure

Not applicable

16.3 Consequences of non-compliance

Not applicable

SECTION 2   RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO THE GRANT ADMINISTRATION

ARTICLE 17 — GENERAL OBLIGATION TO INFORM

17.1 General obligation to provide information upon request

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

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

Each beneficiary must keep information stored in the 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

(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 **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.

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

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

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

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

18.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

ARTICLE 19 — SUBMISSION OF DELIVERABLES

19.1 Obligation to submit deliverables

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

19.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

ARTICLE 20 — REPORTING — PAYMENT REQUESTS

20.1 Obligation to submit reports

The coordinator must submit to the Agency (see Article 52) the technical and financial reports set out in this Article. These reports include 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 15
- RP2: from month 16 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, for the reporting period concerned.

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

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

   If an individual financial statement is not submitted for a reporting period, it may be included in the periodic financial report for the next reporting period.

   The individual financial statements of the last reporting period must also detail the receipts of the action (see Article 5.3.3).

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

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

(iii) not applicable;

(iv) a ‘**periodic summary financial statement**’, 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, 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).

### 20.5 Information on cumulative expenditure incurred

Not applicable

### 20.6 Currency for financial statements and conversion into euro
Financial statements must be drafted in euro.

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

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

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

### 20.7 Language of reports

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

### 20.8 Consequences of non-compliance

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 **2,813,706.00** (two million eight hundred and thirteen thousand seven hundred and six 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 **175,856.63** (one hundred and seventy five thousand eight hundred and fifty six EURO and sixty three eurocents), corresponding to 5% of the maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1), is retained by the Agency from the pre-financing payment and transferred into the ‘Guarantee Fund’.

### 21.3 Interim payments — Amount — Calculation

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

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

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

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

Step 1 – Application of the reimbursement rates

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

#### 21.3.1 Step 1 — Application of the reimbursement rates

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

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

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

\[
\text{90\% of the maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1)} - \text{pre-financing and previous interim payments}.
\]

### 21.4 Payment of the balance — Amount — Calculation — Release of the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- if the balance is positive: the amount released will be paid in full to the coordinator together with the amount due as the balance;
- if the balance is negative (payment of the balance taking the form of recovery): it will be deducted from the amount released (see Article 44.1.2). If the resulting amount:
  - is positive, it will be paid to the coordinator
  - is negative, it will be recovered.

The amount to be paid may however be offset — without the 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: JYSKE BANK A/S
Full name of the account holder: FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET
IBAN code: DK8150780001096016

21.9 Costs of payment transfers

The cost of the payment transfers is borne as follows:

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

21.10 Date of payment

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

21.11 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

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

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

Late-payment interest covers the period running from the day following the due date for payment (see above), up to and including the date of payment.
Late-payment interest is not considered for the purposes of calculating the final grant amount.

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

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

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

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

22.1.1 Right to carry out checks

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

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

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

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

22.1.2 Right to carry out reviews

The Agency or the Commission may — during the implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out reviews on the proper implementation of the action (including assessment of deliverables and reports), compliance with the obligations under the Agreement and continued scientific or technological relevance of the action.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22.1.3 Right to carry out audits

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

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

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

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

The coordinator or beneficiary concerned must provide — within the deadline requested — any information (including complete accounts, individual salary statements or other personal data) to verify compliance with the Agreement. The Agency or the Commission may request beneficiaries to provide such information to it directly.

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

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

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

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

The ‘final audit report’ will take into account observations by the coordinator or beneficiary concerned. The report will be formally notified to it.
Audits (including audit reports) are in the language of the Agreement.

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

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

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

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

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

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

22.4 Checks, reviews, audits and investigations for international organisations

Not applicable

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

22.5.1 Findings in this grant

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

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

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

Checks, reviews, audits or investigations that find systemic or recurrent errors, irregularities, fraud or

---


breach of obligations may also lead to consequences in other EU or Euratom grants awarded under similar conditions (‘extension of findings from this grant to other grants’).

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

22.5.2 Findings in other grants

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

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

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

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

22.5.3 Procedure

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

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

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

(b) the request to submit revised financial statements for all grants affected;

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

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

   (ii) does not submit revised financial statements.

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

The 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 activities19. 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

19 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{20} established in an EU Member State or ‘\textbf{associated country}\textsuperscript{21}, 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.

‘\textbf{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}

\textsuperscript{20}For the definition see Article 2.1(2) Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘\textbf{affiliated entity}’ means any legal entity that is:
- under the direct or indirect control of a participant, or
- under the same direct or indirect control as the participant, or
- directly 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.

\textsuperscript{21}For the definition, see Article 2.1(3) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘\textbf{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.
Two or more beneficiaries own results jointly if:

(a) they have jointly generated them and

(b) it is not possible to:

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

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

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

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

(a) at least 45 days advance notice and

(b) fair and reasonable compensation.

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

26.3 Rights of third parties (including personnel)

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

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

If obtaining the rights is impossible, the beneficiary must refrain from using the third party to generate the results.

26.4 Agency ownership, to protect results

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

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

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

(c) the beneficiary intends to transfer the results to another beneficiary or third party established in an EU Member State or associated country, which will protect them.
Before the results are disseminated and unless any of the cases above under Points (a), (b) or (c) applies, the beneficiary must formally notify the Agency and at the same time inform it of any reasons for refusing consent. The beneficiary may refuse consent only if it can show that its legitimate interests would suffer significant harm.

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

No dissemination relating to these results may 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 788047”.

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 788047”.

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:
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 788047”.

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

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

This does not however give them the right to exclusive use.
Moreover, they may not appropriate the EU emblem or any similar trademark or logo, either by registration or by any other means.

29.5 Disclaimer excluding Agency responsibility

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

29.6 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

ARTICLE 30 — TRANSFER AND LICENSING OF RESULTS

30.1 Transfer of ownership

Each beneficiary may transfer ownership of its results.

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

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

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

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

30.2 Granting licenses

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

(a) this does not impede the 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

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

(a) it is to a third party established in a non-EU country not associated with Horizon 2020 and
(b) the Agency considers that the transfer or licence is not in line with EU interests regarding competitiveness or is inconsistent with ethical principles or security considerations.

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

- identify the specific results concerned;
- describe in detail the new owner or licensee and the planned or potential exploitation of the results, and
- include a reasoned assessment of the likely impact of the transfer or licence on EU competitiveness and its consistency with ethical principles and security considerations.

The Agency may request additional information.

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

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

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

30.4 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

ARTICLE 31 — ACCESS RIGHTS TO RESULTS

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

The conditions set out in Article 25.1 apply.

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

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

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

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

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

31.4 **Access rights of affiliated entities**

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

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

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

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

The beneficiaries must give access to their results — on a royalty-free basis — to EU institutions, bodies, offices or agencies, for developing, implementing or monitoring EU policies or programmes.

Such access rights are limited to non-commercial and non-competitive use.

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

31.6 **Access rights for third parties**

Not applicable

31.7 **Consequences of non-compliance**

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

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

**SECTION 4  OTHER RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS**

**ARTICLE 32 — RECRUITMENT AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR RESEARCHERS**

32.1 **Obligation to take measures to implement the European Charter for Researchers and Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers**
The beneficiaries must take all measures to implement the principles set out in the Commission Recommendation on the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers\textsuperscript{23}, 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 Integrity24.

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;
- 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;

24 The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity of ALLEA (All European Academies) and ESF (European Science Foundation) of March 2011.

- 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, 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 788047”.

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 788047”.

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\(^27\), 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 Article 44.

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, 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) breach of serious 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, 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 or the Commission may offset before the payment date specified in the debit note;

(b) not applicable;

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

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

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

Bank charges incurred in the recovery process will be borne by the beneficiary, unless Directive 2007/64/EC\(^{29}\) 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:

\[
\frac{\{\text{beneficiary's costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency multiplied by the reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned}\}}{\text{the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1}} \times \left(1 - \frac{\{\text{pre-financing and interim payments received by the beneficiary}\}}{\text{the final grant amount (see Article 5.3)}}\right)
\]

(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:

\[
\frac{\{\text{amount calculated according to point (a) for the beneficiary concerned}\}}{\text{the sum of the amounts calculated according to point (a) for all the beneficiaries identified according to point (a)}} \times \text{the amount set out in the debit note formally notified to the coordinator}.
\]
If payment is not made by the date specified in the debit note, the Agency 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 or the Commission 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:

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

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 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 or the Commission 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, prizes 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 interim payments or the payment of the balance 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. 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 information, 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 — 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 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 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) not applicable.

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 — 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 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,
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.

All communication must be made through the Participant Portal electronic exchange system and using the forms and templates provided there.

If — after the payment of the balance — the Agency finds that a formal notification was not accessed, a second formal notification will be made by registered post with proof of delivery (‘formal notification on paper’). Deadlines will be calculated from the moment of the second notification.

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 official mailing address indicated on the Agency’s website.

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\textsuperscript{30}, 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, and
- 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 ASOCIACION COLOMBIANA PARA EL AVANCE DE LA CIENCIA - ACAC, 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 offsetting and enforceable decisions must be brought against the Commission (not against the Agency).
ARTICLE 58 — ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AGREEMENT

The Agreement will enter into force on the day of signature by the Agency or the coordinator, depending on which is later.

SIGNATURES

For the coordinator

Lars KLUVER with ECAS id nkluvela signed in the Participant Portal on 19/03/2018 at 10:41:54 (transaction id Sigld-144883-c58uxxgtQUBSSzqkhavD6cNsRzbTxfl8tzYNVcUptDmU5zVOMpWPp766f0f6AXVjEv0v8wczqzqkAzzl2gG-PHsUMVSSYXcwtBONKzfFjW-Cc7FUg9mMsGVReGA0JCCnR19g8ezbriGNjLzzHA9cpdy).

For the Agency

Signed by Peter VAN DER ZANDT with ECAS id zandte as an authorised representative on 12-04-2018 15:37:32 (transaction id Sigld-116652-AIIjlFr1Z0tSzijvyGhAzy421UfmZKzprbvw6P7kAZqh4sTqNSdXdr92ASDfieONaVHXnPvisUqVfb2q5LJ-Jj71zxYb8yr8TdSP7X3T4W-jfCwxhXyyv4bztkclZaElMQ76JTXRPilGKqdr UAUCD).
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ANNEX 1 (part A)

Coordination and support action
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## Table of Contents

1.1. The project summary ................................................................................................................................. 3
1.2. The list of beneficiaries .............................................................................................................................. 4
1.3. Workplan Tables - Detailed implementation .............................................................................................. 5
    1.3.1. WT1 List of work packages ........................................................................................................... 5
    1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables ................................................................................................................ 6
    1.3.3. WT3 Work package descriptions ................................................................................................... 9
          Work package 1 ................................................................................................................................... 9
          Work package 2 ................................................................................................................................ 12
          Work package 3 ................................................................................................................................ 15
          Work package 4 ................................................................................................................................ 18
          Work package 5 ................................................................................................................................ 21
          Work package 6 ................................................................................................................................ 25
          Work package 7 ................................................................................................................................ 28
          Work package 8 ................................................................................................................................ 31
          Work package 9 ................................................................................................................................ 34
          Work package 10 ................................................................................................................................. 38
          Work package 11 ............................................................................................................................... 42
    1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones ................................................................................................................ 43
    1.3.5. WT5 Critical Implementation risks and mitigation actions ........................................................... 44
    1.3.6. WT6 Summary of project effort in person-months ........................................................................ 46
    1.3.7. WT7 Tentative schedule of project reviews ................................................................................. 47
## 1.1. The project summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>788047</th>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>RiConfigure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### General information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting date</td>
<td>The first day of the month after the signature by the Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration in months</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call (part) identifier</td>
<td>H2020-SwafS-2017-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed EC Keywords</td>
<td>Public engagement, Political systems and institutions, governance, Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free keywords</td>
<td>Quadruple Helix Social Labs Training Governance Civil Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Abstract

The RiConfigure project will enable the diversification of constellations, institutions and actors in research and innovation (R&I) by engaging stakeholders, enhancing conceptual clarity on new constellations, and disseminating best practices to practitioners and policy-makers. The project centers on stakeholder engagement in four social labs. In the social labs, actors from research, industry, the public sector, and civil society will explore how each of them can and do initiate and navigate cross-sectoral collaboration in R&I. Explorations in the labs are complimented by 100+ empirical case studies. On this empirical basis, the project produces a ‘quadruple helix’-framework to provide conceptual clarification on new constellations in R&I. Expanding the circle of engagement to ensure stakeholder relevance, practitioners and policy-makers can provide challenges and inquiries to the project’s explorations through dedicated dialogue events.

The project enables the spread of good practices by facilitating dissemination throughout practitioners’ and policy-makers’ networks, and by providing training to key stakeholders. The project will reach audiences in all relevant sectors through targeted communication and help actors to initiate and support new constellations in R&I by providing inspiration and guidance in the form of handbooks, infotainment videos, on- and offline training, policy briefs, and evidence-based analyses.

The project enables the change of R&I governance frameworks at multiple levels by providing evidence on how such frameworks may hinder or help new R&I constellations and by providing dialogue- and learning-opportunities to policy-makers. Initiated by a consortium of actors from all relevant sectors, the project will speak to crosscutting issues with credibility. The project pays special attention to RRI, but in a manner that integrates with broader issues of open collaboration in R&I and governance support for such collaboration.
# 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>FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET</td>
<td>DBT</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>INSTITUT FUER HOEHERE STUDIEN - INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES</td>
<td>IHS</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY</td>
<td>WU</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FRAUNHOFER GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V.</td>
<td>Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ASOCIACION COLOMBIANA PARA EL AVANCE DE LA CIENCIA - ACAC</td>
<td>ACAC</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FONDAZIONE ADRIANO OLIVETTI</td>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM</td>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>CORO, CO-LAB ROSKILDE</td>
<td>CORO</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LUDWIG BOLTZMANN GESELLSCHAFT GMBH</td>
<td>LBG</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>STICHTING S-ISPT</td>
<td>S-ISPT</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UNIVERSIDAD POMPEU FABRA</td>
<td>UPF</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1.3. Workplan Tables - Detailed implementation

### 1.3.1. WT1 List of work packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP Number</th>
<th>WP Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Person-months</th>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>Preparing social labs and analysis</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Social Lab I: How research organizations initiate new constellations</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Social Lab II: How industry organizations initiate new constellations</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Social Lab III: How public-sector organizations initiate new constellations</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Social Lab IV: How civil society organizations initiate new constellations</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Drawing out general lessons about new constellations</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Stakeholder networks</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>54.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>Communication and dissemination</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>Project management and coordination</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>Ethics requirements</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 407.25
### 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>Analytical framework</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Social lab methodology manual</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Internal training videos</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>SL I Case reports collection</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>SL I Collection of data reports</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of research-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>SL II Case reports collection</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>SL II Collection of data reports</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of industry-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>SL III Case reports collection</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>SL III Collection of data reports</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of public-sector-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>SL IV Case reports collection</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>SL IV Collection of data reports</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of civil society-initiated</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Associated with document Ref. Ares(2018)1449379 - 16/03/2018*
<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>D6.1</td>
<td>Report on QH-collaboration praxis</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Report on RRI practices in QH-collaboration</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>Report on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.4</td>
<td>A Policy-Makers' Handbook for Supporting Quadruple Helix Innovation</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>Working agreements with stakeholder organizations</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Report from practitioners' workshops</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Report on policy-makers' workshops</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>Collection of policy briefs</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.5</td>
<td>Legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations, platforms and networks</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.1</td>
<td>Training guide</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Testing experiences plan</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Training programs and recommendations</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.1</td>
<td>Communication plan</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>Communication packages</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>Project website</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>Social media activity report</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>Booklet series</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.6</td>
<td>Events report</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</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>D9.7</td>
<td>Final conference</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.8</td>
<td>Events Calendar</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.1</td>
<td>Project handbook</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.2</td>
<td>Data Management Plan</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.3</td>
<td>External evaluation report I</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.4</td>
<td>External evaluation report II</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.1</td>
<td>POPD - H - Requirement No. 1</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.2</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>WP11</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.3. WT3 Work package descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>1 - DBT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Preparing social labs and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Objectives

- To develop an analytical framework for observation and comparative analysis
- To develop a methodology manual for social lab (SL) implementation
- To carry out internal training for participants in WP2, 3, 4, and 5

#### Description of work and role of partners

**WP1 - Preparing social labs and analysis** [Months: 1-8]

**DBT, IHS, WU, Fraunhofer, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF**

WP1 will create a common language for all activities in the RiConfigure project. It will create reference materials and protocols ensuring that SL implementations, observations, analyses, debates, training, and communications use a consistent vocabulary throughout the project. It will also ensure that SL implementation and crosscutting analysis follows a well-integrated common approach.

WP1 will prepare participants in WP2, 3, 4, and 5 (SL and crosscutting analysis) for their tasks and ensure a common understanding among them. Participants in WP7, 8, and 9 (networks, training, and communication) will also participate in the work package to ensure integration between the upstream and downstream activities of the project.

**Task 1.1: Develop an analytical framework**

This task will map and consolidate key insights from previous EU and other (inter-)national projects aiming to understand and strengthen practices of QH and RRI, including research into the role of governance frameworks in shaping such practices. Based on this mapping exercise, an integrated framework will be created that provides an ontology for:

- Criteria for success and failure in QH-collaboration
- Roles of individual organizations in QH-collaboration
- Types of constellation in QH-collaboration
- Practices of collaboration in QH-collaboration
- Practices of RRI in collaborative settings
- Impacts of governance frameworks on collaborative settings

The framework must: i) stimulate the planning of SL leaders (WP2, 3, 4, and 5), ii) enable hypothesis formation as part of the crosscutting analysis (WP6), and iii) provide a useful vocabulary for networking and debates (WP7), training (WP8), and communication (WP9). To ensure that these criteria are met, the task leader will liaise with leaders and participants of the other WPs mentioned and make appropriate adjustments based on their feedback. In addition to the core framework, this task will derive protocols for observation and reporting of data from the cases in the SLs (main case, mirror cases, and reference cases).

**Task 1.2: SL methodology manual**

This task will develop a methodology manual for SL implementation in WP2, 3, 4, and 5. Building on state-of-the-art research in SL methodology, the manual will define the roles and responsibilities of participants in the SLs (e.g. SL Manager, SL Case Manager SL Panel, SL Panel Facilitator). It will provide an overall timeline to be followed by all SLs, which will include phases of iteration of idea development and experimentation in each of the QH-cases involved in the SL. Consolidating already existing toolboxes for SLs, collaborative innovation and RRI (e.g. the Living Labs toolbox, RRI Tools, the Engage2020 Action Catalogue, and others), the manual will include a toolbox categorizing different methods according to their usefulness in specific phases and for specific purposes within the SL. In addition to the methodology for SL implementation, the manual will contain practical guidance on the use of the observation and reporting protocols developed in task 1.1. To maximize the usefulness of the observation and reporting done in WP2, 3, 4 and 5 for the network, training and communication activities (WP7, 8 and 9), these activities will – in addition to traditional written reports – make use of alternative reporting vehicles, e.g. photo reporting and video diaries. The task leader will liaise with participants in WP7, 8 and 9 to ensure that observation and reporting is done in a useful manner.
Task 1.3: Internal training

This task will carry out the necessary training of the RiConfigure partners for implementing the SLs, making observations during SL implementation, and reporting implementations to the crosscutting analysis, the network platforms, training program, and communication efforts in WP7, 8, 9. A one-day training workshop will be held to introduce to the analytical framework, the SL methodology, including the manual and toolbox, the observation and reporting protocols, and the practical use of the protocols. The training workshop will make time for individual reflections about how the different tools may be applied in each of WP2, 3, 4 and 5. Presentations given at the internal training will be video recorded and made available on the internal project platform for the benefit of participants joining the project later on.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 1/DBT
2. Task 1.1 will be led by partner 4/FH
3. Task 1.2 will be led by partner 3/WUR
4. Task 1.3 will be led by partner 1/DBT. This task includes a training workshop, with the participation of all partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP1 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.25</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>Analytical framework</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Social lab methodology</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Internal training videos</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

- D1.1 Analytical framework (max. 50 pages) with observation and reporting protocols [5]
- D1.2 Social lab methodology manual with method toolbox and guidance for protocol use [6]
- D1.3 Internal training videos available on internal project platform [8]

D1.1 : Analytical framework [5]
Analytical framework (max. 50 pages) with observation and reporting protocols.

D1.2 : Social lab methodology manual [6]
Social lab methodology manual with method toolbox and guidance for protocol use

D1.3 : Internal training videos [8]
Internal training videos available on internal project platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of relevant Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

- Implement a Social Lab on QH-collaboration initiated by research organizations (RPOs)
- Build up an inventory of reference cases of QH-collaboration initiated by RPOs
- Convene periodical workshops for reflection and mutual learning among social lab participants
- Support and observe the implementation of process methods by social lab participants
- Engage relevant governance actors on how to support QH-collaborations initiated by research
- Synthesize a practitioners’ account of RRI-compatible QH-collaboration initiated by RPOs

Description of work and role of partners

WP2 - Social Lab I: How research organizations initiate new constellations [Months: 2-35]  
Fraunhofer, FAO, BCE, LBG, UPF

WP2 implements an SL focusing on QH-collaboration initiated by research organizations. The main case in WP2 is the SmartFactoryOWL initiative in which Fraunhofer IOSB-INA together with the University of Applied Science Ostwestfalen-Lippe explores new automation technologies and production systems and tests and demonstrates them in real world experiments. Those new, internet-of-things based technologies change the work environment in manufacturing and production: not only technical systems support workers but also workers interact with those systems. Various technologies like 3D-camera technology, localisation and big data analytics are applied, which increases transparency in work flow and other processes. The SL will seek to support engagement with managers and employees in firms involved in the innovation process. Mirror cases will be recruited through dialogue with the currently ongoing European Technology Platforms on ICT and Production and processes.

The Work Package Leader will produce short progress reports to the Coordinator in preparation for each consortium meeting.

Task 2.1: Social lab setup and management
The WP leader (‘SL Manager’) will gather representatives of currently ongoing cases of QH-collaboration initiated organizations from the relevant strand of the QH into a group (the ‘SL Panel’). Members of the SL Panel will meet periodically during the lifespan of the SL to exchange experiences and challenge each other professionally (cf. Task 2.3 below). The SL includes one main case partner, 4-5 mirror case partners, and relevant local stakeholders. Beyond the setup-phase, the tasks of the SL Manager includes being available for practical questions, coordinating SL Panel meetings, ensuring timely progress, and solving challenges regarding timing, manpower, etc.

Task 2.2: Ongoing case mapping and analysis
This task will continue the process of identifying cases that resemble the main case in terms of initiators of the QH-collaboration and the societal challenge in focus for the duration of the SL. The task will identify and analyse at least 20 reference cases. To achieve broad geographical coverage, partners 5, 6 and 7 will research reference cases in South America, Southern Europe, and Central-Eastern Europe respectively. For all reference cases identified, an analytical brief will be made applying the case analysis protocol (developed in Task 1.1) to the case based on desktop research and – where possible – phone interviews with case representatives. These reports will be taken up in the SL Panel dialogues in Task 2.3 and in WP6.

Task 2.3: Monitoring, reflection and mutual learning
This task will continue the process of identifying cases that resemble the main case in terms of initiators of the QH-collaboration and the societal challenge in focus for the duration of the SL. The task will identify and analyse at least 20 reference cases. To achieve broad geographical coverage, partners 5, 6 and 7 will research reference cases in South America, Southern Europe, and Central-Eastern Europe respectively. For all reference cases identified, an analytical brief will be made applying the case analysis protocol (developed in Task 1.1) to the case based on desktop research and – where possible – phone interviews with case representatives. These reports will be taken up in the SL Panel dialogues in Task 2.3 and in WP6.

In this task, the SL Manager will arrange and facilitate 4 one-day workshops involving the SL Panel (i.e. representatives of the main case and mirror cases), which will be designed to facilitate reflection and mutual learning among the participants. In preparation of each SL Panel workshop, representatives of each case will fill out a short state-of-play report about the QH-collaboration collaboration, RRI, and governance which will be distributed beforehand. The workshop will involve general sessions for discussion of topics in QH-collaboration and RRI, and sessions dedicated to each case. The case-specific sessions will center on providing each SL Panel member recommendations on how to solve case-specific challenges using the process methods gathered in the SL Manual or elsewhere, which may be implemented in task 2.4.
A specific session will be dedicated to responding to ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ from task 7.2. Reports from each workshop – including the monitoring reports delivered beforehand – will be made available to WP6 for crosscutting analysis. Structured by a protocol from task 1.1 these workshops reports will cover provide data for each of the comparative analyses in WP6 (process methods, RRI, governance). The SL Manager will deliver workshop reports to the WP6 Leader after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 2.4: Implementation of process methods
In this task, SL Panel members will implement recommendations from the SL Panel meetings in their cases. There will be four rounds of process methods implementation (one from the kick-off meeting to the first SL Panel workshop; three in between the SL Panel). The main case partner will have dedicated funding for implementing process methods to solve case-specific challenges, and will therefore be able to implement recommended process methods in addition to already planned activities at the partners’ discretion. The SL Manager will provide assistance in implementation as relevant. Representatives of the mirror cases do not have dedicated project funding, but can choose to implement recommendation on their own if they are seen to provide value. The SL Manager may provide implementation assistance if the budget allows. The SL Manager and SL Panel members will carry out observation during process method implementation according to the observation and reporting protocol developed in tasks 1.1, which may include – in addition to participant observation – photo reporting and video interviews (depending on decisions taken in task 1.1). Reporting data will be delivered to the leader of WP6 after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 2.5: Case-specific stakeholder dialogue
The SL Manager will support the SL Panel members in reaching out to – as deemed relevant by the SL Panel members - local, regional or national authorities and other governance actors to share lessons learned and to discuss ways that these actors may better support QH-collaboration and RRI. The SL Manager will as a minimum facilitate one network meeting between relevant governance actors and the main case partner. The outcomes of the meeting will be shared on the RiConfigure blog. One blog post reporting one network meeting is the obligatory minimum. Further case-specific activities are allowed and encouraged, and the SL Manager may make use of the allotted budget to this end.

Task 2.6: Synthesis of lessons learned
In this task, the SL Manager and the SL Panel members will debate the outcomes of the crosscutting analyses in WP6 and produce a practitioners’ account of lessons learned about initiating QH-collaboration in a manner compatible with RRI beginning from the research helix. Special emphasis will be placed on the usefulness (or lack thereof) of more radical involvement of citizens and civil society. This account will be taken up in WP9 (Communication) specifically task 9.6 where it will feed into the booklet series.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 4/FH
2. Task 2.1 – 2.6 are all led by partner 4/FH
3. Task 2.1 includes at least four social lab panel meetings organized by partner 4/FH. The social lab panels with coordinate and inform the work of WP5 Comparative analysis and task 7.2 and 7.3 (practitioner and policy-makers’ event).
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>SL I Case reports collection</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>SL I Collection of data reports</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Practitioners’ account of research-initated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D2.1: Case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases [30]
D2.2: Four SL workshop reports and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method implementation [30]
D2.3: A practitioners’ account of how RPOs can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI [32]
D2.1: SL I Case reports collection [30]
Collection of case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases. Min. 25 case reports in total.
D2.2: SL I Collection of data reports [30]
Collection of four SL workshop reports from task 2.3 and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method from task 2.4.
D2.3: Practitioners’ account of research-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI [32]
A practitioners’ account of how RPOs can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI

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>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Work package number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lead beneficiary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 - WU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Work package title

Social Lab II: How industry organizations initiate new constellations

### Start month

2

### End month

35

### Objectives

- Implement a Social Lab on QH-collaboration initiated by industry organizations
- Build up an inventory of reference cases of QH-collaboration initiated by industry
- Convene periodical workshops for reflection and mutual learning among social lab participants
- Support and observe the implementation of process methods by social lab participants
- Engage relevant governance actors on how to support QH-collaborations initiated by research

### Description of work and role of partners

WP3 - Social Lab II: How industry organizations initiate new constellations [Months: 2-35]

**WU, FAO, BCE, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF**

WP3 implements an SL focusing on QH-collaboration initiated by industry.

The main case in WP3 is on collaborative innovation in renewable energy. In the Netherlands, there are multiple ongoing projects, initiated by industrial companies in which technical infrastructures are developed to valorize biomass. Irrespective of their high sustainable innovation potential, biomass and residual energy (BREV) initiatives face several obstacles, which are not so much of a technological nature, but rather of economic and social-ethical origin. ISPT, together with other organizations and researchers see these obstacles or constraints manifesting themselves in three ways: 1) lack of public acceptance and support, 2) lack of stakeholder awareness and 3) lack of collaboration with government authorities. The SL will support the engagement of civic society and other relevant non-industrial parties, to get these new BREV solutions, which are necessary to make the energy transition happen, put into practice successfully.

Mirror cases will be recruited through dialogue with the currently ongoing Knowledge and Innovation Community on Energy, the European Technology Platform on Production and processes, and the ongoing projects in the H2020 ‘Industrial Leadership’ program.

The Work Package Leader will produce short progress reports to the Coordinator in preparation for each consortium meeting.

**Task 3.1: Social lab setup and management**

The WP leader (‘SL Manager’) will gather representatives of currently ongoing cases of QH-collaboration initiated organizations from the relevant strand of the QH into a group (the ‘SL Panel’). Members of the SL Panel will meet periodically during the lifespan of the SL to exchange experiences and challenge each other professionally (cf. Task 3.3 below). The SL includes one main case partner, 4-5 mirror case partners, and relevant local stakeholders. Beyond the setup-phase, the tasks of the SL Manager includes being available for practical questions, coordinating SL Panel meetings, ensuring timely progress, and solving challenges regarding timing, manpower, etc.

**Task 2.2: Ongoing case mapping and analysis**

This task will continue the process of identifying cases that resemble the main case in terms of initiators of the QH-collaboration and the societal challenge in focus for the duration of the SL. The task will identify and analyse at least 20 reference cases. To achieve broad geographical coverage, partners 5, 6 and 7 will research reference cases in South America, Southern Europe, and Central-Eastern Europe respectively. For all reference cases identified, an analytical brief will be made applying the case analysis protocol (developed in Task 1.1) to the case based on desktop research and – where possible – phone interviews with case representatives. These reports will be taken up in the SL Panel dialogues in Task 3.3 and in WP6.

**Task 3.3: Monitoring, reflection and mutual learning**

In this task, the SL Manager will arrange and facilitate 4 one-day workshops involving the SL Panel (i.e. representatives of the main case and mirror cases), which will be designed to facilitate reflection and mutual learning among the participants. In preparation of each SL Panel workshop, representatives of each case will fill out a short state-of-play report about the QH-collaboration collaboration, RRI, and governance which will be distributed beforehand. The workshop will involve general sessions for discussion of topics in QH-collaboration and RRI, and sessions dedicated to
each case. The case-specific sessions will center on providing each SL Panel member recommendations on how to solve case-specific challenges using the process methods gathered in the SL Manual or elsewhere, which may be implemented in task 3.4. A specific session will be dedicated to responding to ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ from task 7.2.

Reports from each workshop – including the monitoring reports delivered beforehand – will be made available to WP6 for crosscutting analysis. Structured by a protocol from task 1.1 these workshops reports will cover provide data for each of the comparative analyses in WP6 (process methods, RRI, governance). The SL Manager will deliver workshop reports to the WP6 Leader after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 3.4: Implementation of process methods
In this task, SL Panel members will implement recommendations from the SL Panel meetings in their cases. There will be four rounds of process methods implementation (one from the kick-off meeting to the first SL Panel workshop; three in between the SL Panel). The main case partner will have dedicated funding for implementing process methods to solve case-specific challenges, and will therefore be able to implement recommended process methods in addition to already planned activities at the partners’ discretion. The SL Manager will provide assistance in implementation as relevant. Representatives of the mirror cases do not have dedicated project funding, but can choose to implement recommendation on their own if they are seen to provide value. The SL Manager may provide implementation assistance if the budget allows. The SL Manager and SL Panel members will carry out observation during process method implementation according to the observation and reporting protocol developed in tasks 1.1, which may include – in addition to participant observation – photo reporting and video interviews (depending on decisions taken in task 1.1). Reporting data will be delivered to the leader of WP6 after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 3.5: Case-specific stakeholder dialogue
The SL Manager will support the SL Panel members in reaching out to – as deemed relevant by the SL Panel members - local, regional or national authorities and other governance actors to share lessons learned and to discuss ways that these actors may better support QH-collaboration and RRI. The SL Manager will as a minimum facilitate one network meeting between relevant governance actors and the main case partner. The outcomes of the meeting will be shared on the RiConfigure blog. Further case-specific activities are allowed and encouraged, and the SL Manager may make use of the allotted budget to this end.

Task 3.6: Synthesis of lessons learned
In this task, the SL Manager and the SL Panel members will debate the outcomes of the crosscutting analyses in WP6 and produce a practitioners’ account of lessons learned about initiating QH-collaboration in a manner compatible with RRI beginning from the research helix. Special emphasis will be placed on the usefulness (or lack thereof) of more radical involvement of citizens and civil society. This account will be taken up in WP9 (Communication) specifically task 9.6 where it will feed into the booklet series.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 3/WU
2. Task 3.1 – 3.6 are all led by partner 3/WU
3. Task 3.1 includes at least four social lab panel meetings organized by partner 4/FH. The social lab panels with coordinate and inform the work of WP6 Comparative analysis and task 7.2 and 7.3 (practitioner and policy-makers’ event).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP3 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</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>D3.1</td>
<td>SL II Case reports collection</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>SL II Collection of data reports</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of industry-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

D3.1: Case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases [30]
D3.2: Four SL workshop reports and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method implementation [30]
D3.3: A practitioners’ account of how industry organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI [32]

D3.1: SL II Case reports collection [30]
Collection of case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases. Min. 25 case reports in total.

D3.2: SL II Collection of data reports [30]
Collection of four SL workshop reports from task 3.3 and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method from task 3.4.

D3.3: Practitioners’ account of industry-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI [32]
A practitioners’ account of how industry organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI

### 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>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number 9: WP4

WP4 Lead beneficiary

Lead beneficiary: 2 - IHS

Work package title

Social Lab III: How public-sector organizations initiate new constellations

Start month

End month

Objectives

- Implement a Social Lab on QH-collaboration initiated by public sector organizations
- Build up an inventory of reference cases of QH-collaboration initiated by the public sector
- Convene periodical workshops for reflection and mutual learning among social lab participants
- Support and observe the implementation of process methods by social lab participants
- Engage relevant governance actors on how to support QH-collaboration initiated by research
- Synthesize a practitioners’ account RRI-compatible QH-collaboration initiated by the public sector

Description of work and role of partners

WP4 - Social Lab III: How public-sector organizations initiate new constellations [Months: 2-35]

IHS, FAO, BCE, LBG, UPF

WP4 implements an SL focusing on QH-collaboration initiated by the public sector.

The main case in WP4 consists of current innovation activities of the Open Innovation Lab Service Design Centre at Austrian Railways (ÖBB). The Center offers employees and managers the opportunity to drive forward customer-focused innovations together with customers. Members of the public can also participate in the development of innovations here. The Center is established part of the „Building open innovation and experimental spaces“ initiative as part of the Implementation measures & cooperation programs in the „Austrian National Open Innovation Strategy“, which is co-initiated by Austrian Federal Ministry of Science, Research and Economy & Austrian Ministry of Transport, Innovation and Technology. Fraunhofer. The SL will specifically seek to support the entrepreneurial role of the Center as initiator of innovations.

Mirror cases will be recruited among similar initiatives by other member states (e.g. the IPTOP Initiative in Denmark, which is similarly a collaboration between a ministerial innovation fund, the national railway, and other actors in research, industry and civil society) as well as among members of the European Knowledge and Innovation Community on Urban Transport.

The Work Package Leader will produce short progress reports to the Coordinator in preparation for each consortium meeting.

Task 4.1: Social lab setup and management

The WP leader (‘SL Manager’) will gather representatives of currently ongoing cases of QH-collaboration initiated organizations from the relevant strand of the QH into a group (the ‘SL Panel’). Members of the SL Panel will meet periodically during the lifespan of the SL to exchange experiences and challenge each other professionally (cf. Task 4.3 below). The SL includes one main case partner, 4-5 mirror case partners, and relevant local stakeholders. Beyond the setup-phase, the tasks of the SL Manager includes being available for practical questions, coordinating SL Panel meetings, ensuring timely progress, and solving challenges regarding timing, manpower, etc.

Task 4.2: Ongoing case mapping and analysis

This task will continue the process of identifying cases that resemble the main case in terms of initiators of the QH-collaboration and the societal challenge in focus for the duration of the SL. The task will identify and analyse at least 20 reference cases. To achieve broad geographical coverage, partners 5, 6 and 7 will research reference cases in South America, Southern Europe, and Central-Eastern Europe respectively. For all reference cases identified, an analytical brief will be made applying the case analysis protocol (developed in Task 1.1) to the case based on desktop research and – where possible – phone interviews with case representatives. These reports will be taken up in the SL Panel dialogues in Task 4.3 and in WP6.

Task 4.3: Monitoring, reflection and mutual learning

In this task, the SL Manager will arrange and facilitate 4 one-day workshops involving the SL Panel (i.e. representatives of the main case and mirror cases), which will be designed to facilitate reflection and mutual learning among the participants. In preparation of each SL Panel workshop, representatives of each case will fill out a short state-of-play report about the QH-collaboration, RRI, and governance which will be distributed beforehand. The workshop will involve general sessions for discussion of topics in QH-collaboration and RRI, and sessions dedicated to each case. The
case-specific sessions will center on providing each SL Panel member recommendations on how to solve case-specific challenges using the process methods gathered in the SL Manual or elsewhere, which may be implemented in task 4.4. A specific session will be dedicated to responding to ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ from task 7.2. Reports from each workshop – including the monitoring reports delivered beforehand – will be made available to WP6 for crosscutting analysis. Structured by a protocol from task 1.1 these workshops reports will cover provide data for each of the comparative analyses in WP6 (process methods, RRI, governance). The SL Manager will deliver workshop reports to the WP6 Leader after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 4.4: Implementation of process methods
In this task, SL Panel members will implement recommendations from the SL Panel meetings in their cases. There will be four rounds of process methods implementation (one from the kick-off meeting to the first SL Panel workshop; three in between the SL Panel). The main case partner will have dedicated funding for implementing process methods to solve case-specific challenges, and will therefore be able to implement recommended process methods in addition to already planned activities at the partners’ discretion. The SL Manager will provide assistance in implementation as relevant. Representatives of the mirror cases do not have dedicated project funding, but can choose to implement recommendation on their own if they are seen to provide value. The SL Manager may provide implementation assistance if the budget allows. The SL Manager and SL Panel members will carry out observation during process method implementation according to the observation and reporting protocol developed in tasks 1.1, which may include – in addition to participant observation – photo reporting and video interviews (depending on decisions taken in task 1.1). Reporting data will be delivered to the leader of WP6 after each SL Panel workshop.

Task 4.5: Case-specific stakeholder dialogue
The SL Manager will support the SL Panel members in reaching out to – as deemed relevant by the SL Panel members - local, regional or national authorities and other governance actors to share lessons learned and to discuss ways that these actors may better support QH-collaboration and RRI. The SL Manager will as a minimum facilitate one network meeting between relevant governance actors and the main case partner. The outcomes of the meeting will be shared on the RiConfigure blog. Further case-specific activities are allowed and encouraged, and the SL Manager may make use of the allotted budget to this end.

Task 4.6: Synthesis of lessons learned
In this task, the SL Manager and the SL Panel members will debate the outcomes of the crosscutting analyses in WP6 and produce a practitioners’ account of lessons learned about initiating QH-collaboration in a manner compatible with RRI beginning from the research helix. Special emphasis will be placed on the usefulness (or lack thereof) of more radical involvement of citizens and civil society. This account will be taken up in WP9 (Communication) specifically task 9.6 where it will feed into the booklet series.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 2/IHS
2. Task 4.1 – 4.6 are all led by partner 2/IHS
3. Task 4.1 includes at least four social lab panel meetings organized by partner 2/IHS. The social lab panels with coordinate and inform the work of WP6 Comparative analysis and task 7.2 and 7.3 (practitioner and policy-makers’ event).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner number and short name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>SL III Case reports collection</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>SL III Collection of data reports</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of public-sector-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

- **D4.1**: Case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases  
  - Collection of case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases. Min. 25 case reports in total.

- **D4.2**: Four SL workshop reports and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method implementation  
  - Collection of four SL workshop reports from task 4.3 and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method from task 4.4.

- **D4.3**: A practitioners’ account of how public-sector organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI  
  - A practitioners’ account of how public-sector organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI

### 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>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Work package number**
9

**Lead beneficiary**
DBT

**Work package title**
Social Lab IV: How civil society organizations initiate new constellations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objectives

- Implement a Social Lab on QH-collaboration initiated by civil society organizations (CSOs)
- Build up an inventory of reference cases of QH-collaboration initiated by civil society
- Convene periodical workshops for reflection and mutual learning among social lab participants
- Support and observe the implementation of process methods by social lab participants
- Engage relevant governance actors on how to support QH-collaboration initiated by CSOs
- Synthesize a practitioners’ account RRI-compatible QH-collaboration initiated by civil society

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP5 - Social Lab IV: How civil society organizations initiate new constellations** [Months: 2-35]

**DBT, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, UPF**

WP2 implements an SL focusing on QH-collaboration initiated by research organizations.

WP5 has two main cases, which together allow for the comparison of roles played by CSOs in regions with very different approaches to innovation. The first main case consists of current innovation activities of CORO (partner 8). At any given time CORO runs a number of projects with civil society involvement. One example of an already running project falls under the Social innovation and sustainability program. Many local villages with a majority of single family homes in Denmark do not have district heating distribution systems. The project is to change these villages from being dependent of fossil fuels and to become complete self-sufficient and independent by introducing renewable, circular systems. The project will engage in a quadruple helix cooperation to succeed. A similar case will be chosen at the start of WP5. The second main case is the bi-annual Expociencia science fair, around which ACAC (partner 5) is currently launching a new platform through which scientists and makers from the city will be able to collaborate in order to explore, and create solutions for various daily challenges. This initiative is led by a group of physicists that have previously built 3D printers with materials only available in Bogota. The project will launch in September 2017 and will bring informal makers and scientists together in collaborative ventures.

Mirror cases will be recruited through dialogue with the currently ongoing European Technology Platforms on ICT and Production and processes and among projects identified as ‘social innovation’ by the European Commission’s Innovation Radar initiative.

The Work Package Leader will produce short progress reports to the Coordinator in preparation for each consortium meeting.

**Description of work**

WP2 implements an SL focusing on QH-collaboration initiated by research organizations.

The main case in WP2 is the SmartFactoryOWL initiative in which Fraunhofer IOSB-INA together with the University of Applied Science Ostwestfalen-Lippe explores new automation technologies and production systems and tests and demonstrates them in real world experiments. Those new, internet-of-things based technologies change the work environment in manufacturing and production: not only technical systems support workers but also workers interact with those systems. Various technologies like 3D-camera technology, localisation and big data analytics are applied, which increases transparency in work flow and other processes. The SL will seek to support engagement with managers and employees in firms involved in the initiative in the innovation process.

Mirror cases will be recruited through dialogue with the currently ongoing European Technology Platforms on ICT and Production and processes.

The Work Package Leader will produce short progress reports to the Coordinator in preparation for each consortium meeting.

**Task 5.1: Social lab setup and management**

The WP leader (‘SL Manager’) will gather representatives of currently ongoing cases of QH-collaboration initiated organizations from the relevant strand of the QH into a group (the ‘SL Panel’). Members of the SL Panel will meet periodically during the lifespan of the SL to exchange experiences and challenge each other professionally (cf. Task...
5.3 below). The SL includes one main case partner, 4-5 mirror case partners, and relevant local stakeholders. Beyond the setup-phase, the tasks of the SL Manager includes being available for practical questions, coordinating SL Panel meetings, ensuring timely progress, and solving challenges regarding timing, manpower, etc.

**Task 5.2: Ongoing case mapping and analysis**

This task will continue the process of identifying cases that resemble the main case in terms of initiators of the QH-collaboration and the societal challenge in focus for the duration of the SL. The task will identify and analyse at least 20 reference cases. To achieve broad geographical coverage, partners 5, 6 and 7 will research reference cases in South America, Southern Europe, and Central-Eastern Europe respectively. For all reference cases identified, an analytical brief will be made applying the case analysis protocol (developed in Task 1.1) to the case based on desktop research and – where possible – phone interviews with case representatives. These reports will be taken up in the SL Panel dialogues in Task 5.3 and in WP6.

**Task 2.3: Monitoring, reflection and mutual learning**

In this task, the SL Manager will arrange and facilitate 4 one-day workshops involving the SL Panel (i.e. representatives of the main case and mirror cases), which will be designed to facilitate reflection and mutual learning among the participants. In preparation of each SL Panel workshop, representatives of each case will fill out a short state-of-play report about the QH-collaboration, RRI, and governance which will be distributed beforehand. The workshop will involve general sessions for discussion of topics in QH-collaboration and RRI, and sessions dedicated to each case. The case-specific sessions will center on providing each SL Panel member recommendations on how to solve case-specific challenges using the process methods gathered in the SL Manual or elsewhere, which may be implemented in task 5.4.

A specific session will be dedicated to responding to ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ from task 7.2.

Reports from each workshop – including the monitoring reports delivered beforehand – will be made available to WP6 for crosscutting analysis. Structured by a protocol from task 1.1 these workshops reports will cover provide data for each of the comparative analyses in WP6 (process methods, RRI, governance). The SL Manager will deliver workshop reports to the WP6 Leader after each SL Panel workshop.

**Task 5.4: Implementation of process methods**

In this task, SL Panel members will implement recommendations from the SL Panel meetings in their cases. There will be four rounds of process methods implementation (one from the kick-off meeting to the first SL Panel workshop; three in between the SL Panel). The main case partner will have dedicated funding for implementing process methods to solve case-specific challenges, and will therefore be able to implement recommended process methods in addition to already planned activities at the partners’ discretion. The SL Manager will provide assistance in implementation as relevant.

Representatives of the mirror cases do not have dedicated project funding, but can choose to implement recommendation on their own if they are seen to provide value. The SL Manager may provide implementation assistance if the budget allows. The SL Manager and SL Panel members will carry out observation during process method implementation according to the observation and reporting protocol developed in tasks 1.1, which may include – in addition to participant observation – photo reporting and video interviews (depending on decisions taken in task 1.1). Reporting data will be delivered to the leader of WP6 after each SL Panel workshop.

**Task 5.5: Case-specific stakeholder dialogue**

The SL Manager will support the SL Panel members in reaching out to – as deemed relevant by the SL Panel members - local, regional or national authorities and other governance actors to share lessons learned and to discuss ways that these actors may better support QH-collaboration and RRI. The SL Manager will as a minimum facilitate one network meeting between relevant governance actors and the main case partner. The outcomes of the meeting will be shared on the RiConfigure blog. Further case-specific activities are allowed and encouraged, and the SL Manager may make use of the allotted budget to this end.

**Task 5.6: Synthesis of lessons learned**

In this task, the SL Manager and the SL Panel members will debate the outcomes of the crosscutting analyses in WP6 and produce a practitioners’ account of lessons learned about initiating QH-collaboration in a manner compatible with RRI beginning from the research helix. Special emphasis will be placed on the usefulness (or lack thereof) of more radical involvement of citizens and civil society. This account will be taken up in WP9 (Communication) specifically task 9.6 where it will feed into the booklet series.

Comments to work distribution between the partners

1. The WP will be led by partner 1/DBT
2. Task 5.1 – 5.6 are all led by partner 1/DBT
3. Task 5.1 includes at least four social lab panel meetings organized by partner 1/DBT. The social lab panels will coordinate and inform the work of WP6 Comparative analysis and task 7.2 and 7.3 (practitioner and policy-makers’ event).
Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP5 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>41.00</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>D5.1</td>
<td>SL IV Case reports collection</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>SL IV Collection of data reports</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Practitioners' account of civil society-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

Deliverables

D2.1: Case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases
D2.2: Four SL workshop reports and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method implementation
D2.3: A practitioners’ account of how civil society organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI

D5.1 : SL IV Case reports collection [30]
Collection of case reports on main case, mirror cases and 20+ reference cases. Min. 25 case reports in total.

D5.2 : SL IV Collection of data reports [30]
Collection of four SL workshop reports from task 5.3 and four sets of observation reporting (text, photos, and/or video) on process method from task 5.4.

D5.3 : Practitioners' account of civil society-initiated QH-collaboration compatible with RRI [32]
A practitioners’ account of how industry organizations can initiate QH-collaborations compatible with RRI
## 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>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package number</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td>Drawing out general lessons about new constellations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>End month</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

- Compare findings about QH-collaboration praxis from the four SLs
- Compare findings about RRI practice in QH-collaboration from the four SLs
- Compare findings about the impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration
- Identify patterns and outliers in QH-collaboration

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP6 - Drawing out general lessons about new constellations** [Months: 12-36]

WU, DBT, IHS, Fraunhofer, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF

WP6 carries out comparative analyses using an appropriate set of mixed-methods tools on three different sets of characteristics of the 100+ main, mirror and reference cases of QH-collaboration analyzed in WP2,3, 4, and 5 (see also section 1.3.3 ‘Methodology’). The tasks will all draw on a common repository of existing research (identified in task 1.1) and case data (gathered in WP2, 3, 4, and 5) managed by the leader of task 6.4. The analyses of WP6 will draw inspiration for analytical hypotheses from the literature surveyed and the framework developed in task 1.1, from the SL Panel workshop reports in WP2, 3, 4, and 5, and from the practitioners’ and policy-makers’ events in WP7, including ‘Policy-makers’ Inquiries’ (T7.3).

**Task 6.1: QH praxis analysis**

This task will carry out comparative analyses of QH-collaboration praxis in the cases studied in WP2, 3, 4 and 5. The task will produce one comparative analysis report for each completed cycle of SL Panel workshops. Respectively, these reports will focus on: i) criteria for success and failure defined by case participants, ii) roles played by the organizations in the four helixes in each of the cases, iii) types of QH-constellations identifiable through bottom-up analysis (in addition to existing top-down typologies) including the types of actors involved, and iv) observable practices of collaboration in QH-collaboration collaborations.

**Task 6.2: RRI in QH-collaboration**

This task will carry out comparative analyses of RRI practices identifiable in the cases studied in WP2, 3, 4 and 5. The task will produce one comparative report for each completed cycle of SL Panel workshops. Respectively, these reports will focus on: i) Practices to ensure compatibility with the RRI keys (I) (gender, education, open access), ii) Practices to ensure compatibility with the RRI keys (II) (ethics, participation), iii) Practices to ensure compatibility with the RRI dimensions (I) (anticipation, reflexivity, inclusiveness), and iv) Practices to ensure compatibility with the RRI dimensions (II) (responsiveness).

**Tasks 6.3: Impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaborations**

This task will carry out comparative analyses of the observable impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration as identifiable in the cases studied in WP2, 3, 4 and 5. The task will produce on comparative report for each completed cycle of SL Panel workshops. Respectively, these reports will focus on: i) the impacts of local (municipal) governance frameworks, ii) the impacts of regional (or metropolitan) governance frameworks, iii) the impacts of national governance frameworks, and iv) the impacts of European or other international frameworks (as appropriate to each case).

**Task 6.4: Patterns and outliers in QH-collaboration**

The leader of task will carry out an appropriate form of correlation analysis of the findings in tasks 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 to identify recurring patterns and outliers in the correlation between QH praxis characteristics, RRI practices, impacts of public governance frameworks in the cases studied in WP2, 3, 4, and 5. On the basis of this analysis, all participants in the task (including participants from the WPs for networking (WP7), training (WP8) and communication (WP9) will help to identify a comprehensive set of “do’s and don’ts” for QH-collaboration practitioners, promoters of RRI, and public governance actors with respect to the achievement of successful QH-collaboration. These do’s and don’ts will be further elaborated in tasks 2.6, 3.6, 4.6, and 5.6 (helix-specific syntheses) as well as task 9.x (booklet series), and they will be communicated widely in WP7, 8 and 9.

Comments to work distribution between the partners

1. The WP will be led by partner 3/WU
2. Task 6.1 will be led by partner 2/IHS. This task includes a kick-off session at a consortium meeting, and follow-up workshop in the end of the task.
3. Task 6.2 will be led by partner 3/WU. This task includes a kick-off session at a consortium meeting, and follow-up workshop in the end of the task.
4. Task 6.3 will be led by partner 6/ASEF. This task includes a kick-off session at a consortium meeting, and follow-up workshop in the end of the task.
5. Task 6.4 will be led by partner 3/WU. All partners will contribute to this task, which also involves a workshop on the content of the Handbook.

### Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP6 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Dissemination level&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>Report on QH-collaboration praxis</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Report on RRI practices in QH-collaboration</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>Report on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.4</td>
<td>A Policy-Makers' Handbook for Supporting Quadruple Helix Innovation</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables
D6.1 Report on QH-collaboration praxis. Gathers and frames four cross-cutting reports (max 25 pages each) on the different aspects of QH-collaboration praxis examined in the social labs [32]

D6.2 Report on RRI practices in QH-collaboration. Gathers and frames four cross-cutting reports (max 25 pages each) on RRI practices with different aims in QH-collaboration [32]

D6.3 Report on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration. Gathers and frames four reports (max 25 pages each) on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration [32]

D6.4 A Policy-Makers' Handbook for Supporting Quadruple Helix Innovation. Gathers and frames findings from D6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 into a handbook format, including a comprehensive list of “do’s and don’ts” for QH-practitioners, RRI promoters, and public governance actors at local, regional, national, European/international level. [34]

D6.1 : Report on QH-collaboration praxis [32]
Gathers and frames four cross-cutting reports (max 25 pages each) on the different aspects of QH-collaboration praxis [32]

D6.2 : Report on RRI practices in QH-collaboration [32]
Gathers and frames four cross-cutting reports (max 25 pages each) on RRI practices with different aims in QH-collaboration.

D6.3 : Report on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration [32]
Gathers and frames four cross-cutting reports (max 25 pages each) on impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration

D6.4 : A Policy-Makers' Handbook for Supporting Quadruple Helix Innovation [34]
A full report (entitled e.g. The Policy-Makers’ Handbook for Supporting Quadruple Helix Innovation) on patterns and outliers in QH-collaboration, including a comprehensive list of “do’s and don’ts” for QH-practitioners, RRI promoters, and public governance actors at local, regional, national, European/international level.

---

### 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>MS3</td>
<td>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

- Establish a network of stakeholders in innovation practice and policy
- Engage with innovation practitioners on SL activities and lessons learned from them
- Engage with innovation policy-makers on the hypotheses and findings of comparative analyses
- Share the project’s main policy-relevant findings with stakeholders across and beyond Europe
- Establish legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations to ensure post-project uptake

Description of work and role of partners

WP7 - Stakeholder networks [Months: 1-36]

IHS, DBT, WU, Fraunhofer, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF

WP7 will ensure the embedding in and spread of the results of WP2, 3, 4 and 5 (Social labs) as well as WP6 (Comparative analysis) in the current concerns and outlooks of stakeholders in the field. To this end, the work package will “open up” the social labs in a controlled manner for continuous reflection and debate with stakeholders. The work package will enable stakeholders to provide input and questions for the social lab process, to engage in continuous reflection on the lessons learned from the SLs and from the comparative analysis, and to reflect on and debate the output of the comparative analysis.

Task 7.1: Establish stakeholder network

This task will map and establish working relations with existing innovation practitioners’ platforms and networks (including but not limited to members of European Technology Platforms (ETPs), European Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs), contributors to the Open Innovation 2.0 Yearbook, RRI hubs, and the Triple Helix Association) and public sector governance bodies and networks related to innovation policy (including but not limited to the Council of Regions, the European Research Area Council, and the OECD Science and Technology program). ‘Working relations’ will include i) agreements to distribute news and public deliverables through the communication networks of the stakeholder organizations, ii) standing invitations for stakeholder organization members to comment on and make requests from the SL work packages and the comparative analysis, iii) invitations to stakeholder organization members to participate in QH-training in WP8.

Letters of intent for supporting the networks have been received from the OECD Working Party on Bio-, Nano, and Converging Technologies as well as the Austrian ministries of science and innovation.

Task 7.2: Dialogue events with innovation practitioners

This task will carry out two dialogue events with representatives and participants of leading innovation practitioners’ platforms and networks. The two workshops will ‘ramp up’ engagement with practitioners, expand the network reach of the project’s outcomes, ensure interest in the final conference, and build a base for the heritage strategy. The first workshop will be smaller than the second, focusing on Key Nodes in European innovation networks (secretariat leaders, network coordinators, journal editors, etc.), with the second workshop expanding to include Innovation Managers (research coordinators, product managers, program officers, initiative coordinators, etc.). Each workshop will contain sessions that i) facilitate critical discussion of the preliminary findings of WP1 through WP6, ii) knowledge sharing concerning initiatives and experiences of the participants, and iii) input of challenges and advice into each of the four SL Panels (in the form of 2-page ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’). At least one member of each SL Panel will participate in the second workshop to provide first-hand accounts of the SL-experiences.

Task 7.3: Dialogue events with innovation policy-makers

This task will carry out two dialogue events with coordinators and members of public sector governance bodies and networks related to innovation policy. The two workshops will ‘ramp up’ engagement with practitioners, expand the network reach of the project’s outcomes, ensure interest in the final conference, and build a base for the heritage strategy. The first workshop will be smaller than the second, focusing on Key Nodes in the bodies and networks involved (secretariat leaders, network coordinators, innovation managers etc.), with the second workshop expanding to include policy makers directly (e.g. elected officials, board members, high-level advisory body members, etc). Each workshop will contain sessions that facilitate critical discussion of the preliminary findings of WP1 through WP6, ii) knowledge
sharing concerning initiatives and experiences of the participants, and iii) input of questions and hypothesis into each
the comparative analyses of WP6 (in the form of 2-page ‘Policy-makers’ Inquiries’).

Task 7.4: Policy briefs
This task will produce four policy briefs to be distributed through the stakeholder network and project website. The
policy briefs will be produced in step with the SL Panel workshops (one brief after each workshop) and will summarize
findings from the SL Panels (WP2, 3, 4, and 5), the comparative analyses (task 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3) and the practitioners’
and policy-makers’ events (task 7.2 and 7.3). The leaders of WP6 (Comparative analysis) and WP9 (Communication)
will discuss the messaging in the policy briefs with the task leaders of 7.2 and 7.3 in order to ensure alignment between
the work packages.

Task 7.5: Legacy and exploitation
This task will ensure the effective uptake of the output of the project by establishing agreements with stakeholder
organizations on the uptake of the project outcomes (including but not limited to the booklet series, and training
materials) in the internal and external training and communication activities of the stakeholder organizations. To support
these agreements, arrangements will be made to ensure digital distribution and print-on-demand of various materials
arrangement as appropriate. This task will liaise closely with WP8 (training) and WP9 (communication), especially on
the planning of training sessions and distribution of booklets and handbooks beyond the end of the project.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 2/IHS
2. Task 7.1 will be led by partner 2/IHS
3. Task 7.2 will be led by partner 6/FAO. This task involves two events for practitioners coordinated with the Reflective
   monitoring and analysis in the four social labs.
4. Task 7.3 will be led by partner 2/IHS. This task involves two events for policy-makers coordinated with the Reflective
   monitoring and analysis in the four social labs.
5. Task 7.4 will be led by partner 2/IHS.
6. Task 7.5 will be led by partner 1/DBT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP7 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D7.1</td>
<td>Working agreements with stakeholder organizations</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>Report from practitioners' workshops</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Report on policy-makers' workshops</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4</td>
<td>Collection of policy briefs</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.5</td>
<td>Legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations, platforms and networks</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

- **D7.1**: Working agreements with stakeholder organizations for dissemination and interaction with networks[6]
- **D7.2**: Two practitioners’ workshop reports, incl. ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ to the SLs [21]
- **D7.3**: Two policy-makers’ workshop reports, incl. ‘Policy-makers’ Inquiries’ to the comparative analysis [26]
- **D7.4**: Four policy briefs summarizing the main policy-relevant findings of the project [30]
- **D7.5**: Legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations, platforms and networks [36]

D7.1: Working agreements with stakeholder organizations
Documentation of working agreements with stakeholder organizations for dissemination and interaction with networks.

D7.2: Report from practitioners' workshops
Two practitioners’ workshop reports, incl. ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ to the SLs.

D7.3: Report on policy-makers' workshops
Two policy-makers’ workshop reports, incl. ‘Policy-makers’ Inquiries’ to the comparative analysis.

D7.4: Collection of policy briefs
Collection of four policy briefs summarizing the main policy-relevant findings of the project.

D7.5: Legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations, platforms and networks
Legacy agreements with stakeholder organizations, platforms and networks.

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>Policy dialogue initiated</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>First policy dialogue held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Objectives**

- To develop and spread “train-the-trainers” courses for education of initiators/managers of collaborative innovation

**Description of work and role of partners**

**WP8 - Training** [Months: 4-36]
UPF, DBT, IHS, WU, Fraunhofer, ACAC, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT

UPF will focus on the outcomes of WP2-WP5, together with the comparative analysis of WP6, to develop training programs for initiators (actors, managers, representatives) from sectors of the QH (research, industry, public sector and civil society organizations) teaching about Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) from a multidisciplinary perspective. UPF will count with the rest of the consortium to develop the “train-the-trainers” courses and ensure their applicability. The targets groups of the training will be identified and reached through the contacts made during WP2-WP5, together with the networks established in WP7.

The “train-the-trainers” courses will be presented offline (around Europe and beyond in the form of workshops and summer schools) and online via a Massive Open Online Course (MOOC). All training materials will be available in open access under the creative commons’ license of attribution alone (BY).

**Task 8.1 Training guide of work (M6)**
Task 8.1 sets the lines of action of WP8 by writing D8.1 Training and exploitation guide of work. This document will establish the protocols for the development of the “train-the-trainers” courses and the detailed mechanisms for connecting with previous WP (particularly WP2-WP5), not only with their results, but also during their implementation.

**Task 8.2 Information collection (M6)**
UPF will be collecting information from the WP2 to WP5 through open and regular communication with the partners involved in these WPs. The Social Labs will be followed closely by UPF, who will not only rely on the cases provided with WP6 but will complement the cases with a broad and deep understanding of the context of the Social Labs.

**Task 8.3 Training programs design (M12)**
UPF will coordinate the design of the “train-the-trainers” programs and course materials addressing initiators (actors, managers, representatives) from sectors of the quadruple helix (research, industry, public sector and civil society organizations). Each program will have its own detailed implementation plan, course curriculum (syllabus) and teaching contents.

In both the online and offline courses, the Problem-based Learning methodology (PBL) will be used as the main teaching method, and the formats selected will be varied (text, video, social media channels, podcast, and others). WP6 will provide with good cases and practices that will be included in the training materials. Although UPF will coordinate this task, all “train-the-trainers” programs will be co-constructed by the whole consortium, in particular, partners leading WP2-WP5.

In total, three different training programs will be produced: a 1-day workshop, a summer school (both offline) and a Massive Online Open Course (MOOC). The content of the programs will differ in depth and perspective, but they will all be focused on teaching and QH-collaboration approach that considers RRI. The 1-day workshop will consist on a 6-hour course, while the summer school will be a 5-day course (5 hours a day) and the MOOC, an online course of 5-7 sessions. These programs will be tested in five countries from the consortium, as explained in Task 8.3. Changes in content, length and form may arise following the testing.

**Task 8.4 Training programs implementation: testing experiences (M20)**
UPF will schedule testing experiences among 5 project members, so that at least 5 testing experiences take place inside the consortium (each course will be tested once minimum). The institutions/countries that will undertake this experience will be UPF (Spain), LBG (Germany), ACAC (Colombia), DBT (Denmark), and IHS (Austria). These first-hand experiences will be evaluated. The feedback received will be important to assess how the “train-the-trainers” courses are perceived. D8.2 Testing experiences plan will explain the methodological procedures to organize and develop the pilots, their evaluation and how the feedback received will go back into the training programs.

**Task 8.5. Final training programs and recommendations (M32)**
After the testing experiences, the training programs will be improved following the evaluations and the feedback obtained. D8.3 Training programs and recommendations will present the refined “train-the-trainers” courses together with specific recommendations for their proper implementation.

Comments to work distribution between the partners
1. The WP will be led by partner 11/UPF
2. Task 8.1 – 8.5 are all led by partner 11/UPF
3. The training will be based on the work in the four social labs and its outcomes as well as it will be in coordination with the stakeholder engagement.

### Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP8 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>54.00</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>D8.1</td>
<td>Training guide</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Testing experiences plan</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Training programs and recommendations</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

- D8.1 Training guide of work [6]
- D8.2 Testing experiences plan [20]
- D8.3 Training programs and recommendations [32]

Training guide of work

D8.2 : Testing experiences plan [20]
Testing experiences plan

D8.3 : Training programs and recommendations [32]
Training program and recommendations.

<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>MS7</td>
<td>&quot;Train-the-trainers&quot; program underway</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Testing experience plan submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

- Ensure coordination of messaging and timely delivery of communication products
- Produce three communication packages for use in all outreach activities
- Ensure online presence through an online website integrated with social media and existing networks
- Disseminate project findings and news via social media and to the press
- Enhance communicative activities throughout the project with relevant video clips
- Disseminate the knowledge and experience gained in the project in a series of targeted booklets
- Present findings and recommendations at major conferences and stakeholder network meetings
- Host a final conference where everyone involved in the different parts of the project (and the interested public besides) can meet to discuss and build on the findings of the project.

Description of work and role of partners

WP9 - Communication and dissemination [Months: 1-36]

DBT, IHS, WU, Fraunhofer, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF

This WP is the backbone of the communication and dissemination efforts of the RiConfigure project. The WP will support continued engagement with both professional stakeholders as well as publics throughout the project. To achieve a continued interest in the project and its results, it is important to combine online with off-line activities.

Task 9.1: Communication Plan

This task will create a communication plan that ensures effective coordination of messaging and dissemination across WP1 through WP8 as well as timely and efficient delivery of outputs in relevant formats to strategically specified target groups. The communication plan will provide necessary details regarding: i) timing of communication activities, ii) formats for the communication outputs, division of specific responsibilities, iii) map of main target groups and communication channels (including but not limited to innovation practitioners and innovation policy-makers, relevant newsletters, relevant hashtags and twitter accounts, relevant press) iv) visual identity and style guidelines, and v) coordination of outreach and communication activities in all the WP’s of the project. Academic partners will self-fund the production of peer-reviewed articles as appropriate in addition to the activities included in the communication plan.

Task 9.2: Communication packages

This task produces three communication packages, which aim at broad communication of RiConfigure's actions and results.

1. Presentation on the project, aims and objectives, methods, consortium, etc. at the beginning of the project. This will include the production of a downloadable flyer, poster, press release, short presentation video, and communication design templates.

2. Communication of results halfway through the project. This will include a press release on the main results, PP presentation, which will be used by the partners for presentation of the results at meetings, conferences, etc.

3. Communication of results at the end of the project. This will include a brochure, and PP presentation, which will be used by the partners for presentation of the results at meetings, conferences, etc.

Task 9.3: Project website

The task will develop and maintain the project website. The website will include information about aims and objectives, activities, events, results, etc. The website will ensure transparency of and public access to the results and ongoing work, from kick-off to the end of the project. The website will be divided into sections clearly relevant to specific stakeholder groups (in research, industry, the public sector, and civil society). The project website will be integrated with the social media accounts of the project consortium members. The news stream of the website will further be integrated with online communication platforms of stakeholder organizations as per the agreements established in task 7.1. All consortium members will make themselves available – as timed by the communication plan and upon request from the WP leader - to produce various forms of content for the website, including workshop impressions, blog posts on current events, video clips, etc. based on their tasks in the project. The websites of the partners will link to the project website and the public deliverables of the project.

Task 9.4: Social media and press
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This task will ensure that information is shared as broadly as possible with target audiences by adding social media updates to the project’s conventional means of communication. The task will create and maintain RiConfigure accounts on Twitter (e.g. @RiConfigure), Facebook and YouTube. The RiConfigure partners will use their professional LinkedIn profiles to also disseminate RiConfigure news and communicate about project activities and results. The RiConfigure partners will also re-tweet all RiConfigure project tweets, and repost RiConfigure Facebook and YouTube activities from their official partner accounts. Three sets of press releases will be made sharing the main messages of each of the communication packages (7.2) and giving relevant press contacts at least the countries represented by the consortium partners access to the content of the communication packages.

Task 9.5: Video
This task will produce shorter and longer video clips for use on the project website, for distribution via social media, for inclusion in presentations, and for inclusion in the training materials. The video clips will offer easily accessible, entertaining presentations of the main findings of the project, and will include personal insights and experiences to enhance the human-interest dimension of the messages of the clips. One sub-task will be to license ready-made footage as well as to arrange and produce original footage from the SLs and the network events. This footage will be pooled along with the video interviews produce by SL participants to give a base of reusable material for the various video products. As another sub-task, the task leader will host an internal competition among its students for a concept for making creative use of the photo and video footage pooled to create YouTube-friendly video presentations (or series of presentations) of the content of the booklet series (task 9.4). The winner of the contest will receive a working grant of 5,000 EUR for production of the five video presentations (or series of presentations).

Task 9.6: Booklet series
This task will create a series of five booklets aimed respectively at innovation practitioners in research, industry, the public sector, and civil society and innovation policy-makers. The booklets will be based respectively on the outcomes of tasks 2.6, 3.6, 4.6, 5.6 and 6.4 and in close collaboration with the authors of these outcomes. Additional materials (case stories, illustrations, etc.) will be provided from the various reports, photo reporting etc. produced as part of the SLs and WP6. The booklet series will be printed for distribution in 5 x 500 copies and made available as downloads through the (as a minimum) the websites of the project and of the authors. Arrangements for reprinting will be made in task 7.5. Promotion of the booklet series will be enhanced by videos produced in task 9.3.

Task 9.7: Presentations in conferences and network meetings
Throughout the project the partners will spread information on findings and recommendations to innovation practitioners and policy-makers through participation in major conferences such as the Open Innovation 2.0 (i.e. network meetings held independently of the RiConfigure project). All conference and network meeting participation will be recorded by the task leader, who will also proactively work to secure presentation and speaking assignments for consortium members. Presentations will be advertised through social media by task 9.4.

Task 9.8: Final conference
A two-day final conference will be held in Brussels. The first day of the conference will include general sessions for the discussion of findings regarding QH-collaboration, RRI in QH-collaboration, and governance of QH-collaboration as well as parallel sessions on initiating QH-collaboration from research, industry, the public sector, and civil society respectively. The second day will include a poster session where stakeholder organizations and their members can present relevant initiatives as well as open space sessions allowing for facilitated discussions of new QH-collaboration initiatives.

Comments to work distribution between the partners:
1) The WP will be led by partner 1/DBT.
2) Task 9.1 is led by partner 1/DBT, with support from partner 7/BCU.
3) Task 9.2 is led by partner 7/BCU
4) Task 9.3 is led by partner 1/DBT. All partners contribute with content.
5) Task 9.4 is led by partner 1/DBT, which will set up the social media accounts and coordinate outreach to press. All partners will forward outreach on their official social media accounts.
6) Task 9.5 is led by partner 7/BCU.
7) Task 9.6 is led by partner 4/FH
8) Task 9.7 is led by partner 6/FAO, which is responsible for coordinating conference and workshop participation. All partners will represent the RiConfigure project.
9) Task 9.8 is led by partner 6/FAO, who will organize the conference with support from partners 1/DBT, 2/IHS, 3/WUR and 4/IHS that will be responsible for different sessions. All partners will attend and advertise the conference.
## Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP9 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67.75</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>D9.1</td>
<td>Communication plan</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>Communication packages</td>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>Project website</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>Social media activity report</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>Booklet series</td>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.6</td>
<td>Events report</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.7</td>
<td>Final conference</td>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.8</td>
<td>Events Calendar</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

- D9.1: Communication plan [4]
- D9.2: Three communication packages [35]
- D9.3: Project website [3]
- D9.4: Two social media activity reports [18/34]
- D9.5: Video clip series to support booklet series launch [32]
- D9.6: Booklet series [34]
- D9.7: Report of presentations throughout the project [35]
D9.8: Final conference [35]

D9.1: Communication plan [4]
Communication plan

D9.2: Communication packages [35]
Three communication packages delivered during the period of the project.

D9.3: Project website [33]
Project website

D9.4: Social media activity report [34]
Gathers two social media activity reports [18, 34]

D9.5: Booklet series [34]
Booklet series, accompanied by video clip series to support booklet series launch

D9.6: Events report [35]
Events report

D9.7: Final conference [35]
Final conference

D9.8: Events Calendar [3]
Information (title, date, location, content) on project website about all planned significant events (conferences, seminars, workshops), including a subscription mechanism for updates about changes to the calendar or additional events.

---

<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>Lessons learned</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Booklet series published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

- Secure efficient and effective management of the project
- Facilitate coordination and knowledge sharing between the work packages
- Produce a common project handbook to strengthen coordination
- Manage and control the project resources to achieve the planned results
- Ensure compliance of the work with contract and consortium agreements
- Ensure project progress and results in accordance with the work plan
- Ensure quality control of project deliverables
- Maintain close contact with the responsible project officer
- Establish an Advisory Panel to assist in maximizing excellence and impact
- Ensure ethical behavior, including data privacy management, through common ethics protocols and reflection

Description of work and role of partners

WP10 - Project management and coordination [Months: 1-36]

DBT, IHS, WU, Fraunhofer, ACAC, FAO, BCE, CORO, LBG, S-ISPT, UPF

The objective of this work package is to ensure through efficient and effective coordination of all parts of the project that the efforts spend in the project contribute to reaching the overall project objectives.

Task 10.1 Management and coordination
1. Maintaining the project implementation plan,
2. Monitoring and supervision of the work progress
3. Quality control measures
4. Resolution of conflicts in and around the consortium.
5. Technical support for internal and external communication.
6. Management and reporting on administrative and financial aspects
7. Management of communication with the EU Commission
8. Generation of internal progress reports each quarter; Submission of the reports to the Commission.

Appropriate project management tools, communication and decision-making procedures will be used in between the consortium meetings, such as an intra-net, e-mail distribution lists, web meetings, etc. This infrastructure will be used for administrative and financial management as well as for scientific coordination.

The overall management approach will be a mix of centralized control and monitoring, and decentralized management by WP/task leaders and individual participants. Measures to ensure quality will include internal peer reviews, reviews/feedback from the Advisory Panel, and overall quality checking by the Coordinator.

Task 10.2 Project handbook
To operationalize the description of work of the project, each work package leader will, taking into account the input from task leaders, produce a more detailed project execution handbook to be shared among the consortium and updated as appropriate. The purpose of the project handbook is on the one hand to clarify the planning of each part of the project and the interactions between tasks and work packages. On the other hand, the project handbook will also serve to ease the introduction of new personnel to the project underway.

Task 10.3 Consortium meetings
Consortium meetings will be held regularly. The consortium partners will take turns to host consortium meetings. A first 3-day kick-off will be held in month 2. Other consortium meetings will follow a two-day format unless circumstances demand otherwise. At the meetings, the results and process of the project will be shared and discussed, and tasks coordinated. Consortium meetings are also main occasions for ongoing revaluation of the project’s strategy, collective risk management, and collective decision-making regarding ways of responding to unforeseen opportunities. Some of the meetings will be held face-to-face others will be arranged as e-meetings.

Task 10.4 Advisory Panel
An Advisory Panel (AP) will be established to maximize the excellence and impact of the project’s efforts. It is a requirement that the (AP) include at least 50% women. The AP will consist of stakeholders in key node positions in European R&I networks as well as experts with first-hand experience in the development of innovation technology. Advisory Panel members are presented in Section 3.2 (Management structure and procedures). The AP will meet 3 times in connection to consortium meetings. Besides, single panel members can take part in events and/or consortium meeting as needed. The panel will contribute with feedback on methodology, deliverables and results and by sharing contacts to people and organizations able to strengthen the impact of the project. The Advisory Panel will have no formal decision-making power. The budget for the panel is placed with the coordinator, who also will have the on-going contact to the AP, maintaining information exchange with and co-ordination of the panel’s activities.

Task 10.5 External evaluations

The external evaluation will monitor the progress and results of the project. The evaluation will be made by an independent subcontractor on the basis of a closed call for tender. The call will be based upon an evaluation plan, which will imply:

- A first evaluation report focusing on the activities in the first half of the project
- The second evaluation report focuses on the activities in the second half of the project as well as the overall outcome of the RiConfigure project.

In their proposal, evaluators can suggest focus and evaluation activities.

All partners will make themselves available to the external evaluators as needed.

Task 10.6 Ethics and data management

This task will deliver an ethics guidance in the form of protocols for research ethics in relation to the interaction with experts, stakeholders, industry and the public. A specific protocol will be created to ensure compliance with European data protection regulation; both with respect to ongoing data management and with respect to the design and implementation of data sharing facilities in the social labs (WP2-5). The task of providing ethics guidance also includes the facilitation of ethical reflection sessions coinciding with the 3 feedback sessions from the AP.

Comments to work distribution between the partners:
1) As coordinator partner 1/DBT will lead WP10.
2) Task 10.1 will be led by partner 1/DBT, which will be responsible for the management and coordination of the project, including relations at project level with the European Commission.
3) Task 10.2 will be led by partner 1/DBT, who will receive input to the project handbook from the WP leaders of WP1-10. The WP-leaders will in turn solicit input as needed from other partners.
4) Task 10.3 will be led by partner 1/DBT, which will host the kick-off meeting. Partners 4/FH, 5/ACAC, 6/ FAO, 7/ BCU and 11/UPF will host the following consortium meetings. Partner 1/DBT is responsible for the agenda setting and facilitations. The hosting partners are responsible for minute taking.
5) Task 10.4 will be led by partner 1/DBT, which will be responsible for ongoing contact with the Advisory Panel.
6) Task 10.5 will be led by partner 2/IHS, who will be responsible for sub-contracting the external evaluation. The Coordinator will take part in talks with the evaluator. All partners will make themselves available to the evaluators as needed.
7) Task 10.6 will be led by partner 4/FH, who will provide the consortium with protocols for ethical behavior and facilitate ethical reflection sessions and provide a data management plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP10 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner number and short name</td>
<td>WP10 effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>2.25</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 handbook</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.2</td>
<td>Data Management Plan</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.3</td>
<td>External evaluation report I</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10.4</td>
<td>External evaluation report II</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of deliverables**

- D10.1 Project handbook [month 4] (internal document)
- D10.2 Ethics and data management guidance protocols [month 4] (internal document)
- D10.3 External evaluation report I [month 18]
- D10.4 External evaluation report II [month 36]

Project handbook (internal document)

Data Management Plan

D10.3 : External evaluation report I [18]  
External evaluation report I

D10.4 : External evaluation report II [36]  
External evaluation report II

**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>Detailed project planning</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workshop held at kick-off</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 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>Social labs started</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Booklet series published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Finalization of project</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Final consortium meeting held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The objective is to ensure compliance with the 'ethics requirements' set out in this work package.

**Description of work and role of partners**

WP11 - Ethics requirements [Months: 1-36]

DBT

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>D11.1</td>
<td>POPD - H - Requirement No. 1</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.2</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description of deliverables**

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


- Templates of the informed consent/assent forms and information sheets (in language and terms intelligible to the participants) must be kept on file. Those should mention possible risks of breach of confidentiality, and specify which data are used in the 'internal' research and which in the 'external/public domain'.


- Detailed information on the procedures for data collection, storage, protection, retention, and destruction, and confirmation that they comply with national and EU legislation must be included in the Data Management Plan also covering for the video recordings. - In case personal data are transferred from/to a non-EU country or international organisation, confirmation that this complies with national and EU legislation, together with the necessary authorisations, must be kept on file. - Detailed information on the informed consent procedures in regard to the collection, storage, and protection of personal data must be submitted with D10.2 (or in a specific deliverable), also covering the case of video recordings.

**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>
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### 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>Detailed project planning</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workshop held at kick-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>Social lab methodology</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Method toolbox and guidelines developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>Social labs started</td>
<td>WP10, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports from first SL Panel workshops in SL I, II, III and IV received by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Social labs ended</td>
<td>WP10, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6</td>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Final SL Panel workshop reports received from social labs by WP6 leader and coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Lessons learned</td>
<td>WP10, WP9</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Booklet series published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Policy dialogue initiated</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>First policy dialogue held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>&quot;Train-the-trainers&quot; program underway</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Testing experience plan submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Finalization of project</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Final consortium meeting held</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 1.3.5. WT5 Critical Implementation risks and mitigation actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk number</th>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>WP Number</th>
<th>Proposed risk-mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A partner is unable to produce its work on time Likelihood: Medium</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Quarterly reports on progress and resource consumption will be delivered by the partners and monitored by the coordinator. If it becomes apparent that this risk is relevant, early remedial is thus possible, e.g. to have another representative from the partner organization to undertake or assist the production. In extreme cases the work may be taken away from the partner and given to other partners or a new partner may be included in the consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Loss of a partner during project duration Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>The risk mainly concerns structural institutional changes, such as abolishment of institutions. This may take away competences and create uncertainties about the distribution of responsibilities among remaining partners. All involved partners are members of strong international professional communities from which substitution partners may be recruited. Problems of coordination and distribution of responsibilities in a period without the new partner will be solved by the remaining partners, who will for a period involve substitute competences from their own organizations, which can be done because of a certain degree of doubling of competences in the consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Budget exceeded Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP10</td>
<td>Firstly, this will mainly be the problem of the partners who prove not to be able to manage their budgets. Secondly, the coordinator will install a rigid monitoring in progress and resource consumption, which makes fast intervention possible. Thirdly, the consortium is composed of partners with long, proven experience in project execution, production planning and with EU projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Underestimation of implied work load Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Resources have been allocated flexibly between WPs. Budgets can be shifted between tasks. Mitigated by constant monitoring of the work and reallocation of resources to other WPs where necessary by the Project Coordinator (after approval of WP leaders concerned).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A partner is unable to work effectively with other partners and/or collaborators to the project. Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP1, WP10, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>Since RiConfigure involves important interaction with stakeholders, policy-makers and networks the partners need to communicate and collaborate effectively and be able to establish good interpersonal relations. If investigation of the problem reveals that the partner is not suited to make the needed relations then remedies as moving responsibilities or in a severe situation to exclude a partner may need to be initiated. However, the risk is regarded as very low, since all partners are professional facilitators of and</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>6</td>
<td>The development of methodology in WP1 for WP2-5 more challenging than anticipated Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5</td>
<td>A minor risk, as all partners has expertise in, and experience with public engagement or multi-stakeholder engagement. And the coordinator and task leader is internationally renowned for developing and implementing such engagement activities, national, international and global.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Unwillingness of professionals and policy-makers to participate in network and dissemination activities. Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP7, WP8, WP9</td>
<td>The risk is as relative low, as professionals and policy-makers have great interest to bring their view forward within R&amp;I. However, should it appear, then active and direct personal communication will be initiated by the Coordinator to identify causes and clear the way for the needed collaboration. Furthermore, all organization is well-respected with extensive professional network, which they will draw upon. Finally, collaboration with OECD and the advisory panel with both private sector, professional and research representatives can be leveraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A partner fails to pilot one of the training programs. Likelihood: Low</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>If this problem arises, and in order to avoid having a program left un-piloted, UPF will assume responsibility and will organize the pilot of the specific program.</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>Total Person/Months per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - DBT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - IHS</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - WU</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>40.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - Fraunhofer</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - ACAC</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>25.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - FAO</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - BCE</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - CORO</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - LBG</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>25.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - S-ISPT</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - UPF</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>39.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Person/Months</strong></td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>43.50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67.75</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>407.25</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>18</td>
<td>Brussels or Coordinator's venue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Brussels or Coordinator's venue</td>
<td></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**
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1. EXCELLENCE

The RiConfigure project will enable the diversification of constellations, institutions and actors in research and innovation (R&I) by engaging stakeholders, enhancing conceptual clarity on new constellations, and disseminating best practices to practitioners and policy-makers. The project centers on stakeholder engagement in four social labs. In the social labs, actors from research, industry, the public sector, and civil society will explore how each of them can and do initiate and navigate cross-sectoral collaboration in R&I. Explorations in the labs are complimented by 100+ empirical case studies. On this empirical basis, the project produces a ‘quadruple helix’ framework to provide conceptual clarification on new constellations in R&I. Expanding the circle of engagement to ensure stakeholder relevance, practitioners and policy-makers can provide challenges and inquiries to the project’s explorations through dedicated dialogue events.

The project enables the spread of good practices by facilitating dissemination throughout practitioners’ and policy-makers’ networks, and by providing training to key stakeholders. The project will reach audiences in all relevant sectors through targeted communication and help actors to initiate and support new constellations in R&I by providing inspiration and guidance in the form of handbooks, infotainment videos, on- and offline training, policy briefs, and evidence-based analyses.

The project enables the change of R&I governance frameworks at multiple levels by providing evidence on how such frameworks may hinder or help new R&I constellations and by providing dialogue-opportunities to policy-makers. Initiated by a consortium of actors from all relevant sectors, the project will speak to crosscutting issues with credibility. The project pays special attention to RRI, but in a manner that integrates with broader issues of open collaboration in R&I and governance-support for such collaboration.

1.1. Objectives

Contemporary society is facing a range of ‘grand challenges’ that are as much a consequence of earlier R&I outcomes applied on a global scale as they are targets for new innovative solutions. Motivated by moral obligation to help address these challenges and pressured from the outside to legitimize themselves in relation to societal needs, existing institutions and actors in the knowledge economy are playing new roles and entering into new constellations of collaboration across sectoral divides. Meanwhile, new institutions and organized actors are cropping up to pursue new approaches to R&I. Guided by visions for a more ‘civic university’, universities are seeking to contribute more directly to local and global civil society. Sensitive to the growing power of globalized activist consumers, corporations are breaking new ground in balancing responsibilities to shareholders against social responsibility through public engagement. Mindful of the failures of current economic frameworks to provide socially and environmentally sustainable growth, public sector organizations are taking on more entrepreneurial roles and aiming for more resilient forms of public innovation. Citizens’ groups and civil society organizations are breaking out of their traditional protest and oversight roles and take matters into their own hands whether through the ’maker movement’, social entrepreneurship or sustainable innovation. At the same time, normative demands are being explicated by policy-makers, which may previously have been only implicit. At European level, institutions and actors are called upon to navigate towards new forms of collective responsibility for addressing societal challenges. At national and local/ regional level, governance actors are revisiting traditional assumptions about R&I processes and are increasingly seeking to motivate and support cross-sectoral collaboration and co-creation.

---

5 cf. the Lund Declaration 2009; 2015; the Rome Declaration 2014
to achieve smart specialization\textsuperscript{6}. These changes amount to “a regime shift in the evolution of science and of its interactions with society”, namely a ‘re-contextualization of science in society’ away from ‘Science, the Endless Frontier’ to ‘Strategic Science’ and challenge-driven innovation with all that this entails in terms of institutional changes\textsuperscript{7}. For the European Commission the notion of ‘Open Science’ is descriptive of these changes to “the modus operandi of the scientific system” (op. cit.).

The main challenge facing practitioners and policy-makers who seek to strengthen and support these changes to the constellations of R&I, according to the European Commission, is that “the various (and tentative) accounts and narratives of the relationship between science and society (e.g. its importance, the degree of urgency to act […] depend on the normative approaches adopted” (op. cit.). In other words, new constellations and new roles in innovation are conceptualized, strategized and practiced in highly diverse ways depending on the outlooks of different types of actors, which creates as much confusion as inspiration. Different strands of research and policy literature that center on such new constellations agree on the value of increased integration between R&I and society but disagree on the nature of that value. While the enthusiasm for cross-sectoral R&I collaboration shared by these approaches provides a general impetus for the diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in R&I, the many different hopes and ambitions attached to them may lead to conceptual confusion and strategic indecisiveness both among practitioners and policy-makers. For instance, in user-driven innovation, users get involved in the development of products and services that they use in their everyday lives and help to zoom in on areas of improvement and potentials for innovation\textsuperscript{8}. In open science, R&I efforts open up to engagement all relevant stakeholders through transparency, dialogue, and knowledge sharing.\textsuperscript{9} In open innovation 2.0, networking and collaboration between civil society and traditional innovation actors is a crucial component in innovation processes aiming for shared-value production\textsuperscript{10}. In smart specialization, regional policy is mobilized in a crosscutting manner by Research and Innovation Strategies for Smart Specialization (RIS3-strategies) to align research and innovation capacities with regional business strengths and social actors (Carayannis et al. op. cit.). In responsible research and innovation (RRI), inclusiveness and responsiveness facilitated through public engagement is seen as a key factor in ensuring the societal readiness of innovations\textsuperscript{11}.

While these multiple approaches that advocate collaboration may inspire practitioners to engage in new R&I constellations. The great diversity of approaches to the value of collaboration entails a risk that best practices for initiating and navigating such constellations are not transmitted effectively to actors. At the same time, the necessary transformation of governance frameworks to support these new constellations may be delayed due to a lack of clear, evidence-based decision support for policy-makers.

The RiConfigure project will address this challenge by pursuing the following six objectives:

1. Engage stakeholders in the diversification of R&I-constellations and roles  
2. Enhance conceptual clarity on new constellations and new institutions and actors in R&I  
3. Facilitate the dissemination of good practices throughout multiple practitioners’ networks  
4. Inform and train key stakeholders to accelerate the uptake of good practices  
5. Involve policy-makers in mutual learning to inspire changes to R&I governance  
6. Support policy-makers with evidence to enable changes to R&I governance frameworks

Each objective and the means, by which RiConfigure pursues them, are described and explained below.

\textsuperscript{6} Carayannis, E., & Grigoroudis, E. (2016). Quadruple Innovation Helix and smart specialization: knowledge production and national competitiveness. \textit{Форосфайм}, 1 (eng)).

\textsuperscript{7} European Commission: \textit{Science with and for Society, Work Programme 2016-17}, p. 5-7


\textsuperscript{9} European Commission 2016: \textit{Open Science, Open Innovation , Open to the World – a vision for Europe, DG Research and Innovation.}


Objective 1 Engage stakeholders in the diversification of R&I-constellations and roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Implement four social labs to identify good practices for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* initiating and maintaining new cross-sectoral R&amp;I-constellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* achieving RRI-objectives within new R&amp;I-constellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* supporting new R&amp;I-constellations through R&amp;I governance frameworks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collaborative forms of innovation, which couple institutions and actors together in constellations - variously referred to as cross-sectoral partnerships, multi-stakeholder alliances, public engagement – are generally understood to enhance the capacity for effectively addressing the complex and ‘wicked’ public problems, which make up the grand challenges of our time. By “linking and sharing of information, resources, activities, and capabilities”, it is expected that such collaborations may “achieve jointly an outcome that could not be achieved by organizations in one sector alone”12 However, a number of factors contribute to ‘collaboration failure’, including actors’ different problem understandings, framings, values, and motivations13. After a period of relative exuberance regarding the potentials of collaboration, recurring observations of ‘collaboration failure’ have led most observers to adopt a more judicious approach, with many emphasizing ‘collaborative advantages’ as necessary for collaboration success14.

Taking the reality of collaboration failure into account, RiConfigure will perform a practice-based exploration of how initiators and participants in collaborative R&I-processes succeed or fail in initiating and navigating these new constellations. This exploration will engage stakeholders involved in actual collaboration projects in a dialogue-based appraisal of the practical usefulness and effectiveness of some of the tools currently promoted by promoters of collaborative approaches to R&I. In this context, the project explores the usefulness and impacts of process methods, RRI tools, and governance frameworks on new collaborative R&I-constellations. These focus points are relevant because ‘process methods’ are central to many current approaches to collaboration, because ‘RRI tools’ (e.g. gathered by RRI Tools, Engage2020, NewHoRRIzon, and others) provide evidence-based approaches for putting RRI into practice, and because ‘governance frameworks’ are precisely those economic, legal and normative structures by which public authorities seek to incentivize and guide R&I activities in socially desirable directions. Learning about these focus points will help improve understandings of how actors inside and outside new R&I-constellations can act to ensure that these constellations succeed in their efforts to address societal challenges.

The project’s vehicle for engaging stakeholders in this exploration is four social labs. A Social Lab (SL) is defined as “a container of social experiments, with a team, a process and space to support social innovation”15. In this project, it is meaningful to think of an SL as an inter-project team that supports each other’s ventures into new R&I-constellations. To appraise the value of existing process methods and RRI tools critically, the project will consolidate a toolbox of previously gathered tools for collaboration and make this toolbox available for implementation by participants in the four SLs. By comparing and contrasting practitioners’ experiences and reflections, the project will provide evidence-based reasons for recommending ‘best practices’ and warning of blind alleys in new R&I-constellations. At the same time, by observing and comparing the apparent impacts that relevant public governance frameworks for R&I policy have on the observed R&I-constellations, and by analyzing correlations between these frameworks and the self-defined success or failure of the collaboration in each case, the project will be able to provide evidence-based recommendations for innovation policy at multiple levels of governance.

---

Objective 2 Enhance conceptual clarity on new constellations and new institutions and actors in R&I

Means

- Place new constellations in a common quadruple helix (QH) framework
- Analyze and compare collaboration, RRI and governance in 100+ cases
- Build an empirically based QH-typology of new constellations in R&I

Building on the quadruple helix (QH) approach to R&I, RiConfigure will use the QH concept as a general framework within which to understand and discuss new constellations of institutions and actor in R&I. **QH-collaboration is defined as** “an innovation cooperation model or innovation environment in which users, firms, universities and public authorities cooperate in order to produce innovations. These innovations can be anything that is considered useful for the cooperating partners; they can be, for example, technological, social, product, service, commercial and non-commercial innovations.”16 This project adopts this definition with the modification that ‘users’ is replaced by ‘civil society’.

The CLIQ-project developed an ideal-typical schema for categorizing QH-cases; a schema consisting of one type of QH-collaboration for each of the four strands with 16 cases providing empirical validation for the typology’s relevance.

RiConfigure will start from and advance beyond this ideal-typical categorization through extensive case-studies. A case of QH-collaboration is defined in this project as a rationally organized activity (such as a project, a platform, a strategy, or some other institutional arrangement), which seeks to facilitate the planned or open-ended collaboration between organizations from each of the four strands of the quadruple helix (research, industry, the public sector, civil society) on the achievement of common innovation aims. Each of the four social labs will involve 4-5 cases directly and explore 20+ cases in the literature. RiConfigure will thus in total assess 100+ cases in various depth. By comparing and contrasting the constellations of institutions and actors involved in QH-collaboration, as well as the roles that each of them play in these constellations, the project will create an empirically based typology of types and sub-types of QH-collaboration which will help innovation practitioners, policy-makers and researchers to navigate new and emerging constellations.

Underlying the CLIQ-typology for QH-collaboration is the assumption that that an important predictor of the nature of the results produced by QH-collaboration is whether the initiator of the collaboration is an organization from research, industry, the public sector, or civil society. For instance, in examples of QH-collaboration initiated by industry we should expect the business model to be central, i.e. the orientation of the collaboration on the development of a marketable product.

The RiConfigure project takes this difference in orientation as point of departure and explores quadruple helix innovation with a focus on the initiators of the collaboration. The project’s case analysis activities are therefore divided firstly according to the initiator in the cases studied. For instance, WP3 focuses on industry-initiated quadruple helix innovation, which means that all cases involved in WP3 are cases of collaborative innovation involving actors from research, industry, the public sector, and civil society in which an actor from industry has initiated the collaboration. **The term initiator is understood in this project as** a synonym for the ‘institution’, ‘actor’, ‘manager’ or ‘representative’ of one of the strands of the quadruple helix who has taken (or taken part in) the original initiative to begin the collaboration and retains a central role. Initiators from the research strand could be research group leaders, university professors, representatives from research centers, etc. Initiators from the industry strand could be company representatives, business development managers, etc. Initiators from the public-sector strand could be funding agencies, local and regional political representatives, etc. Initiators from the civil society strand could be civil society organization representatives, neighborhood associations, etc.

---

Objective 3  Facilitate the dissemination of good practices throughout multiple practitioners’ networks

Means

- Host dedicated practitioners’ dialogue events
- Facilitate the feed-in of practitioners’ challenges to the social labs

To enable the spread of good practices of QH-collaboration among innovation practitioners, RiConfigure will establish links to existing networks and platforms relevant to all four strands of the quadruple helix (including but not limited to members of European Technology Platforms (ETPs), European Knowledge and Innovation Communities (KICs), contributors to the Open Innovation 2.0 Yearbook, RRI hubs, and the Triple Helix Association). Within these networks and platforms, the project will identify individuals who function as central network nodes and invite these individuals to upstream engagement with the project. With the same contacts, the project will establish working relations with the practitioners’ networks and platforms in question to ensure dissemination of the project results through their newsletters, websites etc.

To support the emergence of a community of practice focused on the quadruple helix approach, RiConfigure will begin a tradition of annual dialogue events inviting innovation practitioners (through the above-mentioned networks and platforms) to meet and exchange practical experiences. In addition to their value as vehicles of dissemination and communication, these events will serve as conduits for feeding the reflections and challenges of other practitioners into the four SLs.

Objective 4  Inform and train key stakeholders to accelerate uptake of good practices

Means

Develop and disseminate:
- Practitioners’ handbooks
- Training programs
- Train-the-trainers program

To accelerate uptake in practice of the observations, experiences and analytical lessons learned in the four SLs and comparative analyses across the SLs, the project will develop a ‘train-the-trainers’ program, targeting innovation practitioners from each of the four strands of the QH, as well as developing and testing a practitioners’ QH-collaboration training program for uptake and exploitation by relevant organizations after the end of the project.

The training programs will be designed to facilitate experiential learning and uptake of best practices using problem-based learning methodology. The training programs will be supplemented by practitioners’ handbooks, also targeted at each of the four strands of the QH.

Objective 5  Involve policy-makers in mutual learning to inspire changes to R&I governance

Means

- Host dedicated policy-makers’ dialogue events
- Facilitate the feed-in of policy-makers’ inquiries to the comparative analyses

To inspire changes to existing innovation governance frameworks at local, regional, national, European and international level affecting QH-collaboration, RiConfigure will establish contacts with governance bodies and policy networks at all level (including but not limited to the Council of Regions, the European Research Area Council, the European Commission’s Innovation Radar initiative, and the OECD Science and Technology program). The project will identify individuals within these networks and platforms who function as central network nodes and invite these individuals to upstream engagement with the project. With the same contacts, the project will establish working relations with the policy-makers’ networks and platforms in question to ensure dissemination of project results through their newsletters, websites etc.
To support the emergence of a community of mutual learning on QH-collaboration among policy-makers, RiConfigure will supplement the annual practice-oriented events mentioned above with bi-annual policy-maker dialogues that update policy-makers on knowledge and experience from QH-collaboration and the role of governance frameworks in support of such collaborative R&I-processes. In addition to their value as vehicles of dissemination and communication, these bi-annual events will serve as conduits for feeding policy-makers’ inquiries into the SLs and comparative analysis of the project.

**Objective 6**  Support policy-makers with evidence to enable changes to R&I governance frameworks

**Means**
- Correlate findings about collaboration, RRI and governance impacts
- Identify the do’s and don’ts of R&I governance at multiple levels
- Produce evidence-based policy-recommendations

RiConfigure will produce policy recommendations targeted at local, regional, national and European/international levels as well as a QH-collaboration handbook. These recommendations will be based on analysis of the impacts of different governance frameworks on cases of QH-collaboration and the correlations between these impacts and the success or failure of QH-collaboration. Recommendations will furthermore provide responses to ‘policy-makers inquiries’, which will be fed into the analysis through policy-makers’ dialogue events. Policy-recommendations will be disseminated widely, the reach of communication efforts being enhanced by the communication channels of governance bodies and networks engaged by the project.

**1.2. Relation to the work program**

The RiConfigure project responds to the specific challenge of the topic SWAFS-05-2017 – New Constellations of Changing Actors and Institutions, which is part of the ‘Science with and for Society’ work programme for 2017-18. Table 1 (below) shows the alignment between the specific challenge and scope of SWAFS-05-2017, the overall priorities of the SWAFS programme inherited by the specific topic, and the RiConfigure project proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The SWAFS-05-2017 call</th>
<th>The RICONFIGURE response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific challenge</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New constellations of changing institutions and actors are emerging in research and innovation, which – when they help to articulate good practices – are in line with the priorities of the Science With and For Society Program, and which therefore mandate support.</td>
<td>RiConfigure is designed to explore and support new constellations in R&amp;I: how their collaborations succeed or fail; how they do and could articulate RRI; and how governance frameworks at multiple levels (local, regional, national governments, European institutions, others) can support these new constellations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The topic focuses on the importance of new constellations of actors (…) For example, key institutions are changing (e.g. civic universities, citizen companies); member states are reconsidering their STI policies; new actors are becoming involved, expanding the ‘triple helix’ to a ‘quadruple helix’; and regions, countries and sectors are adopting smart specialization strategies.</td>
<td>RiConfigure adopts the ‘quadruple helix’ approach as a general framework for understanding new constellations in which institutions and actors from all sectors of society (broadly: research, business, government, and civil society) cooperate in new or emerging ways on the creation of innovations with the potential to help address grand societal challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals for the topic will be initiated by consortia of relevant existing and new actors (research organizations, industry, civil society)</td>
<td>RiConfigure is initiated by a ‘quadruple helix’-constellation of institutions and actors. The project consortium consists of organizations from research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
organizations, and policy makers). These consortia will in themselves articulate those evolving practices, which the call text outlines ‘new constellations’.

(partners 2,3,4,7,9); industry (partner 10; policy (third parties 8 a,b,c); and civil society (partners 1, 5, 6. Furthermore, ‘Case Partners’ (see ‘Social Labs Methodology below) will bring their own active quadruple helix projects into the social labs.

There will be a reflective aspect, mapping and analyzing what is happening with respect to new constellations; perhaps placing observed developments in larger economic frameworks.

RiConfigure will map and categorize quadruple helix-collaboration in 100+ cases.
The project will explore and analyze the use and impacts of different process methods, RRI tools, and governance frameworks in all cases.

The proposals would require specific attention to RRI issues, but not necessarily be limited to it.

RiConfigure pays specific attention to RRI issues, but does not limit is exploration or analysis to RRI. The social labs explore the practical uses and impacts of RRI tools mapped and analyzed by previous projects, the comparative case analysis will integrate the RRI monitoring framework developed in MORRI, and RRI aspects will be given specific attention in network events, policy briefs, training materials, and communication. This focus on RRI will be supplemented by a focus on collaboration practices (particularly process methods) and governance frameworks.

A somewhat independent actor might lead the project, since some such organizations have already been involved in RRI, and since one generally acknowledge way of managing conflicts and nurturing trust between organizations from different sectors – e.g. science and society – is to have ‘boundary organizations’ act as brokers or mediators.

The coordinator (partner 1) of RiConfigure is a ‘boundary organization’ established to broker between R&I-actors, policy-makers, and the public. The other leaders of the social labs (partners 2, 3 and 4) also have boundary-spanning missions. Most partners have extensive previous experience in RRI research and practice.

### Expected impact

| Enable diversification of actors and stakeholders in research and innovation processes. | RiConfigure will engage stakeholders in the diversification of R&I-constellations and roles and support diversification by enhancing conceptual clarity on new constellations and new institutions and actors in R&I |
| Enable the spread of good practices among actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations. | RiConfigure will facilitate the dissemination of good practices throughout multiple practitioners’ networks and accelerate uptake by informing and training key stakeholders. |
| Enable the transformation of governance frameworks that affect actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations. | RiConfigure will involve policy-makers in mutual learning to inspire changes to R&I governance and support policy-makers with evidence enabling changes to R&I governance frameworks |

### Crosscutting priorities

| Open Science | RiConfigure is based on transparent, open, inclusive, and networked collaboration. RiConfigure results will be made freely available to stakeholders and the interested public in digital form and, where relevant, limited print editions. |
| Open Innovation | RiConfigure makes purposive use of inflows and outflows of knowledge and experience to and from... |

---
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stakeholders to accelerate the project’s practical and conceptual innovations. The project combines the power of ideas and knowledge from multiple (types of) actors to create practically relevant knowledge, which is of shared value to a wide range of stakeholders.

### Additional thematic priorities of the SWAFS 2016-17 work programme relevant to the SWAFS-05 topic (set out in SWAFS 2016-17, p.8)

| Projects in this theme must enable institutional change to support responsible research and innovation in research performing and funding organizations | RiConfigure enables institutions change supporting RRI in research performing and funding organizations by identifying best practices for RRI in QH-collaborations specifically correlated to the roles of RFPOs in such collaborations. |
| Projects must contribute to implementing the RRI keys in an integrated way | RiConfigure contributes to integrated implementation of the RRI keys in terms of both collaboration practice and R&I governance by exploring and analyzing the use and impacts of RRI tools in correlation with process methods and governance frameworks. |
| Projects must contribute to the implementation of the ERA priorities, a greater involvement of all stakeholders, and a better and more sustainable engagement with society. | RiConfigure will engage with a broad range of R&I stakeholders through multiple practitioners’ and policy-makers’ networks, including national-level R&I ministries and engaged involved in the governance of the European Research Area. By establishing cross-sectoral collaborations, dialogues and network connections, RiConfigure contributes to a more sustainable engagement with society. |

**1.3. Concept and methodology, quality of the coordination and support measures**

**1.3.1 Overall concept behind the RiConfigure project**

The overall conception behind the RiConfigure project is the notion that the support, which is currently needed for the diversification of R&I constellations in order to address the grand challenges of our time, is to establish trust and a common understanding across sectoral divides between stakeholders, while at the same time providing clear and compelling experiences, accounts and evidence of the advantages to be gained from collaborating in such new constellations and with new institutions and actors. To provide such support, the project will coordinate a range of closely connected spaces and processes of practical collaboration experiences that will facilitate dialogue and learning-by-doing, while systematically gathering first-hand accounts and analytical evidence in order to disseminate these through trusted networks, training, and targeted communication. This overall conception involves a set of closely related methodological choices and the mobilization of ideas, models and assumptions, which are explicated below.

**1.3.2 Ideas, models and assumptions: New constellations as patterns quadruple helix patterns**

RiConfigure draws on recent conceptual developments regarding R&I processes and their relation to society. These are outlined below.

**Quadruple helix (QH) research and innovation**

The central theoretical concept underpinning RiConfigure is that of quadruple helix collaboration (as defined in 1.1. Objective page 6). This concept puts into abstract formula an insight common to many contemporary schools of thought on innovation and its relationship to growth, societal inclusiveness and ecological sustainability. In a nutshell, this insight is that in order to understand and support contemporary R&I processes, the types of actors recognized as important to these processes must be expanded to include ‘users’
in the broadest sense of the term, i.e. civil society and the public at large. Traditionally, Schumpeterian innovation theory and its derivatives\(^\text{17}\) have focused on the roles played by industrial actors in innovation, among them entrepreneurs and large enterprises\(^\text{18}\). Post-war innovation policy paradigms, however, placed an equally central emphasis on the role of universities and other research-performing actors\(^\text{19}\); a role that was increasingly diversified and eventually made necessary a distinction between discipline-based research and innovation and application-oriented research and innovation (mode 1 and mode 2)\(^\text{20}\). The role of state organizations was long underestimated or taken for granted until, with the emergence first of the triple helix framework,\(^\text{21}\) the interactions between research, industry and public-sector actors increasingly came to the fore in innovation theory. Still, the active roles that actors in civil society may play as active participants in R&I processes long went unrecognized in mainstream innovation theory until mounting evidence from practitioners and observers in closely related fields\(^\text{22}\) was finally drawn together in the quadruple helix framework (Carayannis et al. op. cit). The quadruple helix is perhaps the most generally applicable theoretical framework, which takes the expansion of R&I process participants to a broader range of societal actors as its starting point.

**Responsible research and innovation (RRI)**

RRI seeks to set in motion an “on-going process of aligning research and innovation to the values, needs and expectations of society” (cf. the Rome Declaration). On this definition, RRI is a R&I policy approach that seeks to transcend the decades long tug-of-war between on the one hand the ambitions of science to remain a self-governing republic and on the other hand political ambitions to steer science towards social needs\(^\text{23}\). By way of operationalizing the RRI governance paradigm, the European Commission launched the ‘RRI keys’ in 2011.\(^\text{24}\) The RRI keys stress the responsibility of R&I practitioners and governance actors to ensure that R&I activities to: engage with stakeholders to frame societal challenges and solutions; promote gender equality to unlock the human resources of women; enhance science education to boost creativity in the next generations; give open access to research results to accelerate innovation; and ensure ethical behavior to maximize the societal relevance of R&I. Because both concepts emphasize cross-sectoral collaboration and orientation towards societal needs, there is an immediate affinity between the QH and RRI approaches to R&I. The value added to RRI by the QH concept is the acute awareness of the ways in which the motivations of different types of initiators shape such collaborations; a perspective missing from RRI with regard, for instance, to the objectives that industry organizations pursue in QH-collaboration (Lubberink et al. op. cit.).

**R&I governance frameworks**

“Governance” is a mode of government that variously emphasizes co-regulation, co-steering, co-production, cooperative management and co-creation “on the borderline between government and society.”\(^\text{25}\) Governance approaches are especially attractive to organizations with little capacity for direct management of the societal sectors they seek to steer. Such is the case for many public authorities who seek to shape the course of R&I in their territories, but whose efforts often overlap and compete and sometimes clash with each other in terms of their power to direct R&I efforts within the territories that they effect. This is particularly true in the EU where multiple level of governance at local, regional, national, and European level are not always well aligned\(^\text{26}\). To provide support for new constellations in R&I, these overlaps between governance frameworks

---


\(^{25}\) European Commission (2012): Responsible Research and Innovation: Europe’s ability to respond to societal challenges.

at different levels must enhance, rather than counteract, synergistic effects between innovation collaborations and innovation policy agendas. This means at least that smart specialization strategies in the regions (RIS3); national research and innovation strategies coordinated within the ERA cooperation; and European-level strategies for stimulating the emergence of science-with-and-for-society approaches (such as RRI and Open Science) must work in conjunction. If such synergy between different R&I-governance levels is achieved, each level will be better able to both gain from and contribute to the emergence of new constellations, institutions, and actors.

1.3.3 Methodology: Building trust through engagement

The RiConfigure methodology centers on dynamic and highly interactive stakeholder engagement, which is structured using social lab methodology, problem-based learning methodology, and practical approaches to facilitating mutual learning in R&I networks. These are described below.

**Social lab methodology (WP2, 3, 4 and 5)**

A Social Lab (SL) is a container for social experiments and mutual learning (cf. Kieboom op. cit). The aim of SLs is to facilitate mutual learning through experimental implementation of new ways of working accompanied by dialogue and reflection among the participants. SL methodology thus enables stakeholders to work together on diagnosing common challenges, appraising current practices, and experimenting with interventions to deal effectively with potential barriers.

In each of the four SLs in RI-Configure, R&I practitioners are brought together who come from different places (towns, cities, regions, or states), but who all:

- Work on a closely related societal challenge (e.g. in WP3 all participants work on the challenge of sustainable energy),
- Do so in a project or program involving all four strands of the quadruple helix (i.e. research, industry, the public sector, or civil society),
- Represent organizations from the same strand of the quadruple helix (e.g. in WP3 all participants are from industry)

Participants in each SL play a number of different roles. The SL Leader acts as a facilitator and manager of all common SL implementation processes, provides a space for the SL Panel to meet, and manages all reporting from the SL. The four SL Leaders are partners 1, 2, 3 and 4, all of which are different forms of ‘boundary organizations’ with the mission of brokering between strands of the quadruple helix. In each SL there is one or two ‘main cases’, each of which is represented by a ‘Case Partner’, i.e. a consortium member (except public-sector, which are the third-party members, see LOI). Partners 5,8,10 are such Case Partners, all of which are R&I practitioners dedicated to addressing different societal challenges. The project provides the Case Partner the extra manpower, resources and expertise needed to carry out social experiments in relation to the case, which might otherwise not be feasible, thereby expanding the projects’ opportunities for learning. The person representing the Case Partner should either be a decision-maker in that organization or be in direct contact with a decision-maker with the authority to shape and change the case project, which the Case Partner brings to the social lab. The Case Partner furthermore acts as an advocate for lessons learned in the SL in relation to the other SLs (in WP6), case-related stakeholders outside the project (in the SL’s outreach activities), and the stakeholders engaged through networking in WP7. ‘Mirror Case Representatives’ are SL participants who represent cases, but are not consortium members. Mirror Case Representatives have all the same opportunities as Case Partners, but must provide their own funding for implementing social experiments. Their obligation therefore extends only to SL Panel participation; all other activities undertaken as extension of the SL are purely voluntary.

The reason for having for SLs divided according to these criteria is both scientific and pragmatic. On the one hand, dividing cases and their representatives in a way that groups them according to sector and societal challenge eliminates these factors from the subsequent analysis. In this way, analyses of the cases belong to a particular SL can better focus on the factors of interest (i.e. process methods, RRI tools, and governance
frameworks). Particularly, grouping Case Partners who come from the same sector, but who are based in different regions, together will facilitate the identification of differences between cases that occur specifically due to the effects of regionally different governance frameworks. At the same time, comparative analysis across the SLs becomes better able to identify the effect of the initiator-type on the processes and outcomes of the collaboration (i.e. whether it makes a discernible difference that all cases in WP3 are initiated by industry). On the other hand, dividing cases and participants in this way is a precondition for the engagement of participants, who must feel that there is a real advantage to be gained from their participation.

Central to the SL methodology is the idea of ‘social experiments’. A social experiment is an intervention that is built on the level of the Social Lab and tested in the different cases that are part of the social lab. The aim of the interventions is to accelerate and improve the R&I-processes that are already taking place within the cases. Working with social experiments is anchored in the ‘learning cycle’. Each SL involves four such learning cycles in which workshops that facilitate dialogue and reflection on common challenges and practical solution in the SL Panel are interspaced with 6-month experimental periods in which each SL participant, supported by the SL leader, implements possible solutions and reports back to the SL Panel on their experiences.

Comparative analysis supported crosscutting dialogue (WP6)

RiConfigure carries out comparative analyses using standard mixed-methods tools on three different sets of characteristics of the 100+ main, mirror and reference cases of QH-collaboration analyzed in WP2,3, 4, and 5, namely: i) QH-collaboration praxis (the criteria for success/failure employed in the cases, the roles played, the types of actors involved, the types of constellations, and the practices of collaboration); ii) RRI in QH-collaboration (practices for ensuring compatibility with RRI); and iii) impacts of public governance frameworks on QH-collaboration. With these three analyses in hand, WP6 will have made possible a higher-order correlation analysis to identify recurring patterns and outliers in the interrelation between QH praxis, RRI, and innovation governance frameworks (the specific methods used will be decided in task 1.1).

Mutual learning in R&I networks (WP7)

To facilitate dialogue and interaction between stakeholders involved in the four social labs and broader networks of innovation practitioners and policy-makers, RiConfigure employs the “Mutual learning exercise” approach. As described by Zwart et al., “mutual learning exercises (MLEs) aim to bring together various groups of stakeholders (researchers, potential users, intermediaries, professionals, students, media, broader publics) to facilitate an interactive learning process through mutual exposure of views and experiences, expectations and concerns.” In-depth dialogues are encouraged by innovative methods, such as MLE, since they provide with a “stage where multiple (and sometimes unexpected) perspectives are mutually exposed to one another, in order to move beyond traditional ‘experts vs. lay audience’ forms of exchange, thereby allowing participants to mutually probe and question each other’s views” (ibid.)

Problem-based learning (PBL) (WP8)

PBL is an approach to training that puts the learning person’s personal processes of acquiring information in the pursuit of problem solving as the basic mechanism for acquiring new knowledge. The approach considers the development of solutions as an open-ended process that cuts across different learning situations in an organic way. It is thus in essence an approach to training that places learning-by-doing at the heart of learning in general. PBL thus emphasizes the need to couple training situations with real-life practical situations so as to activate the full range of experience, knowledge and capacities, which the learner already brings into the situation. PBL in RiConfigure is implemented as group processes involving, where possible,

learners from all the strands of the quadruple helix in order to facilitate learning-by-doing concerning cross-sectoral collaboration and problem solving.

1.3.4 National and international R&I activities linked to the project

The RiConfigure draws on and/or contributes to the following international activities, which are directly related to different aspects of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of activity</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FP7 / H2020 projects</td>
<td>CLIQ</td>
<td>Benchmark for quadruple helix explorations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MORRI</td>
<td>Indicators for monitoring RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RRI Tools</td>
<td>Tools and approaches for practicing RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NewHoRRIzon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HERRI</td>
<td>Approaches to training RRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practitioners’ networks or platforms</td>
<td>The Social Labs</td>
<td>Practice-learning about cross-sectoral collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ETPs, KICs</td>
<td>Knowledge-sharing about open innovation practice in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OpenInnovation2.0</td>
<td>cross-sectoral settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Triple Helix Ass.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-makers’ networks or platforms</td>
<td>Committee of the</td>
<td>Network for sharing best practices between European</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regions (network)</td>
<td>regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Research</td>
<td>Peer review group for sharing best practices between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area Council</td>
<td>R&amp;I ministries in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OECD BNCT</td>
<td>International working group on policies for R&amp;I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>governance, incl. innovation practice and ELSA asp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.5 Sex and gender analysis

RiConfigure has a specific focus on gender, both as an aspect to be researched in the design of future innovation technologies, and in the project process. This is based on the conviction that the consideration of gender in research and innovation leads to scientific excellence that responds to societal challenges. By including sex and gender research, RiConfigure will achieve better science targeted effective opportunities for R&I. Sex, age and gender analysis of data is often lacking, leaving important gaps. For example, research needs to explore how men and women experience health and health care from a multi-dimensional perspective. The consideration of gender differences could be of relevance for the up-take of the research results by both industry and consumers in the innovation/technology field. In addition to other RRI aspects, RiConfigure will monitor gender aspects of all case studies as part of the analysis of correlation between observable cases characteristics in task 6.2. Partner 4 will contribute specifically to this aspect of the task. The project consortium consists of slightly more women than men (section 4.1).

Although there is an increase in the numbers of women’s participating in research, they are underrepresented in top scientific positions. To have a competitive European research needs to recruit the best researchers both male and female and ensure gender balance in research. All project groups and boards will take into account the gender balance when being established to ensure diversity, aiming to exceed the European Commission’s target of 40% of the under-represented gender in panels and groups, and of 50% in advisory groups. The Advisory Panel will take gender into account as one of the dimensions on which feedback will be integrated into the project, and also a criterion for the project evaluation.
2. Impact

2.1 Expected impacts

RiConfigure responds to the SWAFS-05-2017 call for a project on ‘New constellations of changing institutions and actors’, which is a part of the work program for Science with and for Society (SWAFS-2016-17). The project has been specifically designed to deliver an effective contribution to achieving the expected impacts expressed in the topic call as well as the work program.

The expected impacts as expressed in the call are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact I</th>
<th>Enable the diversification of actors and stakeholders in research and innovation processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected impact II</td>
<td>Enable the spread of good practices among actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected impact III</td>
<td>Enable the transformation of governance frameworks that affect actor and stakeholders involved in new constellations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achieving expected impact I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable the diversification of actors and stakeholders in research and innovation processes</td>
<td>1) Engage stakeholders in the diversification of R&amp;I-constellations and roles</td>
<td>Implement four social labs to identify good practices (T2.6, 3.6, 4.6, 5.6) or: .. for initiating and maintaining new cross-sectoral R&amp;I-constellations (T6.1)</td>
<td>Workshop reports from four social panels (D2.3, 3.3, 4.3, 5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.. for achieving RRI-objectives within new R&amp;I-constellations (T6.2)</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of RRI in QH-collaboration (D.6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.. for supporting new R&amp;I-constellations through R&amp;I governance frameworks (T6.3)</td>
<td>Comparative analysis of governance of QH-collaboration (D6.3) plus policy-makers’ handbook (D6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Enhance conceptual clarity on new constellations and new institutions and actors in R&amp;I</td>
<td>Place new constellations in a common quadruple helix (QH) framework (T1.1)</td>
<td>Analytical framework (D1.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze and compare collaboration, RRI and governance in 100+ cases (T2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.3)</td>
<td>Comparative analyses of process methods (D6.1), RRI Tools (D6.2), and governance frameworks (D6.3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To enable the diversification of actors and stakeholders in the research and innovation processes, RiConfigure will enhance conceptual clarity on new constellations and roles of institutions and actors in innovation by providing an analytical framework based on the QH-collaboration concept, within which different constellations and roles can be understood more systematically than before (WP1). Applying this framework to 100+ case studies, the project will develop an empirically grounded typology of constellations and roles (including new actor types) (WP6). RiConfigure will further support diversification by identifying good practices for initiating and collaborating on QH-collaboration, for RRI in QH-collaboration, and for governance of QH-collaboration. This identification will draw on practitioners’ experiences and reflections in four social labs, one for each strand of the quadruple helix (WP2, 3, 4 and 5) and comparative analyses (WP6). Lessons learned about best practice will be expressed in practitioners’ accounts and a policy-makers’ handbook. Table 2.1.1 describes in the detail the success criteria and key performance indicators for measuring achievement of the first expected impact.

Table 2.1.1 – Measurement of progress towards expected impact I for SWAFS-05-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Enable the diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in R&amp;I processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Qualification of impact</strong></td>
<td>Conceptual and practical resources are made available for free utilization by relevant target groups which, if and when taken up by stakeholders in innovation practice and governance, will empower representatives of all the four strands of the quadruple helix to engage with confidence in new constellations and to play new roles in innovation processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key performance indicator(s)</strong></td>
<td>90% of participants in practitioners’ events and policy-makers’ events (WP7) agree that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the analytical framework and the typology help to provide conceptual clarification on new constellations and roles in R&amp;I processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• best practices for QH-collaboration expressed in the practitioners’ accounts and policy-makers’ handbook provide useful guidance to their respective audiences thus supporting diversification of actors and stakeholders in R&amp;I processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achieving expected impact II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable the spread of good practices among actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations</td>
<td>3) Facilitate the dissemination of good practices throughout multiple practitioners’ networks</td>
<td>Host dedicated practitioners’ dialogue events facilitating the feed-in of practitioners’ challenges to the social labs (T2.3, 3.3, 4.4, 5.3, 7.2, 9.8)</td>
<td>Workshop reports from 4x4 SL Panel workshops (D2.3, 3.3, 4.3, 5.3), practitioners’ events and final conference (D7.2, D9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.. and carry out extensive communication (T9.3, 9.4, 9.7)</td>
<td>Communication packages distributed via project website, social media, and conference participation (D9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 9.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4) Inform and train key stakeholders to accelerate uptake of good practices</td>
<td>Develop practitioners’ handbooks (T9.6)</td>
<td>Booklet series on initiating QH-collaboration (D9.6) with infotainment videos (D9.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To enable the spread of good practices for QH-collaboration collaboration and RRI in QH-collaboration, RiConfigure will engage with multiple innovation practitioners’ networks with a Europe-wide or international scope (WP7). Members of these networks will be engaged directly through dedicated dialogue events on QH-collaboration and will be able to feed-in ‘Practitioners’ Challenges’ to the SLs in order to ensure the relevance and embeddedness of the lessons learned in the practical realities of innovation collaboration outside of the particular cases involved in the SLs (WP7). Through these networks –in addition to the networks of consortium member organizations - the major practice-oriented outputs of the project will be disseminated to a large number of practitioners (WP7 and 9). To accelerate the uptake of best practices of QH-collaboration collaboration and RRI in QH-collaboration training programs will be made available to network members and other interested practitioners (WP8). Table 2.1.1 describes in the detail the success criteria and key performance indicators for measuring progress towards achieving of the second expected impact.

Table 2.1.2 - Measurement of progress towards expected impact II for SWAFS-05-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Enable the spread of good practices among actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification of impact</td>
<td>Analytical results and practical lessons about how practitioners can initiate, navigate and co-manage new constellations of innovation collaboration are embedded in the practical realities of innovation practitioners and disseminated to broad and targeted audiences among innovation practitioners through shallow as well as deep forms of communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key performance indicator(s) | • Notifications and ‘teasers’ about all major practitioner-oriented results (practitioners’ accounts, comparative analyses, booklet series) will be disseminated to 10,000+ unique readers/visitors through the newsletters, websites and social media of the consortium and the stakeholder organizations engaged in WP7.  
• The five ‘YouTube-friendly’ infotainment videos (D9.5) gather 500 ‘likes’ or shares via social media each.  
• 250+ innovation practitioners will be engaged in dedicated dialogue events (T2.3, 3.3, 4.3, 5.3, 7.2, 9.8)  
• 50+ practitioners will test QH-collaboration training programs  
• 2 consortium member organizations and 2 network organizations will make training programs available after the end of the project |

Achieving expected impact III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Project objectives</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enable the transformation of governance frameworks that affect actor and stakeholders</td>
<td>5) Involve policy-makers in mutual learning to inspire changes to R&amp;I governance</td>
<td>Host dedicated policy-makers’ dialogue events facilitating the feed-in of policy-makers’ inquiries to the comparative analyses (T2.5, 3.5, 4.5, 5.5, 7.3)</td>
<td>Two policy-makers’ workshop reports (D7.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blog-posts on case-specific stakeholder meetings (D2.5, 3.5, 4.5, 5.5)
involved in new constellations

6) Support policy-makers with evidence to enable changes to R&I governance frameworks

Produce evidence-based policy recommendations, incl do’s and don’ts for R&I governance at multiple levels (T7.4, 6.4)

Four policy briefs summarizing the main policy-relevant findings (D7.4)

A policy-makers’ handbook for supporting QH-collaboration (D6.4, 9.6)

To enable the transformation of the governance frameworks at local, regional, national and European/international level that affect actors and stakeholders involved in new constellations of R&I, RiConfigure will provide evidence-based policy recommendations (do’s and don’ts) about how to support QH-collaboration and RRI in QH-collaboration through innovation policies. This evidence will be provided in the form of four policy briefs (WP7) and a policy-makers’ handbook on QH-collaboration governance available both as a full report (WP6) and a booklet (WP9). To inspire changes to the governance frameworks – using the provided evidence or otherwise inspired by the project – dedicated dialogue events will be hosted both in relation to specific cases involved in WP2, 3, 4, and 5 and in relation to the governance bodies and networks involved in WP7. In addition to helping spread the do’s and don’ts identified in the project among policy-makers, the latter events will also provide the opportunity for policy-makers to help shape the process of reflection in the SLs (WP2, 3, 4 and 5) as well as the comparative analysis (WP6) by feeding in ‘Policy-makers’ inquiries’ to these work packages, thereby helping to create a sense of ownership among the policy-makers thus engaged. Table 2.1.3 describes in the detail the success criteria and key performance indicators for measuring achievement of the first expected impact.

Table 2.1.3 – Measurement of progress towards expected impact III for SWAFS-05-2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected impact</th>
<th>Enable the transformation of governance frameworks that affect actor and stakeholders involved in new constellations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qualification of impact</td>
<td>Evidence about the positive and negative impacts (do’s and don’ts) of governance frameworks on the success or failure of new constellations of innovation collaboration and actors playing new roles are embedded in current innovation policy debates and disseminated to innovation policy-makers through both shallow and deep communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key performance indicator(s)**
- Notifications and ‘teasers’ about all major policy-relevant results (policy-briefs, comparative analyses, handbook) will be disseminated to 5000+ innovation policy-makers through the newsletters, websites and/or social media of third parties to the project (the OECD, the two Austrian Ministries of Science and Innovation) and other governance bodies and networks engaged in WP7.
- 50+ policy-makers are engaged directly through case-specific dialogue events (T2.5. 3.5, 4.5, 5.5) and policy-makers’ workshops (D7.3)
- Minimum one of the governance bodies or networks involved in WP7 agrees to promote the part of the training program (D8.3) which is targeted to innovation policy-makers.

KPI progress reports for all of the above measures to achieve the expected impacts will be part of the reporting of the external evaluation team (T10.5).

RiConfigure relies very much on the engagement of organizations, experts and stakeholders through networking and inclusion in social labs, workshops and conferences. This provides a strong basis for the dissemination of the project and its results to various actors involved in research and innovation.
2.2. Measures to maximize impact

2.2.1. Dissemination and exploitation of results
RiConfigure is designed to enable diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in Research and Innovation processes and in particular to improve their governance framework and make research & innovation processes responsive to public values and concerns. Dissemination, communication and exploitation of the process and outcome are crucial for achieving the expected impacts. Dissemination of the project’s results as well as creating a network of practitioners and policy-makers to share their findings and reflect on their interactions is an essential component of RiConfigure building reflections on the “interactions between the various relevant organizations and actors, in terms of exchanges about good practices and exploring new collaborations.” (SwafS-05-2017). RiConfigure will use existing as well as create new spaces and networks to reach specific target groups in appropriate channels.

The main objectives for the dissemination and exploitation activities are:
1. To establish links to existing networks, academies, practitioners, policy-makers, and other potential distributors and target groups.
2. To disseminate RiConfigure findings, good practices and training materials developed in Social Labs and beyond as well as information generated in the project via the network and its channels.
3. To identify and appoint Q-helix Innovation “knowledge holders” within participating institutions, especially policy agencies, key industry players.
4. To develop a strategy for the long-term implementation and extension of the network and secure the necessary support and funds.
5. To prepare and disseminate information materials that review key concerns of Q-helix Innovation, particularly focusing on the legitimization provided by the cases monitored in RiConfigure and the pros and cons presented of a broad integration. The goal of WP9 is to translate the project results into target group specific, clear, and instructive information material. It must also show the potentials of Q-helix Innovation and ways to achieve them.

Target groups
For an effective dissemination and exploitation of the RiConfigure outcomes, as well as the engagement activities in the project, the following main target groups and actors have been identified as crucial for the implementation of RiConfigure, for adopting or applying the results of the project, and benefit from the knowledge produced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-makers</td>
<td>R&amp;I governance bodies at local, regional, national and European/international level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research organizations</td>
<td>Universities, applied research institutes, technology transfer bodies, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Firms involved in or considering involvement in open innovation, co-creation, cross-sector partnerships, multi-stakeholder alliances, as well as their platforms and networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector organizations</td>
<td>Public authorities and agencies who are not themselves ‘governors’ of R&amp;I, but who are involved in R&amp;I processes as active participants with their own innovation aims. events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil society</td>
<td>Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), consumer and human rights advocates, with a focus on the public good, citizens, consumer and/or workers’ associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>Science journalists, the business press, public sector publications, civil society newsletters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Management
RiConfigure include 4 partners (DBT, HIS, WUR and FH) which are experts in data protection and privacy. FH will lead Task 10.6 ‘Ethics and data management’, which includes establishing a Data Management Plan for the consortium. This data management plan will respect EU and international regulation for data protection and handling, ethics, human rights and research ethics.

We expect the project to generate the following types of data: Workshop findings data from all WPs – not person identifiable and not sensitive; Data from social labs - informed consent and not sensitive; Interview data – informed consent and not sensitive.

The data collected in RiConfigure will not be sensitive (see ethics self-evaluation in chapter 5), since they will only contain data about name, profession and contact data. Data collection by interviews etc. will be gathered on basis of informed consent and transcripts etcetera will be kept on media only available for the researchers. RiConfigure will only use data storage (cloud, servers etc.) which conforms to policies about the EU Cloud.

Knowledge management and open access strategy
RiConfigure does not raise issues of IPR and copyright, which is to say that our intention is not to “protect” our results and deliverables. Rather the intention is to give them the widest possible currency, via the project’s website, direct e-mailings, publications, etc. We intend to make all deliverables freely available (at least, electronically) to anyone who wants a copy. However, we will use either the Creative Commons licenses CC-BY or CC-0 for all of our project products in order to ensure that they are shared with minimal restrictions, aside from attribution to the authors or creators. Furthermore, all user-generated data created by the public will remain the copyright and intellectual property of the data providers (the organizations involved in RiConfigure) or data creators (the users) in compliance with the data providers’ own terms and conditions.

2.2.2. Communication activities
Communication activities are planned to maximize the impact of the RiConfigure outcomes and trigger effects across the targeted stakeholders and communities. In the implementation of the project, we prioritize substantial dissemination of the RiConfigure outcomes, allowing for its sustainability beyond the end of the project.

The main contents to be used in the communication strategies refer to the project in itself, the knowledge it will be producing and the activities in which the project and the project members are engaged in. This content can be transformed into a very varied range of formats: written or audiovisual, to be used online or offline, or presented in person to others by project partners or dedicated stakeholders involved in the project. Enabling diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in Research and Innovation processes, RiConfigure rests on extensive and sophisticated state-of-the-art co-creation and public engagement activities (WP2-5).

RiConfigure will make use of a range of different communication activities to secure the exploitation and uptake of the project results and, ultimately, to engage stakeholders to create a European governance framework that will support and expand the ‘quadruple helix’ fourth strand, the public sphere. RiConfigure have dedicated three distinct work packages (WP7, WP8 and WP9) to dissemination and exploitation of results, training and outreach and stakeholder engagement.

his includes, but is not limited to, the following elements:

- RiConfigure website, giving information about objectives, methods and results of RiConfigure in order to ensure transparency of and open access to the results as they develop in the project. The web-site will also publish the public deliverables of the project.
Social media and press will ensure that information is shared with appropriate audiences on a timely basis by a very active use of social media, to extend the knowledge of RiConfigure and to support an enhanced public engagement and understanding of innovation technology.

Production of three Communication Packages to be used for presenting the RiConfigure to networks, at conferences, seminars, workshops etc. and towards potential users engaged in quadruple helix R&I. The packages will include communication materials about the project, aims and objectives, methods and outcomes, one at the beginning, one in the middle and one at the end of the project.

The Consortium will strategically use their networks to disseminate the results and objectives of the project. Videos will be produced (shorter and longer video clips) for use on the project website, for distribution via social media, for inclusion in presentations, and for inclusion in the training materials.

Policy briefs developed by WP7 based on the research in the project. Approximately 3 policy briefs will be made during the project on the relevant topics. The policy briefs will be developed to deal with themes that are high on the policy agenda. The briefs will include summaries of relevant results of the project and link them to the developments. Policy briefs will be given to all policy makers in contact with the project, as well as the broader policy community and interested non-policy making stakeholders.

Training of change agents, institutional staff and practitioners in RRI and quadruple helix practice. The training activities (WP8) will sustain beyond the duration of the project, as it will be implemented in the operation of partner 9/LBG and 11/UPF.

A final conference open to R&I practitioners, EU-policy makers, and the public.

Policy-makers’ events and Practitioners events in WP7 which will be central to securing policy alignment exploration of results from RiConfigure.

A QH booklet series will be downloadable on the project and partner websites.

Scientific publications and presentations on the methods and results of RiConfigure will communicate to the scientific community. Thereby, supporting a scholarly discourse on societal engagement and new constellations of actors and stakeholders in Research and Innovation processes.

In line with the topic, RiConfigure aims to enable diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in Research and Innovation processes, a spread of good practices among them, and a transformation in their governance framework. Consequently, the products of RiConfigure are very useful for a wide range of user segments. Therefore, the communication will be spread on a variety of media in order to be able to get in contact with representatives from all user groups. The following table shows which different communication means are likely to reach different user groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target groups</th>
<th>Means of dissemination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-makers</td>
<td>• Engagement in network dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Policy briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training format dedicated to policy-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Handbook for QH-collaboration governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research organizations</td>
<td>• Engagement in social labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement in network dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Booklet on how research organizations initiate new constellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conference presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• MOOC designed for researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>• Engagement in social labs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Engagement in network dialogues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Booklet on how industry initiates new constellations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Training format for industry organizations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Public sector organizations | • Engagement in social labs  
• Case-specific outreach from social labs to relevant public sectors stakeholders  
• Engagement in network dialogues  
• Booklet on how the public sector initiates new constellations  
• Training format for public sector organizations |
|---|---|
| Civil society | • Engagement in social labs  
• Engagement in network dialogues  
• Booklet on how the public sector initiates new constellations  
• Training format for public sector organizations |
| Media | • Press releases aimed at specific sectors distributed to relevant press editors  
• Distribution of all sector-relevant outcomes to sector specific editors |
3. IMPLEMENTATION

3.1 Work plan – Work packages and deliverables
The RiConfigure work plan is structured to enable the diversification of constellations of actors and stakeholders in R&I processes, a spread of good practices among them, and changes to their governance frameworks. WP1 will produce an analytical framework and a common methodology for implementation of the four social labs (WP2-5) and crosscutting comparison. A methodology handbook will ensure uniform application of the methodology while observation protocols will enable comparative analyses.

WP2-5 will implement the four social labs. The social labs will explore and experiment with practices for collaboration and RRI-in-practice in existing quadruple helix constellations. Each social lab has a consortium member or third party acting as ‘case partner’ with 4-5 ‘mirror cases’ being invited to the social labs during their establishment to enable reflection and mutual learning. The four social labs each address the entire continuum of quadruple helix actors. However, an underlying assumption of RiConfigure is that - mainly in terms of the outcomes produced - it matters which actor (research, industry, the public sector, or civil society) initiates quadruple helix collaboration. Hence, the four social labs focusing each on one of the strands of the quadruple helix will run in parallel, each with their own social lab leader, but with cross-WP coordination provided by the project coordinator. While WP6 will analyze and synthesize quadruple helix practice and governance based on the activities in the social lab, WP7 will engage R&I practitioners and policy-makers in four events in dialogues learning from putting challenges and questions to the social labs. Policy brief will summarize the lesson learned. During the project outcomes relevant to the complete quadruple helix continuum of actors are produced e.g. for researchers, academia, civil society organizations or policy-makers. Therefore, considerable efforts will be put into WP8, which develops training and guidelines to secure the broadest possible uptake the good practices identified by project. During the project, communication and dissemination activities in WP9 will support and strengthen project activities. This will be guided by the project’s communication plan, and supported by social media and press activities as well as by videos. The project will reach audiences in all relevant sectors through targeted communication and help actors to initiate and support new constellations in R&I by providing inspiration and guidance in the form of handbooks, infotainment videos, policy briefs, and evidence-based analyses. The videos will capture the story of the co-creation processes in the social labs (WP2-5) as well as in the dissemination of the Policy-Handbook produced in WP6.

Pert diagram
WP1 - Preparing social labs and analysis
T 1.1 Develop a theoretical framework
T 1.2 SL methodology manual
T 1.3 Internal training

WP2 - Social Lab I: How research organizations initiate new constellations
T 2.1 Social lab setup and management
T 2.2 Ongoing case mapping and analysis
T 2.3 Monitoring, reflection and mutual
T 2.4 Implementation of process methods
T 2.5 Case-specific stakeholder dialogue
T 2.6 Synthesis of lessons learned

WP3 - Social Lab II: How industry initiates new constellations
Same as above

WP4 - Social Lab III: How the public sector initiates new constellations
Same as above

WP5 - Social Lab IV: How civil society initiates new constellations
Same as above

WP6 - Drawing out general lessons about new constellations
T 6.1 Ohpraxis analysis
T 6.2 RRI in QH innovation
T 6.3 Impacts of public governance framework on QH
T 6.4 Patterns and outliers in QH innovation

WP7 - Stakeholder networks
T 7.1 Establish stakeholder network
T 7.2 Dialogue events with innovation practitioners
T 7.3 Dialogue events with innovation policy-makers
T 7.4 Policy briefs
T 7.5 Legacy agreements

WP8 - Training
T 8.1 Training guide of work
T 8.2 Information collection
T 8.3 Training programs design
T 8.4 Training programs implementation testing
T 8.5 Final training programs and recommendations

WP9 - Communication and dissemination
T 9.1 Communication plan
T 9.2 Communication packages
T 9.4 Social media and press
T 9.5 Video
T 9.6 Booklet series
T 9.7 Presentations in conferences and network meetings
T 9.8 Final conference

WP10 - Project management and coordination
T 10.1 Management and coordination
T 10.2 Project handbook
T 10.3 Consortium meetings
T 10.4 Advisory board
T 10.5 External evaluation
T 10.6 Ethics management and data protection

* D1.1 = Deliverable 1.1
* = Active but not intense
* M1 = Milestone 1
3.2 Management structure and procedures
The management structure of RiConfigure is designed to meet the challenges of a project of this size, the organizational structure and decision-making mechanisms will be as follows:

1. **Management Committee**: The management committee (MAC) will be made up of 1-2 representatives of the coordinator, plus one representative from each of the other partners. It will be responsible for all major decision-making and the overall execution of the project. Majority voting, if necessary, with the Coordinator having casting vote in case of a tie, will make decisions. The MAC will mainly make decisions at the Consortium meetings, but can, according to needs, take decisions in between the meetings. The Consortium is very experienced in coordination of trans-national projects, as the Coordinator and several of the partners have been coordinating EU FP-projects, H2020-projects and large trans-national projects before. All partners are used to working in trans-national projects, as they all have been part of EU FP projects before.

2. **Day-to-day management**, direction and decision-making will be undertaken by the Coordinator, who will liaise on a case-to-case basis with other members of the Consortium, and call in the MAC when needed.

3. **Work Package Leaders** will be responsible for detailed implementation and management of the specific work packages. Part of this responsibility is delegated to Task Leaders, when such delegations are mentioned in the Work Package Descriptions. However, the Work Package Leaders will have the responsibility for coordination inside the work package.

4. **Advisory Panel**: The Advisory Panel (AP) will consist of persons who have a needed expertise and/or represent important user groups and/or stakeholders. Five panel members are envisaged, specifically persons with expertise in quadruple helix R&I (Dr. Marina Ranga of Stanford University has accepted our invitation in this regard), cross-sectoral collaboration in general, RRI-in-practice, multi-level R&I governance, and social labs methodology. The AP will provide on-going feedback and advice and review drafts of deliverables. Furthermore, the AP is expected to serve as contact to wider networks of potential users of the project outcomes. The AP will take part in some of the workshops and the final conference. The AP will meet in person at least 3 times during the proposed project, besides contributing to the various WPs electronically.

All project committees and boards will take into account the gender balance when being established to ensure diversity, aiming to meet the European Commission’s target of 40% of the under-represented gender in panels and groups and of 50% in advisory groups. The Advisory Panel will take gender into account as one of the dimensions on which feedback will be integrated into the project, and also a criterion for the project evaluation. The members will be recruited as part of T.10.4 by the offset of the project and in accordance with the gender strategy.

5. **Management Infrastructure**: Apart from the face-to-face meetings in the Consortium, the consortium will make use of on-line networking, including e-mail with specific distribution lists, regular ‘e-meetings’ with VoIP/WebEx, and intra-net. Such infrastructure tools are already standard tools in other activities of the Coordinator.

### 3.2.1 Consortium Agreement
The consortium partners will sign a Consortium Agreement during the negotiation phase, which shall regulate relations between the Consortium Partners and their respective rights and obligations arising from their participation in the project and the Grant Agreement with the European Commission. Further, the
consortium agreement shall set the deadlines for reporting, the quality assurance criteria, as well as the performance indicators against which progress of work will be measured. The Consortium Agreement will deal with the communication flows and the communication rules among the consortium partners as well, and will indicate the remedy mechanism to be employed in case of a non-performing partner and remedies for other such risks. The Consortium Agreement will be based upon a standard template and be adjusted to the specificities of RiConfigure.

3.2.2 Management style, related to the nature of the project

The management style of the project will relate to the relatively high need for coordination by giving emphasis to strong management, which incorporates precise delegation of responsibility, combined with internal routines for progress and quality check. It is expected from all participants, that the strong binding to purpose will result in a sharp focus on coordination. The management activities will be tailored in size to the purpose in RiConfigure, in order not to over-focus on management or under-focus on project purpose and execution. The need for effectiveness of the consortium as a whole will call for precise decision-making with a minimum of need for re-negotiating plans. The initial development of a project handbook will strongly support this management style by making all partners conscious about the interdependencies and responsibilities in the project.

The timeline of activities and their deadlines in terms of events and deliverables will be managed with clear authority.

In case of a conflict in the consortium the Coordinator will apply a three-step mediation and decision process:

1. The Coordinator will try to mediate the conflict on a bilateral basis. If this does not solve the issue, then
2. The Management Committee will be consulted in order to search for a resolution of the conflict. A vote can be made in the MAC. If this does not solve the problems either, then
3. The Coordinator will take a final decision.

This three-step process ensures that a decision can be made even in the improbable but very difficult case, where the MAC refrains from taking a decision. Step 3 will only be executed if step 2 leads to such a situation, which would in such a case, be documented by the minutes of the MAC consultation.

The Coordinator is a globally well-respected parliamentary technology assessment institution, which delivers high reliance in the execution of work programs and projects. The management traditions behind the status of this institution will be transferred to the project.

Management objectives:

- Ensure timely deliverables and project execution
- Control the progress of the project
- Provide an efficient and effective management
- Manage the project resources to achieve the planned results
- Control the use of resources and budget
- Ensure compliance with Grant Agreement and consortium agreements

Management activities:

- Management and reporting on administrative and financial aspects
- Management of communication with the EU Commission
- Quality control measures
- Generation of internal progress reports each quarter;
- Submission of the reports to the Commission.
- Resolution of conflicts in and around the consortium.
- Technical support for internal and external communication.
3.2.3 Financial management
It is the obligation of the Coordinator, The Danish Board of Technology Foundation, to ensure efficient financial management and observation of the regulations and the rules of Horizon 2020 by all consortium partners. The Coordinator is well experienced with the financial and operative management and reporting of EU-funded projects with excellent results and as a Coordinator will be the liaison for communication between the partners and European Commission Services. The Danish Board of Technology Foundation is regularly audited by an internationally authorized auditing company (Christensen Kjærulff www.ck.dk). All audits are performed according to the International Accounting Standards. The accounting, personnel and payroll management of the DBT is fully computerized with audit authorized software. All projects are managed as separate accounting cost centers. Audit trail of each accounting transaction is provided. Written regulations, rules and procedures, overseen by the Danish governmental foundation control authorities, govern the administrative and financial policy, personnel policy, procurement policy, accounting and archiving policy. Financial management guidelines with specified requirements will be developed for the consortium partners in order to facilitate the financial implementation of the project following the financial regulations and rules. Instructions, cost reporting and requested forms will be part of this guide. The partners will submit interim financial statements to the Coordinator for fixed periods of three months, in order to provide financial monitoring and smooth financial management. The Coordinator will be responsible for EU review processes, informing all partners of the review results and circulating follow-up recommendations.

3.2.4 Quality assurance
The quality assurance will link to all aspects of the project:

- **Focus on the purpose:** This will be ensured by an initial in-depth description of the methodology in a so-called “Project Handbook”, which relates directly to the expected outcomes and impacts.
- **Quality of deliverables:** Traditional quality assurance of products and deliverables will be provided through internal peer reviews and reviews by the Advisory Panel.
- **Quality of results:** The results in terms of the RiConfigure documentation, workshops, reports, dissemination etc. will be subject to internal evaluation as a standard agenda point for the consortium meetings. This will be supported by an external evaluator (Task 8.5). These evaluations will be reflected in adjustments of future plans by revising the project handbook.

An important part of the quality assurance within RiConfigure is the continuous advice of the Advisory Panel. We will set up a transnational panel, which will consist of at least five highly competent researchers and experts. It will meet 3 times in connection with consortium meetings. Single panel members will also take part in events and/or consortium meetings as needed. The panel will contribute feedback on the project methodology, deliverables and results. The budget for the panel is placed with the coordinator.

3.3 Consortium as a whole
The 11 partners in the RiConfigure consortium together have the expertise and experience required to implement the project to the highest standards of quality and with direct relevance to stakeholders both in and around the project. The partners provide distinctive but complementary expertise, sectoral profiles and networks, which enables the project as a whole to address the world around it with credibility and efficiency.

Third parties committed to the project include: A) the OECD Working Party for Bio-, Nano-, and Emerging Technologies (BNCT), which is an international body dedicated to sharing of best practices R&I governance bodies; B) the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science, Innovation and Economy, which is a member of the ERAC network, and C) the Austrian Railways (OEBB). In addition to the competencies of the consortium, these third parties involved in the project provide strong contacts to policy-makers’ networks.

The project is coordinated by an independent ‘boundary organization’ (partner 1 established to broker between R&I-actors, policy-makers, and the public. The other leaders of the social labs (partners 2, 3 and 4) also have boundary-spanning missions.
A consortium of institutions and actors from research, industry, the public sector, and civil society initiates the project. The consortium members and third parties belong to each of these sectors in as follows: research (partners 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11); industry (partner 10); the public sector (partner 8, third parties A, B, and C); and civil society (partners 1, 5, and 6). Furthermore, ‘Case Partners’ (partners 4, 8, 10, third party C) will bring their own active quadruple helix projects into the social labs in which other external parties are involved, further expanding the cross-sectoral involvement built into the project.

The consortium comprises extensive experience in RRI as it includes coordinators and participants of RRI Tools, MoRRI, NewHoRRizon, HERRI, Res-AgorA, Engage2020, SATORI, and more.

The participation of partner 5 (ACAC), the national contact point for the SwafS program in Columbia, provides three key advantages. Firstly, ACAC can bring cases into Social Lab IV that draw on different traditions for collaboration. Secondly, ACAC is in a position to draw feed-in and disseminate outputs to and from South American networks of innovation practitioners. Thirdly, by studying cases and engaging practitioners in Columbia gives the possibility to contrast the effect of EU governance of R&I with non-EU governance frameworks.
### Competences / profiles

**Boundary organizations**
- Practitioners of cross-sectoral collaboration in R&I
- Practitioners of stakeholder engagement
- Strong contacts w/ practitioners’ networks (ETPs, KICs, etc.)
- Strong contacts w/ policy-makers’ networks
- Extensive experience in providing practical information and training
- Extensive experience in developing and disseminating communication materials
- Extensive experience in process facilitation
- High-level involvement in RRI
- In-depth experience in policy dialogues

**Partners / Third-parties**
- 1, 2, 3, 4
- 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, C
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, A
- 2, 4, 5, 6
- 1, 2, A, B, C.
- 1, 2, 9, 11
- 1, 6, 7
- 1, 2, 4, 8, 9
- 1, 2, 3, 4, 11
- 1, 2, A, B, C

### 3.4 Resources to be committed

The distribution of costs between work packages is seen in the diagram.

#### Table 3.4 b ‘Other direct cost’ items (travel, equipment, infrastructure, goods and services, large research infrastructure)

For the following partners the sum of the direct costs for ‘travel’, ‘equipment’, and ‘goods and services’ exceeds 15% of the personnel costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2/IHS</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>€14,000 for travels for social lab members to four SL-Panel meetings; €3,500 for SL-members to workshop in T6.2; and €9,100 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>30,500</td>
<td>2*€10,000 for Dialogue events with innovation policy-makers; €4,000 for four sl panel meetings; €2,000 for workshop in T6.2; €1,500 for printing Policy Briefs; €1,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for audit costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/FH</td>
<td>Cost (€)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>33,300</td>
<td>€16,800 for travels for social lab members to four SL-Panel meetings; €16,500 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>€4,000 for four SL panel meetings; €10,000 for publishing the Booklet series; €2,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for hosting a consortium meeting, €2,000 for audit costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/ACAC</td>
<td>Cost (€)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>33,600</td>
<td>€8,400 for travels to four SL-Panel meetings; €11,100 for travelling to consortium meetings; €14,100 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>€1,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for hosting a consortium meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/ASEF</td>
<td>Cost (€)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>2*€10,000 for Dialogue events with innovation practitioners; €2,000 for workshop in T6.3; €1,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for hosting a consortium meeting; €20,000 for organizing the Final Conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/BCU</td>
<td>Cost (€)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>€1,500 for the communication packages; €10,000 for producing video competition and clips; €1,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for hosting a consortium meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/UPF</td>
<td>Cost (€)</td>
<td>Justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>7,900</td>
<td>7,900 for travels to workshops, seminars etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>34,400</td>
<td>€10,000 for training design and print; €14,400 for training video production, €5,000 for fees to professors expert testing training materials; €2,000 for internal training workshop; €1,000 Presentations in conferences and network meetings; €2,000 for hosting a consortium meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. MEMBERS OF THE CONSORTIUM

4.1 PARTICIPANTS (APPLICANTS)

PARTNER 1 – THE DANISH BOARD OF TECHNOLOGY FOUNDATION – FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRÅDET – DBT – DENMARK

The DBT is the parliamentary technology assessment institution of Denmark. It is an independent, non-profit, common good, corporative foundation SME, committed to technology assessment, foresight, knowledge-based decision-making, parliamentary advisory activities on science, technology and innovation, collaborative democracy and methodological research. The DBT works with a local, regional, national, as well as international perspective. It is specialised into interactive methodologies, involving trans-disciplinary research, stakeholder involvement, citizen participation, political deliberation and advice, and public communication. Especially in the domain of stakeholder and citizen consultation, connected to policy analysis, the DBT aims at being at the forefront of praxis. The DBT employs 14 researchers and 8 research assistants. The DBT has historically emphasized the importance of inclusion and co-creation in technological development, administrative planning, innovation and political decision-making. In its 30 years of methodological development it has built a world-class skillset for the facilitation of trans-disciplinary dialogue and solution-oriented research.

The DBT has many years of experience as coordinator of international research projects, e.g. the DBT has coordinated European research projects under FP5 (EUROPTA), FP6 (CIVISTI), FP7 (PACITA, Engage2020, DESSI) and H2020 (CIMULACT). Moreover, the DBT has participated as partner and work package leader in several other European research projects, such as SurPRISE, SATORI, Res-AgorA, Human Brain Project, Foresight, BASE, CASI, SUBSOL, EUth and ASSET. The DBT is the initiator and global coordinator of the World Wide Views citizen consultations, which in 2009 involved citizen consultations in 38 countries around the world on global warming, citizen consultations in 25 countries around the world on biodiversity in 2012, and in 2015 citizen consultations on climate and energy was organized in 76 countries involving 10.000 citizens.

In addition to the vast project management experience the DBT holds, it is internationally recognized as a neutral and highly credible broker between science and society. Moreover, the DBT is highly engaged in RRI and is currently involved with several projects focusing on RRI, knowledge sharing and engagement, such as ASSET, CASI, SATORI, and CIMULACT.

Persons involved in the project:

Dr. Rasmus Øjvind NIELSEN, male, MA in philosophy, PhD (as of October 2018) in governance studies from Roskilde University. As a researcher Rasmus is specialized in institutional changes in relation to research and innovation governance. He has served as the DBT’s principal investigator in two FP7 projects (incl. two work packages in the SATORI project and three work packages in the EST Frame project) as well as in three technology assessment projects for the European Parliament’s STOA. In addition, Rasmus has served as supporting investigator in the Res-AgorA and PACITA projects (H2020/FP7). In addition to his research profile, Rasmus has strong facilitation and coordination skills.

Ms. Marie Louise JØRGENSEN, female, MSc in Public Administration. Senior Project Manager specialised in international stakeholder and citizen engagement in R&I and policy-making. Coordination team member of the global citizen consultation World Wide Views on Biodiversity, Coordinator of citizen consultations on sustainable consumption in 11 European countries in the FP7 PACITA project, and coordinator of the FP7 project Engage2020 on societal engagement in R&I, and Coordinator of the H2020 project CIMULACT on citizen and multi-actor engagement in R&I in 30 countries in Europe.
Mr. Lars Klüver, male, MSc. Environmental Biology/Ecology, is Director of the DBT and has a status as international expert in technology assessment and foresight methodology, and has been scientific advisor on a multitude of national and international research, foresight and technology assessment activities.

Mr. John S. Haukeland, male, M.Sc. International Business and Politics, is specialized in the inclusion of civil society actors into international politics. He has experience with international multi-stakeholder engagement and the dissemination of participatory processes into public policy. He is currently WP-leader in the FP7-funded research project ASSET, and have recently participated in the Horizon 2020 project CIMULACT and coordination team member of the global citizen consultation World Wide Views on Climate and Energy leading up to COP21 in Paris 2015.

Ms. Karen Riisgaard, female, Phd in Biological Oceanography, is Project Manager at the DBT. Her expertise covers science communication and she is currently responsible for the communication package in the Horizon 2020 project CIMULACT. She has experience in production and editing of video and text for web, social media and established media. She has a background as co-editor of the Danish environmental magazine Miljøsk and has post graduate training from the Danish School of Media and Journalism.

Selected publications relevant to this project:


Selected projects relevant to this project:

- CIMULACT (H2020 – Coordinator)(2015-2018), citizen and multi-actor engagement on R&I in 30 countries in Europe. The project engages citizens, along with a variety of other actors, in redefining the European research and innovation agenda and thereby make it relevant and accountable to society. http://www.cimulact.eu/
- Res-AGoRA (FP7 – Partner)(2013-2016), which aims to build a governance framework for responsible research and innovation (RRI). DBT was lead on the task to organise five European stakeholder workshops, http://res-agora.eu/
- Human Brain project (FP7&H2020- Partner) (2013- ) - The Human Brain Project (HBP) is a European Commission Future and Emerging Technologies Flagship that aims to accelerate our understanding of the human brain, make advances in defining and diagnosing brain disorders, and develop new brain-like technologies. It also pioneers an integrated approach to responsible research and innovation (RRI). https://www.humanbrainproject.eu/sp12
- World Wide Views on Climate and Energy (Coordinator) (2015), a global citizen consultation in collaboration on climate and energy with the UNFCCC and The French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which involved face-to-face meetings with approximately 10.000 citizens in 76 countries around the world on the same day. The results were presented at the UN General Assembly and at four events at COP21.
Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:
Non applicable for DBT

PARTNER 2 – INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES - INSTITUT FÜR HÖHERE STUDIEN - IHS – AUSTRIA

The Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) is an independent, non-profit research institute and brings together expertise from economists, sociologists, and political scientists, among others, to address fundamental economic and social problems and policy choices. The IHS, which is the only Austrian research institution that links basic academic research and training with applied research and policy advice, consist of eleven research groups. The IHS in general, and the research group “Techno-Science & Societal Transformation” (TSST) in particular, has participated in and co-ordinated numerous national and European research projects, and has a long-standing tradition of international research in research innovation policy. The fundamental concept is that society shapes science, technology and innovation. At the same time, technology and innovation are important driving forces of societal transformation, both in positive (“social progress”) as well as negative ways. The research group TSST investigates the mutual interdependency of science/technology and society as well as the societal preconditions, possibilities, and limitations to govern related issues. Its staff members conduct empirical research on emerging and/or contested research and technologies linked, e.g. to health, beginning- and end-of-life situations or security and surveillance, especially focusing on their societal impacts. Besides, the research group monitors emerging technologies and works on the concepts and empirical basis of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI) and Open Innovation, building on a longstanding experience with international and national research projects on ethical, legal, and social aspects (ELSA) of life sciences, RRI, citizen participation in R&I, and the role of experts and policy makers in R&I policy. Currently, the research group TSST is involved in the EU funded projects JERRI, ENERI, HEIRRI, MoRRI, SATORI and NewHoRRIzon.

Persons involved in the project:

**Erich Griessler**, male, Dr. Mag. Erich Griessler, head of the IHS research group “Techno-Science & Societal Transformation”, has been senior researcher at the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) since 1999. He previously worked at the Institute for Theory and Social Studies of Science at the University of Vienna (1990-1992), the Department of Technology Research at the Austrian Institute of Technology (1992-1995) and the Ludwig Boltzmann Institute for the Sociology of Health and Medicine (1995-1999). He has been teaching at the Vienna University of Economics and Business Administration since 2003 and at the University of Vienna since 2006.

Erich’s research covers a broad range of areas including: social studies of science and technology, sociology of biomedicine, ethical, legal, and social aspects of biotechnology, citizen engagement and participation in research and innovation (R&I) policy, political regulation of biotechnology, political sociology, and Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI). In recent years, Erich has worked on and coordinated a number of projects supported by Austrian funding organisations and the European Commission which have been relevant for conceptualising, understanding and monitoring various aspects of RRI in different technological areas. He has addressed the question of how to meaningfully involve the public in debates on ethically controversial areas of R&I in several research projects. These projects include: the comparative European projects “Increasing Public Involvement in Debates on Ethical Questions of Xenotransplantation” (XENO, FP 5, 2002-2004, coordinator together with Beate Littig), “Participatory Governance and Institutional Innovation” (PAGANINI, FP 6, 2004-2007, partner), “Impact of Citizen Participation on Decision-Making in a Knowledge Intensive Policy Field” (CIT-PART, FP7, 2009-2012, coordinator), “You-Test. Jugendliche und genetisches Testen. Jugendliche partizipieren an wissenschaftlicher Technikfolgenabschätzung: Das Beispiel direct-to-consumer genetische
Analysen” (Austrian Science Ministry, 2011-2012, partner), and “Neo-Socratic Dialogue for Improved Genetic Counselling” (GEN-DIALOG, Austrian Genome Research Programme GEN-AU, 2006-2008, coordinator). Erich has dealt with the ethics of R&I and its governance in the field of biotechnology in several research projects. These projects include: “Genetic Testing and Changing ‘Images of Human Life’ in the Clinical and Political Domains of Pre-Implantation Genetic Diagnosis and Pre-Natal Diagnosis” (Austrian Genome Research Programme GEN-AU, 2007-2010, coordinator); and “Stammzellforschung und Embryonenschutz – Status Quo, Rechtsvergleich und öffentliche Debatte am Beispiel ausgewählter europäischer Staaten” (Austrian Federal Chancellery, 2008, coordinator).

Erich studied Sociology and History at the University of Vienna (PhD 1995 on technology foresight in Austria and the Netherlands) and the University of Maastricht. He is fluent in German and English. Erich is currently working in the EC funded projects JERRI, ENERI, HEIRRI, MoRRI and SATORI and is inter alia responsible for the monitoring of RRI in selected European countries.

Robert Braun, male, Dr. Mag. Robert Braun is a senior researcher at IHS research group “Techno-Science & Societal Transformation” since 2016. Robert studied Philosophy of Arts and History at the University of Budapest and completed his PhD in Philosophy in 2002. From 1991-1994 he was assistant professor at ELTE University of Budapest, since 1994 he is Associate Professor at Corvinus University in Budapest. Robert used to be Pro-Rector of International Business School in Budapest. Since 2015 he is also Professor at Lauder Business School in Vienna. Robert did research at Rutgers University in the USA (politics of the historiography of Holocaust narratives), at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Wassenaar Netherlands (the politics of the self and identity), and taught at numerous universities in the EU and the USA. He also led corporate research projects in corporate social responsibility in Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, and Poland. The core research interest of Robert is in the politics of societal transformation. His research projects focus on the representation and engagement of stakeholders in corporate or other post-national communities as well as the politics of autonomous mobility via its societal impacts. His past research includes the politics of historiography, the politics of corporations, and the politics of autonomous mobility. In 2007 he has been the lead researcher in the UNDP/EU research on the baseline of corporate social responsibility in the EU accession states.

Thomas König, male, Dr. Thomas König is currently a senior researcher at the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS) and part of the research group “Techno-Science & Societal Transformation”. From 2010-2013 he was a Scientific Advisor to the President of the European Research Council (ERC), Helga Nowotny. Prior to that he was a research assistant at Center for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences, University of Vienna. Thomas is a founding member of the Collaborative Research Network for the ERA (UACES). In addition, he is a member of the editorial board of the World Political Science Review and the Austrian Journal of Political Science. In 2014, Thomas was granted a Fulbright Research Scholarship Grant at the Center for European Studies in Harvard.

Selected publications relevant to this project:

Selected projects relevant to this project:

- **NewHoRRIZon**: (Excellence in science and innovation for Europe by adopting the concept of Responsible Research and Innovation) sets out to promote the acceptance of RRI in Horizon 2020 (H2020) and beyond. It will work out the conceptual and operational basis to fully integrate RRI into European and national research and innovation (R&I) practice and funding. In order to accomplish this goal, NewHoRRIZon will establish altogether 18 Social Labs that cover all sections of H2020. Together with a wide-ranging group of R&I stakeholders, in these Social Labs, NewHoRRIZon will co-create tailor-made pilot actions that will stimulate an increased use and acceptance of RRI across H2020 and each of its parts. European Commission, Horizon 2020 (2017-2021).

- **JERRI** (Joining Efforts for Responsible Research and Innovation): Aims to foster RRI transition in Europe by developing and testing good RRI practices in two pilot cases, for further upscaling among the RTOs in the EU28. An RRI approach will be developed and implemented at the biggest European RTOs, the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft and the Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO). European Commission, Horizon 2020 (2016-2019).

- **ENERI** (European Network of Research Ethics and Research Integrity): The project brings together European initiatives involved in research ethics and research integrity and establishes an operable platform of actors in these areas. The network aims at strengthening activities of education and training in research ethics and research integrity, promoting a culture of integrity, and fostering the development of and compliance with joint rules and norms. Moreover, it will be strongly linked to other relevant EC funded projects and thus lead to new collaborations, implementations, and incentives for the European Research Era (ERA) and civil society. European Commission, Horizon 2020 (2016-2019).

- **HEIRRI** (Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation): aims to further integrate RRI within formal and informal education of future scientists, engineers, and other professionals involved in research, development, and innovation processes. To this end, HEIRRI develops, tests and disseminates RRI training programmes and materials to be used at higher education institutions at different educational levels. European Commission, Horizon 2020 (2015-2018), [http://www.heirri.eu](http://www.heirri.eu)

- **MoRRI** (Monitoring the evolution and benefits of Responsible Research and Innovation): The project’s objective is “to provide scientific evidence, data, analysis and policy intelligence to support directly Directorate General for Research and Innovation (DG-RTD) research funding activities and policy-making activities in relation with Responsible Research and Innovation”. The project empirically investigates the impacts of RRI activities covering the six RRI key dimensions (Citizen Engagement and Participation, Science Literacy and Scientific Education, Gender Equality, Open Access, R&I Governance, Ethics) using quantitative and qualitative data. European Commission, Call for Tenders Nr. RTD-B6-PP-00964-2013 (2014-2018).

Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:

Non applicable for IHS
PARTNER 3 – WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY – WUR – THE NETHERLANDS

Wageningen University is part of Wageningen University and Research Centre (WUR), which is a leading international knowledge institute in the fields of nutritional health, sustainable agricultural systems and environmental quality. WUR consists of Wageningen University, eight research institutes, two applied research institutes and a training and advisory centre. WUR has 6,500 employees and over 4,500 students. The research institutes carry out strategic, applied and practical research for businesses, governments and stakeholder groups. The research institutes and university work together closely in five areas of expertise: Social-, Plant-, Environmental-, Animal- and Agrotechnology & Food Sciences.

The Social Sciences Group (SSG) of WUR consists of the Department of Social Sciences which consists of 22 Chair Groups, the Agricultural Economics Institute (LEI) and the Centre for Development Innovation (CDI) and has approximately 750 employees. The Social Sciences Group combines the strengths of scientific research and education in the field of people and society and is extremely qualified to support governments, companies and civil-society organisations in the choices they have to make. SSG is involved in various national and international projects.

The management studies group (MST) conducts leading research in the field of chain and network science, with a special focus on stakeholder engagement, (responsible) innovation and internationalization. MST offers and contributes to a broad range of different educational programs for both undergraduate and postgraduate students. Central in MST’s research program is the quest for understanding and managing the rapidly developing international chains and networks, with a special focus on stakeholder engagement, societal- and ethical dimensions of innovation processes, innovation management, technology adoption, transparency and sustainability.

The Education and Competence studies group (ECS) conducts leading research in the field of identifying competence frameworks, developing arrangements for competence development in both education and professional organisations, specifying the conditions under which competence development takes place, and construction of the assessment of competence improvement. With this, ECS has the aim to strengthen responsive and responsible education, training and development to contribute to the development of key competencies society needs in order to address various current and future grand challenges (e.g. poverty, disparity, sustainability). Besides research, ECS is involved in many BSc and MSc courses in different educational programmes within Wageningen University.

With its multi-disciplinary team consisting of management scientists, business ethicists, economists, sociologists, and econometrists, MST is specialised in empirical research in the field of industrial responsible innovation and especially suited to identify social and economic benefits of RRI in the different industries and scientific disciplines, as well as drivers and barriers for the adoption of RRI in practice. Together with ECS, MST focusses on individual/team learning and co-creation in cross-sector partnerships for Responsible Innovation. With its HR-D focus, ECS is also specialized in the development of training and coaching programs for RI.

Persons involved in the project:

Dr. Vincent Blok MBA, male, is associate professor in sustainable entrepreneurship, business ethics and responsible innovation at the management studies and philosophy chair group, Wageningen University. Previously, he was CEO of the Louis Bolk Institute, a private research institute in the field of sustainable and organic agriculture, food and health. In his current job, he leads several European and National action and research projects. Together with a team of 9 PhD students and 2 Post-docs, Blok pursues three lines of research – Business Ethical Issues in Sustainable Entrepreneurship, the role of entrepreneurship and innovation in the transition to a more sustainable system of consumption and production, responsible
Innovation and innovation theory. Blok’s team is one of the leading groups specialized in the field of responsible innovation in the private sector.

Dr. Renate Wesselink, female, is assistant professor in HRD and competence development for sustainability at the Education and Competence studies group at Wageningen University. She did her PhD thesis on competence-based vocational education and currently she is involved, together with 8 PhD candidates and 1 Post-doc in the identification of competencies relevant for future grand challenges such as sustainable development and unravelling effective learning environments in professional organisations, with a special focus on teams and team learning, to develop these competencies. The research of her team is positioned in the niche of discovering the effective mechanism of the micro level (i.e. teams and individuals) in contributing to sustainable development and responsible innovation within professional organisations.

Selected publications relevant to this project:


Selected projects relevant to this project:

- **RRI Practice** (EU Coordination and Support Action) – A project to understand the barriers and drivers to the successful implementation of RRI both in European and global contexts; to reflect on and promote the modernisation of institutional practices and cultures of research institutions and funding organisations; and to identify and support best practices to facilitate the uptake of RRI and its implementation in research programmes. The project involves detailed and comparative analysis of the five keys of RRI (societal engagement, gender, open access, science education and ethics) locating these within broader, evolving discourses on RRI. WUR’s role in specific is to contribute to the conceptual framework of the total program, to collect data about best practices in the Netherlands and to audit RRI practices in Dutch Universities.

- **Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education** (EnRRICH) – A project to build the capacity of staff in higher education to facilitate their students’ development of knowledge, skills and attitudes and competencies in responsible research and innovation, and respond to the research needs of society, particularly underserved civil society organisations (CSOs). It will do this by identifying, developing, testing, and disseminating resources,
based on existing good practice and trials of new initiatives, to embed the five RRI keys in academic curricula across Europe, with specific reference to science and engineering. It will develop case studies which showcase examples for students, teachers, professional trainers and academic staff of HEIs. ECS is responsible for the identification of competencies and describing learning outcomes to embed RRI within BSc and MSc levels of HEIs (http://www.livingknowledge.org/projects/enrich/).

- **Motivations, drivers and barriers for responsible innovation in the Dutch food sector** (NWO 2 PhD funding) – A research project to identify the motivation of companies to innovate responsibly and to identify and evaluate socio-ethical and economic drivers and barriers to invest and participate in innovations for healthy food. The project studies the motivations, socio-ethical and economic drivers and barriers of responsible innovation both on the food company and the innovation cycle of specific food product level. MST is project leader of the project, in which WUR collaborates with the Dutch Choices foundation, an organization that promotes innovations for healthy food.

- **Responsible Innovation Practices of Sustainable Entrepreneurs in Making the Transition towards Sustainable Agricultural, Water and Energy Systems** (NWO 2 post-doc funding) – A research project to explore how dimensions of RI are applied by European New Technology Based Firms (NTBF) start-ups developing climate change innovations, how sustainable entrepreneurship can benefit from RI, how relevant capabilities and resources could be enhanced as well as how the systems NTBFs operate in can be supportive. MST is project leader of the project, in which WUR collaborates with Climate KiC BV, one of the largest brokers in climate innovations in Europe.

- **Responsible Innovation for sustainable city systems: the role of the social entrepreneurs** (Climate KiC PhD funding) – a project to explore the role of social entrepreneurs as ‘transformational leaders’ or ‘social transformers’ in responsible innovations for sustainable innovation in general and sustainable city systems in particular, and strategies which can help social entrepreneurs to improve their responsible innovation processes to further sustainable city systems. MST is project leader of the project.

**Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:**

Non applicable for WUR
Fraunhofer is Europe’s largest application-oriented research organization. Our research efforts are geared entirely to people’s needs: health, security, communication, energy and the environment. As a result, the work undertaken by our researchers and developers has a significant impact on people’s lives. There are more than 80 research units, including 60 Fraunhofer Institutes, at different locations in Germany. The participating project unit Fraunhofer Center for Responsible Research and Innovation (CeRRI) is located at the Fraunhofer IAO. The basis for all work undertaken at the Fraunhofer IAO is a deep conviction that business success in a globalised arena is contingent on an ability to profitably leverage new high-tech potentials. In order to optimally exploit these opportunities, companies must be capable of developing and implementing customer and employee-oriented technologies faster than their competitors. Work organisation concepts must be simultaneously innovative and anthropocentric. A systematic design, in other words, is the outcome of pooled management and technical expertise. This holistic perspective when it comes to project processing ensures that equal consideration is given to commercial success, employees’ interests and social consequences.

Fraunhofer CeRRI is seeking to reorient innovation toward people, to anticipate prospective socio-technological developments, and to identify promising research trajectories, we re-envision team compositions and utilize the potential of (gender) diversity. We expand the term stakeholder to include all groups and individuals who can affect or be affected by research and development — such as decision-makers from scientific, political, and commercial organizations and, in a broader sense, the public. We develop original interaction and preference articulation formats and utilize our vast expertise in the social and natural sciences, economics, design, communication studies, and computer science. With this focus, Fraunhofer CeRRI can contribute a wide range of theoretical and conceptual knowledge in the RiCONFIGURE project; as well as a long term experience in the realization of research projects that focus on public engagement, stakeholder integration and the utilization of (gender) diversity in innovation and technology transfer processes.

The Fraunhofer Institute of Optronics, System Technologies and Image Exploitation (IOSB) has 380 permanent employees, of which 282 are scientists or engineers, and has annual operational costs of about 38 million € (2012). IOSB develops innovative concepts and application solutions in information technology. It provides sustainable solutions of advanced control, monitoring and diagnosis systems mainly for industrial partners including SMEs.

The Fraunhofer Application Center for Industrial Automation (IOSB-INA) in Lemgo is one of the five IOSB locations and was founded in 2009. It develops innovative solutions for intelligent technical systems in the areas of intelligent computer networks, machine learning, big data and adaptable automation systems, microelectronics, software engineering, and systems engineering in conjunction with deep domain knowledge in the domain of industrial automation are the core competences. Target groups are manufacturers of hardware and software for automation, machine and plant manufacturers, and operators of technical systems. Fraunhofer IOSB-INA is a research partner of the German leading edge technology cluster Intelligent Technical Systems Ostwestfalen-Lippe (it’s OWL). With the SmartFactoryOWL, a cutting-edge lab environment for ICT-based automation technologies, which is run together with the OWL University in Lemgo, the IOSB-INA provides the space to form a social-lab

Persons involved in this project:

Dr. phil. Fabian Schroth, male, is senior scientist at the Fraunhofer Center for Responsible Research and Innovation. Current projects focus on need oriented research planning and knowledge and technology transfer. He holds a doctoral degree in sociology and has thorough expertise in innovation theory and science and technology studies.
Simone Kaiser, female is head of Need-Oriented Research Planning at Fraunhofer Center for Responsible Research and Innovation (CeRRI). Her current projects focus on the development of new procedure models which will enable companies and research institutes to generate user-centered, popularly accepted and highly marketable innovations. The combination of well-established social science methods and novel approaches of Design research leads to new strategies for customized configurations of technological development and research agenda processes.

Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Martina Schraudner, female, is head of the unit Fraunhofer Center for Responsible Research and Innovation (CeRRI) and of the department of Gender and Diversity in Organisations at the Institute for Machine Tools and Factory Management at the Technical University of Berlin. Her research focuses on the integration of different perspectives in the innovation process already in very early stages of research planning. Martina Schraudner has served in several innovation committee of the German government, is a member of the Expert Group "Structural Change" of the EU, and was member of the "Women in Science and Technology Group (WIST)". She has undertaken first steps in establishing gender mainstreaming strategies for research institutions in Germany especially by integrating gender aspects in different research themes.

Mr. Sebastian Schriegel, male. Sebastian Schriegel is Group Manager Communication Systems at Fraunhofer IOSB-INA. He received his Diploma degree in Automation Technology from the University of Applied Sciences Ostwestfalen-Lippe in 2005 und his master degree in Mechatronics in 2010. Sebastian Schriegel is expert in High Precision Time Synchronisation, Real-Time Ethernet and Industry 4.0. He is author of more than 40 scientific publications and he is the winner of the best paper Awards of IEEE Symposium ISPCS 2007 and GI-Conference Real-Time 2014. In 2013 he was General Co-Chair of the international IEEE Symposium ISPCS.

Selected publications relevant to this project:

- Heidingsfelder, Marie; Kimpel, Kora; Best, Kathinka; Schraudner, Martina (2015): Shaping Future—Adapting design know-how to reorient innovation towards public preferences. Technological Forecasting and Social Change 101(0), 291-298.


- Best, Kathinka; Sinell, Anna; Heidingsfelder, Marie; Schraudner, Martina (2015): The Gender Dimension in Knowledge and Technology Transfer - The German Case. European Journal of Innovation Management 19(1).

- Paelke, Volker; Röcker, Carsten: User Interfaces for Cyber-Physical Systems: Challenges and Possible Approaches. In: International Conference on Human-Computer Interaction, Los Angeles, USA, Aug.2015


Selected projects relevant to this project:

- Shaping Future  
  (2014-1017; funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research)
Seeking to enable the »experts in everyday« to co-shape long-term trajectories of socio-technological advances, Shaping Future has developed an original participatory foresight methodology that draws from both design know-how and the social sciences. In a multi-staged co-ideational process, laypersons – people with a non-professional interest in technology – develop original notions of prospective human-machine cooperation and articulate their ideas in a variety of original formats. By engaging multiple senses, these formats help transcend the limitations of purely verbal expression and provide accessible forms of presentation. In a round-up session, a group of specialists from a range of professional fields projects the outcomes of these workshops into participatory technology roadmaps by estimating when anticipated developments will become technologically feasible and by arranging them on a timeline based on these estimates. By projecting public needs and values into accessible scenarios and roadmaps, our method can help foster widely accepted research trajectories and highly marketable technological advances.

- **Discover Markets**
  (2010-2013; funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research)
  Seeking to accommodate public preferences and to foster the viability of innovations, Discover Markets has developed an original participatory methodology that always keeps an eye toward creating marketable products and centers the entire research and development process on the lay perspective. In a guided co-ideational process, laypersons are enabled to articulate their preferences and to conceive of a range of original ideas for potential innovations. A group of engineers conditions the developed ideas with regard to their technical feasibility. One particular purpose of the project is to develop promising business ideas and, in cooperation with Fraunhofer Venture, to initiate highly technological start-ups.

- **Wissenspool**
  (2013-2015; funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research)
  The Knowledge Pool project brings together groups of people with complementary skills at an early stage in research projects in order to mutually define markets, to address these with new technologies, establish appropriate teams and to evaluate project ideas. The user-centered generation of ideas is thus expanded by the opportunity of integrating ideas for potential business models from the very start of project idea development.
  The goal is to develop evaluation systems within the scope of topic-specific workshops that make it possible to identify project ideas that have a serious likelihood of being spun-off. In a more developed form, the Knowledge Pool approach could be used as an incubator for research projects that are capable of being spun-off.

- **IMPROVE**
  (EU-Project 678867)(2016-2018) Innovative Modelling Approaches for Production Systems to Raise Validatable Efficiency; By dealing with the issue of user support functions in terms of self-diagnosis and self-optimisation, the project wants to develop standardisable and commercialisable Human Machine Interface solutions that can be made accessible and applicable for European SMEs.

- **itsowl-IV**

**Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:**
- In the SmartFactoryOWL, a cutting-edge lab environment for ICT-based automation technologies, the most important research topics for digitization at the shop floor level of the factory of the future, such as adaptability, resource efficiency and cognitive human-machine interaction are addressed. Located on the campus of the OWL University in Lemgo in the heart of Germany’s leading-edge
technology cluster "Intelligent Technical Systems OstWestfalenLippe it's OWL", the SmartFactoryOWL is simultaneously research and testing lab for the scientists and engineers of the involved research institutes and companies as well as an outstanding learning environment for students (Bachelor, Master, Ph.D) of engineering study programmes. In particular for small and medium sized enterprises (SME) it is possible to test and optimize their production systems with integrated Industry 4.0 technologies and to train their staff.
PARTNER 5 - THE COLUMBIAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE – ACAC – COLUMBIA

ACAC is a Colombian independent, non-government, grass-root organization created in 1970. With more than 1,000 members, its main objective is to facilitate the popularization of science, technology and innovation in the society. For more than 40 years, ACAC has worked with local, regional, national Colombian government as a support body for implementing public strategies in the field of science, technology and innovation – STI. In 1997 ACAC created the first science and technology interactive museum in Bogotá: Maloka. For more than 30 years ACAC has lead the most relevant science fair in Colombia: Expociencia.

Based on those achievements, in the last 10 years ACAC moved towards creating academic programs such as capacity building and peer review evaluation. Since its associates can be from different fields, ACACs methodologies involve trans-disciplinary approaches, stakeholder involvement, citizen participation, and public communication. ACAC employs 5 researchers and 10 research assistants but its strategy is to work closely to its associates.

ACAC has evolved using information technology as a driver to overcome barriers of development. It is convinced that with empowered communities communicating among themselves knowledge will have a different meaning in the XXI century. Scientific and technological knowledge, therefore, will be closer to common people and the correct use of it will strengthen networks around the world.

In addition to the vast project management experience ACAC holds in Colombia, it has also started to undertake international projects such as: IANPHI-Koplan-28496 ACAC (2015, 2016, 2017) with the International Association of National Health Institutes, WIPO-ACAC 2015 for reporting on the evolution of the Intellectual property in Colombia.

Moreover, ACAC is highly engaged in RRI and especially with the European vision of RRI. That is why ACAC applied to become an H2020 – SWAFS national contact point, and in 2016 Colciencias (the Colombian National Authority for STI) granted it.

Persons involved to this project:

Ms. Maria VILLAVECES, female, Law degree, MA in arts, PhD applicant in political studies, specializes in science and technology policies. She leads the Colombian Association of the Advancement of Science – ACAC. Currently her work is centered in promoting the popularization of science and technology in a developing countries linking sectors such as intellectual property, open access and day by day scientific work.

Dr. Eduardo POSADA, male, Bachelor in Physics, PhD in Science. Senior Project Manager specialised in popularization of science. Chairperson of COMSATS’ Coordinating Council, comprising the Heads of Centres of Excellence. Dr. Posada is a Professor Emeritus at the National University of Colombia (1990). At the National University in Bogotá, he has been the principal investigator of several projects founded by Colcienciencias

Mr. Francisco GONZALEZ, male, BSc. Environmental Biology/Ecology, specialized in Information Technology. As the head of the innovation department of ACAC, he leads the design, adaptation or development of all software infrastructure of ACAC including all the participatory strategies that ACAC promotes for popularization of STI.
Selected publications relevant to this project:

- Gonzalez F. (2016) Cafeto (software for ACACs peer review evaluation)


Selected projects relevant to this project:

- **Cundinamarca Investiga** (2014-2016) the purpose of that project was identify or map where in that region were citizens interested in innovation, train them for grants applications, receive the funds and empower them to share the results of the projects.

- **ExpoCIENCIA** (1991-2017), children, researchers and citizens engagement on science, technology and innovation. 50,000 people gathered in Bogota to share knowledge and passion for science. http://www.expociencia.co

- **Encuentro con la Ciencia** (2000-2016), program that aims at bringing closer scientist with children.

Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:

A network of more than 1,000 members spread around Colombia.
PARTNER 6 – THE ADRIANO OLIVETTI FOUNDATION – ASEF – ITALY

Fondazione Adriano Olivetti was established in 1962 by Adriano Olivetti’s relatives, friends, and collaborators, with the aim of mobilizing and developing the civil, social, and political engagement that distinguished his work. Among its statutory aim is "the promotion, encouragement, and organization of studies directed at deepening the knowledge of the conditions upon which social progress depend". In line with this mandate, the Foundation carries out research and sponsors cultural and scientific projects following an interdisciplinary approach in four areas: Institutions and Society; Economy and Society; Community and Society; and Art, Architecture, and City Planning. Since its establishment, the Foundation has always seen its complex and valuable cultural legacy as more than just something to be remembered, but rather as a creative instrument. The staff of the Foundation is based in two branch offices in Roma and Ivrea, the former Olivetti Headquarter. To implement its programs and projects the Foundation avails itself of experts in social research, particularly in areas such as: the relationship between scientific research, innovation and society, and specifically in responsible research and innovation (RRI) and Open Science (OS); multi-stakeholders dialogue, participation and partnership in the field of innovation and science ethics. Specific expertise concerns the mapping of risks, obstacles and facilitating factors with respect to certain changes, and technical and social innovation.

Starting from December 2012, the Fondazione Adriano Olivetti and the Edizioni di Comunità started a communal publishing programme, with the aim, among others, of bringing back to bookshops the most interesting and important writings of Adriano Olivetti and his time Founded by Adriano Olivetti in 1946, Edizioni di Comunità is widely regarded as the first and most important Italian publishing house which strongly supported the creation of a common culture in architecture, city planning and both environmental and social sustainability. The publishing house reopened in 2012, in partnership with Fondazione Adriano Olivetti, and presently focuses on texts about Olivetti’s legacy, as well as Adriano Olivetti’s own works (speeches, essays, letters). It also reintroduces texts from its historical catalogue and attracts and publishes researches and projects results reports about innovation and sustainability.

The Adriano Olivetti Foundation has been also a member of the European Foundation Center (EFC) since 1998. The EFC is a platform for and champion of institutional philanthropy – with a focus on Europe, but also with an eye to the global philanthropic landscape. With over 25 years of experience and over 200 member organisations, the EFC gives its members access to a wealth of knowledge on the sector and to long-term relationships with philanthropic peers and external actors from the academic and entrepreneurial worlds. In late Nineties, Fondazione Adriano Olivetti represented the European Foundations at the International Committee of the Council on Foundations in Washington.

Persons involved in this project:

**Mr. Alfonso ALFONSI**, male, sociologist, MA in Humanities, has more than 35 years of experience at international level in social research, training, evaluation, scientific networking. His expertise includes science ethics and science policies, social and cultural change and socialisation of scientific and technological research. He has coordinated international multi-stakeholder networks for development, such as the Network on Services for the Urban Poor of the WSSCC or the UN-Habitat International Forum of Researchers on Human Settlements. For what concerns his most recent activities, he worked in Ethiopia as an expert for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, was scientific coordinator for the SET-DEV Project (Science Ethics and Technological Responsibility in Developing and Emerging Countries) and is currently Team Leader of the WP “Dialogue and participation” of the MAPPING Project (Managing Alternatives for Privacy, Property and INternet Governance). He serves as Science Ethics expert for the European Commission.

**Mr. Stefano FAUSTINI**, male, degree in Economics (specialization in Environmental Economics) post-degree courses in no-profit (fundraising, accounting and taxation). Three years of working experience in the field of application EU funding for training (Leonardo Da Vinci, European Social Fund), financial controller
for an Italian joint-venture in Tanzania (construction sector), since 2010 administrative for Adriano Olivetti Foundation.

Ms. Francesca LIMANA, female, founded in 1998 "Studio 54", a press office that develops communication strategy in the cultural field for public and private institutions. From 1998 to 2000 is in chief of the Swiss Cultural Institute's press office in Rome. Since 1999 is in charge of the communication, the digital media and the publishing for the Adriano Olivetti Foundation, where she was creator of the editorial project "Collana Intangibili". Since 2010 she has been a member of the network European Communications Professionals in Philanthropy, representing the Fondazione Adriano Olivetti. She has been visiting professor for several master and university courses.

Mr. Daniele MEZZANA, male, sociologist, MA in Humanities, MA in Mass communication, specialised in the relationship between science, innovation and society. He collaborates as a consultant in several research organizations and currently works at the University of Rome "Tor Vergata" in the management of the STARBIOS2 project. He has most served as a task leader in several European projects (FP7 and Horizon 2020) about, among others, science and innovation (SET-DEV), surveillance studies (SMART), electronic evidence in justice (EVIDENCE), technologies to improve the relationship between citizens and law enforcement agencies (CITYCOP).

Ms. Matilde TREVISANI, female, MA in Philosophy from Rome University La Sapienza and an MSc in Human Rights and Development from University of Bologna. Before joining Fondazione Adriano Olivetti she worked as research fellow in Paris for UNESCO and as project manager for the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. She joined the Adriano Olivetti team in 2010 and as programme manager she has been coordinating several national and international programs. She has been participated to the Annual General Assembly of the European Foundation Centre since 2011 representing the Fondazione Adriano Olivetti.

Selected publications relevant to this project:
- Alfonsi, A., (2013), “Reaching the MDGs: Socialisation of scientific and technological research to meet the challenges of diversity and globality”, as a preparatory contribution to the works of the 2013 ECOSOC High Level segment, Ginevra. Published by the ECOSOC secretariat in all the UN working languages.
- AA.VV. Lisbon Hearings, Collana Intangibili, Fondazione Adriano Olivetti, 2008.

Selected projects relevant to this project:
- Title: Ivrea 2008-2010 Program

The Adriano Olivetti Foundation, along with the Ivrea 2008-2010 program, has launched studies and projects related to the key issues of the Knowledge Society, the core of the Lisbon Strategy, now Europe 2020, and the support of its development. 2008 marked the centennial celebration of foundation of the first Olivetti factory in 1908 in Ivrea by the “engineer”, Camillo Olivetti. This celebration, along with the conviction that according to the Olivetti company, both at the time of its founding many years ago and in the years to follow, the future is founded upon being a pioneer of values and actions based on the development of the knowledge of people and territories, provided the project’s name as well as its agenda. Its first task was the formation of an Innovation Board (Tavolo dell’Innovazione), whose participants are the Piedmont Region, the City of Ivrea and Microsoft Italy, the Province of Turin, Confindustria Canavese and the Canavese Bioindustry Park. The word Ivrea is to identify the Canavese region as the area where Ivrea 2008-2010’s first tasks and empirical analysis were carried out. The program’s initiatives, i.e. The Innovation Board (Tavolo dell’Innovazione), The Census (Il Censimento), Observatory (Osservatorio), The Laboratory of the Intangible (Laboratorio dell’Intangibile), and the Lisbon Hearings, have been defined taking into account this area in the North-East part of the Turin/Piedmont Province, and performed and managed according to criteria of strict and reciprocal integration.

With the research-task oriented project, The Census, whose governing body is the Innovation Board, the Foundation has carried out the first cognitive analysis “of the consistency and governing methods of a companies’ strategic ‘intangibles’”. Its aim is to identify the structure and development potential of the various elements of intellectual capital, including its contributions to the company on an economic and financial level. The survey regarding the problems of recognition and development of intangible assets will be prosecuted among businesses (in particular SMEs) of the Innovation Clusters in collaboration with the Piedmont Region.

**Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:**
Non applicable for ASEF
Corvinus University of Budapest (CUB) is the major higher education institution in the field of economic and management sciences in Hungary. Its intellectual antecedent dates back to the 18th century and its very first legal predecessor was established well over a century ago. Corvinus is often identified with its historic main building – originally the central Customs House, opened in 1874 and re-opened as university in 1950 – referring to a solid tradition, high quality and excellent reputation.

Corvinus Business School is the largest of the three Faculties of CUB representing 70 percent of students and staff within the university. The number of students exceeds 7000. Corvinus Business School offers programs at the bachelor, master and post-graduate levels both in English and Hungarian; PhD programs in English; and a double degree master program in German.

Corvinus Business School is a member of EnRRICH, a H2020 consortium, exploring promising teaching and learning practices of RRI, and developing new RRI-related features for the curriculum. EnRRICH is Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education. The project will improve the capacity of students and staff in higher education to develop knowledge, skills and attitudes to support the embedding of RRI in curricula by responding to the research needs of society as expressed by civil society organisations (CSOs).

Department of Marketing, Media and Designcommunication (MMDC)

MMDC is part of one of the six institutes of CUB, Institute of Marketing and Media. MMDC focuses on innovative communication related education and research topics such as co-creation and user generated content with respect to corporate and societal value, designcommunication as a complex creative design methodology (communication integrated into development), open innovation, ethical aspects of social media. Members of the department have participated in several international education and research projects such as COST Action, CEMS, FP7.

Persons involved in this project:

Dóra Horváth, Ph.D., female, is associate professor at Corvinus University of Budapest, Institute of Marketing and Media, head of the Department of Marketing, Media and Designcommunication. Her areas of research include diffusion of new technology in personal communication, designcommunication, co-creation, projective research techniques. Her areas of education involve: strategic and creative planning of marketing communication, design management, advertising management. Participant and WP leader in the FP7 Cre8tv.eu project.

Julianna Faludi, Ph.D., female, is assistant professor of MMDC. Her areas of research include: open innovation, innovation patterns in the design-driven industries, consumption of cultural products. Her areas of education are: brand management, consumption of cultural product, economic sociology. Julianna Faludi is vice director of the Master Program in Comparative Local Development at CUB in cooperation with the University of Trento, University of Regensburg, and University of Ljubljana.

Attila Cosovan, DLA, male, is associate professor of MMDC. He is a designer artist, with his company Co&Co holds several international design awards such as Red Dot (http://coandco.cc/eredmenyeink). Attila Cosovan is first author of designcommunication, DIS.CO (https://issuu.com/cosovan/docs/ca_disco_web),
complex creative design methodology. As an artist, he contributes to the multidisciplinary education of future economists, by implementing design and artistic approaches into teaching. His areas of research includes design communication, integration of design methods in education, leadership and research.

**Attila Simay**, Ph.D., male, is assistant professor of MMDC. His areas of research include responsible approaches of marketing, matters of privacy in social media communication, SME marketing, Eastern Asia; his areas of teaching are marketing, marketing communication, marketing research.

**Zita Komár**, doctoral student, female, – her area of interest is communication, would contribute to the dissemination part of the project

**Daniella Horváth**, doctoral student, female, – her doctoral research would directly relate to RiCONFIGURE, desingcommunication and innovativeness

**Selected publications relevant to this project:**


- Faludi, Julianna (2016) Innovációs minták a design-vezérelt iparágakban. A nyílt Made in Italy = Innovation Patterns In the Design-Driven Industries: Opening Up The Made In Italy. Doktori (PhD) értekezés, Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem, Szociológia Doktori Iskola. DOI 10.14267/PhD.2016007


**Selected projects relevant to this project:**


- **Designcommunication Lab** – research and education theme in the framework of EFOP 3.6.1. (Institutional framework for the Rural Development Programme)

** Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:**

Non applicable for BCU
Partnership 8 – Corolab – Coro – Denmark

CORO, Co-lab Roskilde is a laboratory for innovation. We develop innovative ideas for growth and welfare in multidisciplinary co-labs. We are a platform for social innovation and inventions. Together with members, which consist of research, industry, public sector, and civil society we work on complex societal challenges which cannot be addressed or solved by just one of the actors/members. We work on creating and prototyping new products, business models, processes and/or services in real-life local environments with the aim to realize social, environmental and economic value for all implicated actors. We make change and innovate through concrete projects and networks. Members are often test platforms enabling ideas to be tested, challenged, developed and implemented – with the aim to scale nationally or even internationally.

The areas of specific focus lie within sustainability, diversity, social innovation, competences and food. All based on COROs philosophy on co-creation and inclusion from the beginning of an idea until implementation.

CORO is an independent non-profit organization founded in November 2015 by Roskilde municipality and some large companies and research institutions. Today CORO consist of 26 members; Roskilde Municipality, Roskilde Festival, Technical University of Denmark, Roskilde University, BC Catering, Housing association Zealand, Chr. Hansen, CLAVIS – Language school, Chamber of Commerce Roskilde, Zealand Institute of Business and Technology, De Forenede Dampvaskerier (industrial laundry) FORS - Utility company, Himmelev High school, KARA/NOVEREN - Waste incineration plant, Ramboll – consultancy, ROCKWOOL, Roskilde high school, Roskilde congress center, Roskilde technical school, University hospital, Skt. Josefs school, Spar Nord – bank, TVC – Lawyer, Absalon University college, Zealand Business School, VUC – high school.

CORO employs 3 fulltime employees, and two part-time. The employees are skilled within - and have years of experience in facilitating cross-sectorial cooperation and innovation activities.

Persons involved in the project:

Ms. Karolina E. Osipowska, female, M.sc. in business administration and business law. CEO – CORO. 12 years of work experience with management both within non-profit organizations – clusters and private sector. Working across borders with people from diverse cultural backgrounds at all organizational levels and sectors, and building long lasting relations with partners, distributors, customers and other stakeholders. Implementation of complex projects in partnerships.

Mr. Martin Thuesen, male, MSc. in Business Administration and Philosophy, is Senior Project Manager at CORO. He has extensive experience in managing open innovation processes both within the public and private sector. For an example he has facilitated multi-stakeholder dialogue and technology development contributing to new environmental legislation in the public-private partnership “The Moon Pig Project”. Currently he is responsible for the involvement of citizens and market actors in an urban planning project, where the goal is to create social value by implementing new outdoor facilities and climate solutions.

Selected publications relevant to this project:

Non applicable for CORO

Selected projects relevant to this project:

Diversity: The industry in DK is lacking skilled labor. The challenge is increasing and this needs to be solved asap as it will have an extremely high economic negative impact on the Danish society and financial situation. What if refugees could become an attractive work force in the future. In order to solve these challenges, the projects goal is to develop tools that support companies’ ability to access refugees as a real recruitment base. At the same time develop the right skills and competences for the refugees to meet the requirements made by the companies. The project is to make a new employment model with the take of a
360 degree approach involving the civil society – native Danes, refugees, municipalities and companies involved as test platforms.

**Social innovation and sustainability:**
Many local villages with a majority of single family homes in DK do not have district heating distribution systems. These villages are challenged as they are often being heated by fossil fuels. The project is to change these villages from being dependent of fossil fuels and to become complete self-sufficient and independent by introducing renewable, circular systems. The project will engage in a quadruple helix cooperation to succeed.

**Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:**
Non applicable for CORO
PARTNER 9 – LUDWIG BOLTZMANN GESELLSCHAFT – LBG – AUSTRIA

The Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft (LBG) is Austria’s independent research incubator with a focus on the health sciences. Currently the LBG operates 18 research institutes and clusters with about 600 employees.

Acting according to its motto “Research for people”, the LBG deals with socially relevant research questions. Therefore, the Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft is firmly embedding the concept of Open Innovation in Science (OIS) in Austria. Following successful pilot projects on the subject, the LBG launched 2016 the world's first Open Innovation in Science Research and Competence Center (OIS Center). Drawing on the experiences from the two pilot projects CRIS (Crowdsourcing Research Questions in Science) and LOIS (Lab for Open Innovation in Science), the OIS Center aims at generating insights into the potential of using of open innovation principles and methods in science, along the entire process of generating and disseminating new scientific research.

The main objectives of the OIS Center are to:
- Enable scientists and scientific organizations to generate more novel solutions to relevant societal challenges by applying open innovation principles and methods along the entire scientific research process
- Source knowledge from and collaborate with “unusual suspects” (outsiders) like users and user crowds, citizens, companies, non-profits, researchers and research groups from other disciplines, etc. with a view to improving scientific research processes and outcomes in terms of novelty and impact
- Improve the dissemination and translation of scientific knowledge into real-world innovations
- Make the entire scientific process more interactive and permeable, and by doing so contributing to improving the linkages between science and society

The main activities of the OIS Center are:
1) OIS Research: The OIS Center aims to investigate if, if yes how and under which conditions open innovation principles and methods can be applied in scientific research, with a view to building an understanding of
   - overall opportunities and risks of OIS
   - types of research projects and research project phases for which open innovation methods and principles are particularly relevant
   - approaches to collaboration, knowledge sourcing and/or knowledge sharing which are particularly relevant in different research projects and along different phases in the research process
   - approaches to capturing value from OIS
   - ecosystems which facilitate OIS on the level of organizations, scientific communities or society in general
2) OIS Methods Development: building on the pilot projects and the OIS Research, the OIS Center aims at developing and experimentally testing novel approaches to implementing OIS, specifically related to the use of crowdsourcing for generating research questions in basic science, the identification of alternative application areas for scientific results and novel approaches to appropriating and distributing innovation rents from scientific research.
3) OIS Education and Training: based on OIS Research and Methods Development and the pilot projects, the OIS Center aims at providing services for scientists and scientific institutions in the fields of education, training and project supervision/coaching.

Persons involved in the project:
Dr. Marion POETZ, female, is the scientific director of the OIS Center. She is also Associate Professor of Innovation Management (tenured) at the Department of Innovation and Organizational Economics,
Copenhagen Business School (CBS). She gained her PhD from WU Vienna and has been a visiting scholar at MIT Sloan School of Management, Bocconi University and ETH Zurich. Inspired by phenomena linked to open innovation, crowdsourcing and similar topics, her research is concerned with strategy, leadership, organizational learning and problem solving in new forms of innovation practices that are characterized by being more open, distributed, collaborative, and democratized than traditional models. Marion’s work has been published in leading international journals such as Management Science, featured in media such as Harvard Business Review or Inc. Magazine, and received numerous awards. She engages as a coordinator and teacher in different international master, PhD and executive teaching programs in the fields of entrepreneurship and innovation, and has been an academic advisor and consultant to organizations from various industries including national and international firms and policy-making institutions. Marion has been involved in developing the Open Innovation in Science (OIS) Initiative of the Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft and acts as the academic director of the Lab for Open Innovation in Science (LOIS). She is affiliated with the Danish Research Unit for Industrial Dynamics (DRUID), the Academy of Management (AOM) and has been selected as a member of the Young Global Leaders (YGLs) of the World Economic Forum (WEF).

Dr. Lucia MALFENT, female, has been managing the Open Innovation in Science Initiative at Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft since 2014. She has been involved in developing the Crowdsourcing project “Tell us!” as well as the Lab for Open Innovation in Science LOIS. Lucia is an expert in communications science. She studied at the University of Salzburg (Department of Communication Studies) and the Hanze University of Applied Sciences (Hanzehogeschool Groningen). Before joining the Ludwig Boltzmann Gesellschaft, Lucia held various positions within the fields of communications and project management, including Global Head of Corporate Communications at Intercell AG. Lucia completed the Trainee Program of the Federation of Austrian Industries (Industriellenvereinigung). She is a communications trainer and has lived in China, which was the source of inspiration for her PhD thesis on the theme of “Mobile Elites and Cultural Differences in Human Resources Management”.

Mag. Marie TRAPPL, female, Project Manager LOIS, joined the OIS Center in March 2017 to take over the operational lead of the Lab for Open Innovation in Science (LOIS), the LBG’s professional development which enables scientists to learn about and experiment with principles and methods of Open Innovation along the entire scientific research process. Having contributed to the development of the graduate school and event office of the international research institute IST Austria before, she has extensive experience in advisory and organizational services for scientists, establishing co-operations in academia and research, and communicating scientific programs and events. Before that she (co-) directed the Central College study exchange program for US students in Vienna. She studied Philosophy at the University of Vienna and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. She is also trained in systemic coaching and a professional narrator.

NN (M/F) is a Post-Doc to be hired at OIS Center.

Selected publications relevant to this project:


Selected projects relevant to this project:

• ‘Open Innovation in Science’ initiative launched in 2014 aiming to increase research impact through public engagement. The goal of this initiative is to establish open innovation methods in science to solving questions using new approaches, providing researchers access to new scientific sources, using new ways to disclose the findings, strengthening the culture of collaboration and sharing, and thereby redesigning research processes.

• CRIS - Crowdsourcing Research Questions in Science - The crowdsourcing initiative ‘Tell Us!’ invited the community, consisting of patients, family members, and health care professionals, to generate new research questions in the field of mental health. LBG took up that challenge and announced a research call representing an interactive workshop, known as Sandpit/Ideas Lab, to bring together 30 researchers for a multi-day event, during which researchers are specifically encouraged to think out-of-the box and dissolve disciplinary boundaries.

• LOIS – Lab for Open Innovation in Science – The one year programme LOIS enables scientists to learn about and experiment with principles and methods of Open Innovation along the entire scientific research process from generating research questions to eventually translating scientific knowledge into innovation. It is professional development program for scientists with in-class workshops, experimentation, hands-on-learning and practical implementation. LOIS provides access to international good practices and networks in the field of Open Innovation. The training aims to enable the cultural shift necessary to work more openly and collaboratively, and to integrate open practices into researchers’ day-to-day work. Besides the one-year program, a LOIS Summer School and customized LOIS programs and program modules are offered.

Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:

Non applicable for LGB
ISPT is the Dutch public-private innovation centre for the sustainability in process industry. It has organized over 50 international research programs and projects and more than 25 technology validation and valorisation projects. ISPT has been involved with social innovation projects focussing at multi partner cooperation and learning across organisations. ISPT has been the initiator of a social lab on circular energy. This includes partners of the total quadruple helix. ISPT projects cover both fundamental research and implementation projects always focused at sustainability and circularity. ISPT takes an active role in valorisation via involvement of numerous regions and the support of industrial practitioners (end users). The Innovation Academy maintains a large toolset to facilitate the process of cooperation in ideation execution and reflection phases. The RRI project will help validate and extend this toolset as well as to disseminate this toolset to a wider (European) network. ISPT expects to contribute and learn. This toolset and the related training will facilitate the training in innovation and cooperation skills for doctorate students and industrial researchers. The S-ISPT employs 10 co-workers.

Persons involved in the project:

Frans van den Akker, male, is a male Program Manager at ISPT, responsible for programs on social innovation and the training and education program for the ISPT process industry community. He has a Masters degree in Physics and over 20 years’ experience in innovation program management. Mr. Van den Akker is member of the Social Innovation taskgroup for the Dutch Energy topsector the author of the 2Score Innovation assessment tool and a number of innovation facilitation tools.

Lisa Groothuis, female, is an experienced communication officer at ISPT, responsible for external communication and events. She has organized various internal and external conferences for the Process Technology community, including the European Conference of Chemical Engineering 9. Miss Groothuis holds a degree in business communication and has worked prior to ISPT in various communication and marketing functions.

Selected publications relevant to this project:
Non applicable for ISPT

Selected projects relevant to this project:

EU Projects:
- FP7 CSA R4R – 2012 – 2015
- H2020-NMP-CSA-2015
- Interreg – Carbon2Value – 2016-2019 - networking, communication and dissemination activities, workshop organisation

National Programs:

Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:
Non applicable for ISPT
The Pompeu Fabra University (UPF) was established in 1990 as a public university with a strong dedication to excellence in research and teaching. Committed from its beginnings to the pursuit of excellence, it holds 26 undergraduate programmes, 91 Master’s courses and 9 doctoral degrees in the fields of biomedical sciences, social sciences and humanities, and communication and information technologies. The UPF in rankings: Times Higher Education ranking (2017): 17th highest ranked university in the world among those under 50 years of age; and 2nd Spanish university (position 175 worldwide and 83 in Europe); U-Multirank (2017): ranked 1st in Europe; Shanghai university ranking (2016): among the 400 top universities in the world; U-Ranking (BBVA Foundation & Ivie, 2016): the most productive university in Spain. The UPF and the Department of Experimental and Health Sciences have a strong international composition, show great dynamism in research and consider transversal education as a must. This international projection has been recognised by the Spanish Ministry of Education through the International Campus of Excellence award (2010) and is backed up by the UPF’s distinguished position in international rankings as one of the top Spanish universities. Researchers at UPF are successful securing international funding. For example, regarding the European Commission’s ERC programme, they obtained 19 ERC grants during FP7 (7 Starting, 2 Consolidator and 10 Advanced) and, so far, 7 within H2020 (2 Starting, 4 Consolidator and 1 Advanced).

The Department of Experimental and Health Sciences (DCEXS) was founded in 1998 by UPF, and nowadays the research and teaching excellence of the department is widely acknowledged. It was one of six research units in Spain to be awarded the “María de Maeztu” distinction and grant by the Spanish Ministry of Economy (MINECO) in its first call (2014). Together with the UPF’s Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, the DCEXS is responsible for undergraduate degrees, Master’s degrees, and PhD Programmes in Biomedicine, fully taught in English and recognized by independent agencies. Scientific research is perceived by the students, both undergraduates and postgraduates, as an essential tool in their studies. Over the last few years, the DCEXS has achieved a notable presence in different research fields and a growing research output and impact. Remarkably, the DCEXS researchers published 383 papers during 2015 and 2016, with 331 (86 %) falling in the first quartile and 233 (61 %) in the first decile. These publications have so far received over 400 citations.

Gema Revuelta is well versed in combining training and research. She teaches science communication in the Human Biology Degree of UPF; science communication courses in Master’s programmes of the DCEXS, and is the Director of the Master’s programme on Science Communication. She is the Director of the Studies Center on Science, Communication and Society (SCS-UPF). This centre aims at bringing closer together society and science by, on one hand, fostering the scientific knowledge and culture and, on the other hand, working for the better alignment between R+D+i—in all its stages—and society’s needs and values. As Director of the SCS-UPF, Gema coordinates the Horizon2020 project HEIRRI (Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation). This project also involves the Research Group in Health Science Education (GRECS), which aims at improving the educational project of the Science Faculty of UPF, at enhancing the initiatives to improve the university teaching, at facilitating the contact with secondary education to increase of scientific interest of young students, and at binging together society and science.

Persons involved in the project:

Gema Revuelta, female. Director of the Studies Center on Science, Communication and Society from Universitat Pompeu Fabra, associated professor of Science Communication and Director of the Master Degree on Science Communication at the same university. She is nowadays the Coordinator of H2020 project HEIRRI (Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation). She has participated in several European projects (ENSCOT, AMPERA, ESCITY, STEPE, MASIS, PLACES, Kitics, NERRI and ResAGORA) and other international projects (IBAMOCA). For the last 7 years, and
from time to time, she has been an independent evaluator for the EC in the field of Science and Society. Revuelta was also member of the Scientific Committee of the Rome Declaration on Responsible Research and Innovation in Europe (http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/rome_declaration_RRI_final_21_November.pdf ) and member of the Expert Group on Policy Indicators for Responsible Research and Innovation, who published the Report “Indicators for promoting and monitoring Responsible Research and Innovation” (http://ec.europa.eu/research/swafs/pdf/pub_rii/rii_indicators_final_version.pdf ). From 1998 to 2014, she was Deputy Director of the Science Communication Observatory from Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

**Josep Eladi Baños**, male. Degree in medicine (1981), PhD with Extraordinary Prize (1988). He has worked at universities in France, Canada and the United States, and has been guest lecturer at the University of Chile (2003) and at McMaster University (2007). Professor at the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB) (1985-2002) and associate professor at the Blomberg School of Public Health at the Johns Hopkins University (2009-2012). Professor of pharmacology at UPF since 2002. Vice-dean (2004-2005) and vice-rector of Teaching and Academic Planning (2005-2013). He has received four Vicens-Vives awards by the Catalan Government, three for teaching innovation and one for academic trajectory (2015). He investigates the mechanisms of neuropathic pain, and pain associated with medical procedures in intensive care patients. In 2016 he received the Grünenthal Foundation's award for the best clinical pain research work.

**Mar Carrió**, female. Faculty member at the Department of experimental and health sciences at UPF. Member of the Health Sciences Educational Research Group (GRECS), director of the interuniversitary Master degree of pre-service teacher training UPF-UOC, coordinator of the problem based learning courses in Human Biology Degree and of the program “Bringing science to young people” at the Barcelona Biomedical Research Park (PRBB). Mar is also a member of the “school scientific activity: language, tools and contexts” (ACELEC) from the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB). She had her PhD in biotechnology on 2003 at the UAB and afterwards she specialized in science education. Actually her research area is focused on inquiry based learning methodologies and science teachers training. She has participated in several projects on teaching innovation in secondary school and higher education. Her research has been published in more than 35 journal papers and book chapters and presented in more than 40 conferences. She received the national award for educational innovation from the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science on 2007, the teacher quality award from Universitat Pompeu Fabra on 2013 and the Jaume Vicens Vives award for the project "Evaluation of learning in the Faculty of Health and Life sciences" from the Catalan Government on 2016.

**Núria Saladié** , female. Since 2015, project manager of the H2020 project HEIRRI (Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation). She has previously been working - since 2013 and until 2016 - as a research assistant for European projects at the Studies Center on Science, Communication and Society from UPF. She has worked with the FP7 projects PLACES, KiICs and NERRI. Núria has a degree in journalism from Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and a master’s degree in Science Communication from UPF.

**Selected publications relevant to this project:**


Selected projects relevant to this project:

• **HEIRRI** (H2020 – Coordinator) (2015-2018), Higher Education Institutions and Responsible Research and Innovation (HEIRRI), is a project that wants to integrate the concept of RRI into the curricula of higher education institutions around Europe and beyond, in order to help the research and innovation of the future to be better tailored to society’s needs and expectations. [http://www.heirri.eu](http://www.heirri.eu)

• **Res-AGorA** (FP7 – involved) (2013-2016), Res-AGorA aims to build a governance framework for responsible research and innovation (RRI). UPF contributed in its section “RRI Trends”, contributing to the monitoring of RRI at a policy level [http://www.rritrends.res-agora.eu](http://www.rritrends.res-agora.eu)

• **NERRI** (FP7 – partner). (2013-2016). NERRI (Neuro-enhancement Responsible Research and Innovation) was a project aiming at establishing trends of opinion about neuro-enhancement and neuro-enhancers use around Europe.

• **PLACES** (FP7 – partner) (2010-2014)

Significant infrastructure relevant to this project:

Non applicable for UPF
### 4.2 THIRD PARTIES INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT (INCLUDING USE OF THIRD PARTY RESOURCES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1/DBT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party A (the OECD Working Party for Bio, Nano-, and Emerging Technologies (BNCT), B (the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science, Innovation and Economy), and C (the Austrian Railways (OEBB) will all disseminate handbook and booklet series, deliverables 6.4 and 9.6 through relevant channels (free of charge).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2/HIS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€22,500 for External Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</strong></td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third party A (the OECD Working Party for Bio, Nano-, and Emerging Technologies (BNCT) will:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assist task 7.1 in establishing network contacts to innovation practitioners and policy-makers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Host one or two policy workshops in task 7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Disseminate policy briefs from task 7.4
  • (Contributions are free of charge)

Third party B (the Austrian Federal Ministry for Science, Innovation and Economy will):
  • Participate as case partner in WP4 (Social Lab III)
  • Assist task 7.1 in establishing network contacts to ERAC members
  • Participate in policy workshops in task 7.3
  • Disseminate policy briefs from task 7.4 to ERAC and other relevant networks
  • (Contributions are free of charge)

Third party C (the Austrian Railways (OEBB) will):
  • Participate as case partner in WP4 (Social Lab III)
  • Assist task 7.1 in establishing network contacts to relevant network
  • Participate in practitioners’ workshops in task 7.2
  • (Contributions are free of charge)

3/WUR

Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted) Y/N

If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted No

Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties Y/N

If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party No

Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement) Y/N

If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions Yes

Third party A (the OECD Working Party for Bio, Nano-, and Emerging Technologies (BNCT) will contribute expert participants in WP6 meetings on the invitation of task leaders, especially task 6.4, in order to help ensure policy-relevance (free of charge).

4/FH

Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted) Y/N
### If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</em></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>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5/ACAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</em></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>Y/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</em></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third party A (the OECD Working Party for Bio, Nano-, and Emerging Technologies (BNCT) will disseminate training opportunities in task 8.3 (free of charge).

### 6/ASEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</em></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party* | No

Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement) | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions* | No

7/BCU

Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted) | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted* | No

Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party* | No

Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement) | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions* | No

8/CORO

Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted) | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted* | No

Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties | Y/N
---|---
*If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party* | No

Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement) | Y/N
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9/CBG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10/ISPT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11/UPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant plan to subcontract certain tasks (please note that core tasks of the action should not be sub-contracted)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe and justify the tasks to be subcontracted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€18,000 for the elaboration of supporting teaching videos for the training materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does the participant envisage that part of its work is performed by linked third parties</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party, the link of the participant to the third party, and describe and justify the foreseen tasks to be performed by the third party</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Does the participant envisage the use of contributions in kind provided by third parties (Articles 11 and 12 of the General Model Grant Agreement)</strong></th>
<th>Y/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If yes, please describe the third party and their contributions</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Ethics and security

5.1. Ethics
The potential ethical issues concerning research involving human participants in RiConfigure is connected to the element of public engagement in the social labs and workshop, conferences and expert interviews in WP7.

INFORMED CONSENT
No personal or sensitive data will be gathered as part of the RiConfigure. Data gathered through conferences and workshops will be about desirable sustainable futures, and will not contain personal information. Most data collected will already be available for the public in some form.

The consultations and workshops will involve both citizens and experts. These participants will take part in workshop activities and they will answer questions in order to provide the project with information and feedback on their visions, research program scenarios and policy options. The participants will join the workshops and consultations on voluntary basis.

Data gathered from experts and stakeholders will be treated according to the following protocol.

The data management protocol for data gathering from experts and stakeholders will ensure that data gathered from experts will be shared in full transparency and with full consent from these experts. All experts will be given the opportunity to consent to specific data being published and the specific form under which it is published. This ensures full compliance with the data directive. No other publication will be made without renewed consent. All specific data from experts will be stored in unaltered form. Completed consent forms will be stored as long as data remains stored.

If interviews with respondents are made, then consent for recording the interviews will be asked for. Interviews will 1) be treated anonymously, 2) not involve collection of personal or sensitive data, 3) be referred to as anonymous citations, 4) be initiated with the information that the interviewee is free to not participate and free to not answer questions.

Right to be forgotten
- All participants will have – and understand that they retain at all times – the right to withdraw themselves and their data from the public consultation exercise. They may do so for any (or no) reason. They may be asked for a reason, but it will be clear that there is no obligation, and that they are under no pressure whatsoever, to answer.
- Volunteers will be briefed, from the outset, on the procedures for ending their participation in the project. There will be clear guidelines and procedures for indicating withdrawal.
- Organizers will be sensitive to outward signals of distress, discomfort or fatigue, and will act at all times in the best interest of volunteers.

Data Protection
- Volunteers’ participation will not be revealed to any person or organization outside the project. Reasonable steps towards confidentiality and anonymity will be taken. Should it be necessary to mention particular individuals in research outputs, either permission will be sought prior to dissemination, or data will be anonymized.
- Data gathered from individuals will be handled in accordance with relevant EU and national legal standards. No sensitive data will be collected or shared.
• Data will be gathered only for specified, legitimate purposes and not used except for those purposes. Data will not be excessive relative to the purposes for which it is gathered.
• Data will be stored securely.
• A named data controller will be responsible for data management

**Data protection issues**
No personal data will be collected.

**Use of animals**
The research will not make use of animals.

**Human embryonic stem cells**
The research will not involve the use of such.

**Pre-Grant requirement (as indicated in the Ethics Summary report):**
**Third countries**
*In case activities undertaken in non-EU countries raise ethics issues, the applicants must ensure that the research conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State. This must be specified in the grant agreement.*

Answer from the consortium:
The consortium members ensure that the research that will be conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State.

**5.2. Security**
Please indicate if your project will involve:
• activities or results raising security issues: (NO)
• 'EU-classified information' as background or results: (NO)
### ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR THE ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Direct personnel costs</th>
<th>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</th>
<th>C. Direct costs of fin. support</th>
<th>D. Other direct costs</th>
<th>E. Indirect costs</th>
<th>Total costs</th>
<th>Reimbursement rate %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.2 Natural persons under direct contract</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.3 Seconded persons</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.4 SME owners without salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.5 Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.6 Personnel for providing access to research infrastructure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of costs</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit 1</th>
<th>Unit 2</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit 3</th>
<th>Flat-rate 15%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Total b</td>
<td>No hours</td>
<td>Total c</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Total g</td>
<td>h = 0.25 x (a + b + c + f) / (g - (i1 + i2) / n)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. DBT</strong></td>
<td>115,780.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>66,706.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. IEK</strong></td>
<td>175,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>57,100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. WU</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>276,317.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>25,800.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Fraunhofer</strong></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>341,181.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>31,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. ACAC</strong></td>
<td>56,495.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>46,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. FAO</strong></td>
<td>191,250.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>54,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. BICE</strong></td>
<td>77,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>26,500.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. CORIO</strong></td>
<td>122,000.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. LBG</strong></td>
<td>124,135.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>10,100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. S-ESPT</strong></td>
<td>127,780.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>12,400.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. UPP</strong></td>
<td>159,050.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>42,300.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Total** | 3,517,132.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1,571,132.50 | 0.00 | 1,571,132.50 | 3,517,132.50 | 0.00

1. See Article 6 for the eligibility conditions.
2. Indirect costs already covered by an operating grant received under any EU or Euatom funding programme; see Article 6.5(b)) are ineligible under the GA. Therefore, a beneficiary/linking third party 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, unless it can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action (see Article 6.2.E).
3. This is the theoretical amount of EU contribution that the system calculates automatically (by multiplying all the allocated 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. This is the theoretical amount of EU contribution that the system calculates automatically (by multiplying all the allocated 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).
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. Unit costs per unit calculated according to the beneficiary’s usual accounting practice.
10. Other: Only specific unit costs that do not include indirect costs.
11. Only for linked third parties that receive funding.
12. Only for linked third parties not receiving funding.
13. Only for linked third parties that receive funding.
ADDITONAL INFORMATION ON THE ESTIMATED BUDGET

- Instructions and footnotes in blue will not appear in the text generated by the IT system (since they are internal instructions only).
- For options in square brackets: the applicable option will be chosen by the IT system. Options not chosen will automatically not appear.
- For fields in grey in square brackets (even if they are part of an option as specified in the previous item): IT system will enter the appropriate data.

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:

\[
\text{\{EUR 4,650 / 143 hours\}} \times \text{\{country-specific correction coefficient of the country where the beneficiary is established\}}
\]

Country-specific correction coefficient (in force at the time of the call):

**EU Member States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>104.8%</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>135.3%</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>LV</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>111.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>EE</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>SI</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>EL</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>IE</td>
<td>113.5%</td>
<td>NL</td>
<td>104.3%</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CY</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>106.7%</td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>120.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>FI</td>
<td>116.6%</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>PT</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>FR</td>
<td>111.0%</td>
<td>LU</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**H2020 associated countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>FO</td>
<td>134.1%</td>
<td>LI</td>
<td>110.0%</td>
<td>MK</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>108.7%</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>131.9%</td>
<td>CEE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>113.1%</td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>116.6%</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>RS</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other countries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
<th>country</th>
<th>coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>CU</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>JP</td>
<td>115.9%</td>
<td>NI</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>114.6%</td>
<td>CV</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>KE</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>TL</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>KG</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>105.0%</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>KH</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
<td>DZ</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
<td>KR</td>
<td>105.2%</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>TT</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>116.6%</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>KZ</td>
<td>100.2%</td>
<td>PG</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>EG</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>TZ</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>ER</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>86.4%</td>
<td>PK</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJ</td>
<td>92.6%</td>
<td>ET</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>LK</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>100.4%</td>
<td>UG</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>151.5%</td>
<td>FJ</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>LR</td>
<td>100.1%</td>
<td>PY</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>99.4%</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:

\[ \text{EUR } 0.1 \times \text{estimated total kWh saved per m}^2 \text{ per year x 10} \]

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>

¹ Data from the ‘building energy specification table (BEST)’ that is part of the proposal and Annex 1.
**Research infrastructure unit cost**

*OPTION if specific unit cost applicable to the grant: 3. Access costs for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure*

Units: see (for each access provider and installation) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

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)*5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short name access provider</th>
<th>Short name infrastructure</th>
<th>Installation</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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</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 sequence (if any), 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 the cost components of each task, as follows:

For personnel costs:

---

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.
For personnel costs of doctors: ‘average hourly cost for doctors’, i.e.:

\[
\text{\{certified or auditable total personnel costs for doctors for year N-1}\}
\]
\[
\frac{(1720 \times \text{number of full-time-equivalent for doctors for year N-1})}{\text{multiplied by estimated number of hours to be worked by doctors for the task (per participant)}}
\]

For personnel costs of other medical personnel: ‘average hourly cost for other medical personnel’, i.e.:

\[
\text{\{certified or auditable total personnel costs for other medical personnel for year N-1}\}
\]
\[
\frac{(1720 \times \text{number of full-time-equivalent for other medical personnel for year N-1})}{\text{multiplied by estimated number of hours to be worked by other medical personnel for the task (per participant)}}
\]

For personnel costs of technical personnel: ‘average hourly cost for technical personnel’, i.e.:

\[
\text{\{certified or auditable total personnel costs for technical personnel for year N-1}\}
\]
\[
\frac{(1720 \times \text{number of full-time-equivalent for technical personnel for year N-1})}{\text{multiplied by estimated number of hours to be worked by technical personnel for the task (per participant)}}
\]

‘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/ equivalent appointing act

For consumables:

For each cost item: ‘average price of the consumable’, i.e.:

\[
\frac{(\text{total number of items purchased in year N-1})}{\text{multiplied by estimated number of items to be used for the task (per participant)}}
\]

‘total costs of purchase of the consumable’ means total value of the supply contracts (including related duties, taxes and charges such as non-deductible VAT) concluded by the beneficiary for the consumable 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

For medical equipment:

For each cost item: ‘average cost of depreciation and directly related services per unit of use’, i.e.:

\[
\frac{(\text{total capacity in year N-1} + \text{certified or auditable total costs of purchase of services in year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned})}{\text{multiplied by estimated number of units of use of the equipment for the task (per participant)}}
\]

‘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

For services:

For each cost item: ‘average cost of the service per study participant’, i.e.:

\[
\frac{(\text{total number of patients or subjects included in the clinical studies for which the service was delivered in year N-1})}{\text{multiplied by total number of items purchased}}
\]

‘total costs of purchase of the 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

For indirect costs:
Grant Agreement number: [insert number] [insert acronym] [insert call identifier]

H2020 Model Grant Agreements: H2020 General MGA: v4.0

\{
{\{\text{cost component ‘personnel costs’} + \text{cost component ‘consumables’} + \text{cost component ‘medical equipment’}}

\text{minus}

\{\text{costs of in-kind contributions provided by third parties which are not used on the beneficiary’s premises} \\
+ \text{costs of providing financial support to third parties (if any)}\}\}

\text{multiplied by}

\text{25\%}\}

The estimation of the resources to be used must be done on the basis of the study protocol and must be the
same for all beneficiaries/linked third parties/third parties involved.

The year N-1 to be used is the last closed financial year at the time of submission of the grant application.

Unit cost table: clinical studies unit cost\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task, Direct cost categories</th>
<th>Resource per patient</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Beneficiary 1 [short name]</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Beneficiary 2 [short name]</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Linked third party 1a [short name]</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Linked third party 2a [short name]</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Third party giving in-kind contributions 1 [short name]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sequence No. 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Personnel costs:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Doctors</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Medical Personnel</td>
<td>Phlebotomy (nurse), 10 minutes</td>
<td>8.33 EUR</td>
<td>11.59 EUR</td>
<td>10.30 EUR</td>
<td>11.00 EUR</td>
<td>9.49 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical Personnel</td>
<td>Sample Processing (lab technician), 15 minutes</td>
<td>9.51 EUR</td>
<td>15.68 EUR</td>
<td>14.60 EUR</td>
<td>15.23 EUR</td>
<td>10.78 EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Costs of consumables:</td>
<td>Syringe</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannula</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blood container</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Costs of medical equipment:</td>
<td>Use of -80° deep freezer, 60 days</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of centrifuge, 15 minutes</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Costs of services</td>
<td>Cleaning of XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Indirect costs (25% flat-rate)</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Same table as in proposal and Annex 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No. 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount per unit (unit cost sequence 1):</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sequence No. 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No. 1</th>
<th>XXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Personnel costs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Doctors</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Medical Personnel</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical Personnel</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Costs of consumables:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Costs of medical equipment:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Costs of services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>XXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Indirect costs (25% flat-rate)</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task No. 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount per unit (unit cost sequence 2):</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

INSTITUT FUER HOEHERE STUDIEN - INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES (IHS), established in JOSEFSTAEDTER STRASSE 39, WIEN 1080, Austria, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Martin KOCHER with ECAS id nkcherma signed in the Participant Portal on 18/04/2018 at 09:54:05 (transaction id SigId-20171-
1BptpqGxSPcXdDvOyojLYg68UKa3xT9sY4sORzt5MgZH
xcZcH3E3JuQ835hQ5Y16jmhwhV74mn9X23vWw66sly-
Jj71zyb8yr9NolznXKKp3-
4hacnZSUN8uzuYG9bhbYtQgsRUZmeMjFzKn9Qe4
)o). Timestamp by third party at
Wed Apr 18 10:54:16 CEST 2018
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

WAGENINGEN UNIVERSITY (WU), established in DROEVENDAALSESTEEG 4, WAGENINGEN 6708 PB, Netherlands, VAT number: NL811383696B01, ('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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’. 

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

Martijn HACKMANN with ECAS id nhackmma signed in the Participant Portal on 17/04/2018 at 10:47:49 (transaction id SigId-6099-mxnFAyhfF5wgUuuhSnLD0fTcxizcRRrhP8vFPowkwP0TJq-WGsfwT4DoQxuggY9KAgHFPHCxiA1zQmCCUcEn0jQ8-jJ71xfYb6y9NslzXKKP3-VWKjX5u2ViAoa0XPMma8Vf5Z2HIfOc2KX2ji0A55vW).
Timestamp by third party at Tue Apr 17 11:47:59 CEST 2018
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

FRAUNHOFER GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V. (Fraunhofer), established in HANSASTRASSE 27C, MUNCHEN 80686, Germany, VAT number: DE129515865, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADDET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Andrea ZEUMANN with EC id nzremaan signed in the Participant Portal on 12/04/2018 at 15:27:18 (transaction id Sgld-118090- T8naRetsHTQzTpl/o3ZypBx/7Lpsb84oOQCAuaOYzNz XKAAnd1B3z3zhP6Q0BlyWDWyQn6De3sCR4zg2BzluW0- j717z5b8y87dSP7X3t4W- TZNZ5zQ6luhass8oJL0.re8MuqzJlezTliiTXIXO05Br0). Timestamp by third party at Thu Apr 12 16:27:31 CEST 2018
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

ASOCIACION COLOMBIANA PARA EL AVANCE DE LA CIENCIA - ACAC (ACAC), established in CARRERA 16 NR 31 A-36, BOGOTA 111311, Colombia, VAT number: CO8902039449, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the powers delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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 VILLAVECES with ECAS id nvavecma signed in the Participant Portal on 26/04/2018 at 17:08:02 (transaction id SigId-46372-
1Aya9hBqix1qETuUsV7VUCdB7xTYNhdfthYncb30110hvV
ais3MA9aYdlswFLM9R0BOJTzmyC12a2mQre57dYi-
J71zxYb9yQpGqQXwkkev-
JxH7MB1gFLqsyfW9AsR9iri1K7WZQqXc5iAzrE4fVQ). Timestamp by third party at Thu Apr 26 18:08:12 CEST 2018
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

FONDAZIONE ADRIANO OLIVETTI (FAO), established in STRADA PRIVATA BIDASIO 2, IVREA 10015, Italy, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Cynthia BIANCONI with ECAS id nbicaint signed in the Participant Portal on 13/04/2018 at 13:57:03 (transaction id Sigld:20-qygzpKD7pPyiLH3kDQgBZkjkZdFQzRI3cFOrmGPeYmtLid7YYQ05VxYmtgevo2tnipo2alyVoqPzV589wRRN0-PHsiUMV5XYC6MB6zzze1Do0-EQPQzGEIOsQjzhzdpelUde7rRENpQx0KzvsYmr4sbj4jq). Timestamp by third party at Fri Apr 13 14:57:14 CEST 2018
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM (BCE), 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 (‘7’) in Grant Agreement No 788047 (‘the Agreement’)**

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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 nrostozs signed in the Participant Portal on 13/04/2018 at 10:33:30 (transaction id SigId-128509-wJNfHkPbavgGGG3j81VomU6xG5Ntdyg11KbxaYgNR4vDf0a6YsKZCtxAQ7bNXnyf0u3axT0zvkYBjkJWdJ6S3J71zYb8y8TdSP7X3T4W-IFhVHbQeVoNdZL4gwW78fAeq0j8fKrN5eGldxt8). Timestamp by third party at Fri Apr 13 11:33:13 CEST 2018
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

CORO, CO-LAB ROSKILDE (CORO), established in JERNBANEGADE 3A, ROSKILDE 4000, Denmark, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Karolina E. OSIPOWSKA with ECAS id nosipkar signed in the Participant Portal on 12/04/2018 at 15:42:44
(transaction id SigId-118554-Vqk8ei3Xx8XOoxklN6kh31PG7Dsun0uHG3PZZvAF6pk
nlTNeuZu7Bf5zfg54EIm112pbEgj3mS7HcHM2isW-
J71izYb9y8Tc5P7X3T4W-
CL2zWzGObdEqZLHkYtnaYLbWRroEyhPVjcrkPO30
). Timestamp by third party at
Thu Apr 12 16:42:55 CEST 2018
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

LUDWIG BOLTZMANN GESELLSCHAFT GMBH (LBG), established in NUSSDORFER STRASSE 64 6 STOCK, WIEN 1090, Austria, VAT number: ATU61640503, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Mathilde WOLFF with ECAS id nwolffmth signed in the Participant Portal on 13/04/2018 at 08:29:31 (transaction id SigId-123177-jy0R4IU3NQLON1Mvi04LViPtwRohnTy3sWWNVTOJsljE4UEonPUEIDyw3ytegr5ESPsiOdcalO6dN0SEN0Bi0-Jl71zyB6yr5Tc5PFx3T4W-RT2rpLHVcpaSHUKyFq40e6zw0fRQhLgnOESzlSDs7awi). Timestamp by third party at Fri Apr 13 09:29:42 CEST 2018
ANNEX 3

ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

STICHTING S-ISPT (S-ISPT), established in GROEN VAN PRINSTERERLAAN 37, AMERSFOORT 3818 JN, Netherlands, VAT number: NL816013664B01, (‘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 788047 (‘the Agreement’)

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Tjeerd JONGSMA with ECAS id njongstij signed in the Participant Portal on 17/04/2018 at 15:32:09 (transaction id SigId-13503-G7qprJqXGT7CrUMs1mkRya75j0PKAPPtIvom8PzbQJYnlPBcGEBSe39f1er5k4aqjYZ74gFVyyqEvF0TKwu-J71zxYbo9yr9NelznXnKP3-LQtrNnXrku9YjeXu80RzruX3YByyTGDO7afWj4FK). Timestamp by third party at Tue Apr 17 16:34:26 CEST 2018
ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERSIDAD POMPEU FABRA (UPF), established in PLACA DE LA MERCE, 10-12, BARCELONA 08002, Spain, VAT number: ESQ5850017D, ('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 788047 ('the Agreement')

between FONDEN TEKNOLOGIRADET and the Research Executive Agency (REA) ('the Agency'), under the powers delegated by the European Commission ('the Commission'),

for the action entitled ‘Reconfiguring Research and Innovation Constellations (RiConfigure)’.

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

Enric VALLDUVÍ with ECAS id nvalidue signed in the Participant Portal on 13/04/2018 at 07:13:54 (transaction id Sigld-122331-cX2aK3QuvP6mmZpS2nlzjdaEAJrDuaiRYdn4LdDU3Jug6D67qyX7oPTKOvTRHmatNZ3OsI5TwdcBlyN0cO-Jj71zxyb8yrt5d5P7x3T4W-W5mC24G7HOMTsD6v8FV3UJUJayCmoWRfhBhspDH8Cu8). Timestamp by third party at Fri Apr 13 08:14:08 CEST 2018
**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>A. Direct personnel costs</th>
<th>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</th>
<th>C. Direct costs of fn. support</th>
<th>D. Other direct costs</th>
<th>E. Indirect costs</th>
<th>[F. Costs of ...]</th>
<th>Total costs</th>
<th>Reimbursement rate %</th>
<th>Maximum EU contribution</th>
<th>Requested EU contribution</th>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>EU contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td>A.4 SME owners without salary</td>
<td>C.1 Financial support</td>
<td>D.1 Travel</td>
<td>F.1 Costs of ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2 Natural persons under direct contract</td>
<td>A.5 Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary</td>
<td>C.2 Prices</td>
<td>D.2 Equipment</td>
<td>F.2 Costs of ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Seconded persons</td>
<td>A.8 Personnel for providing access to research infrastructure</td>
<td>D.4 Costs of large research infrastructure</td>
<td>D.3 Other goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 Employees (or equivalent)</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>A.5 Beneficiaries that are natural persons without salary</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>A.6 Personnel for providing access to research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form of costs**

- **Actual**
- **Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[b]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d]</td>
<td>[e]</td>
<td>[f]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td>[h]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eligible costs (per budget category)**

- **Receipts**
- **EU contribution**
- **Additional information**

---

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).

---

1 Please declare all eligible costs, even if they exceed the amounts indicated in the estimated budget (see Annex 2). Only amounts that were declared in your individual financial statements can be taken into account later on, in order to replace other costs that are found to be ineligible.

2 See Article 6 for the eligibility conditions

3 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 indirect costs unless you can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action.

4 Costs of in-kind contributions not used on premises.

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 indirect costs unless you can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action.

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)

---

\[ i = 0.25 \times (a + b + c + d) \]

\[ j = 0.25 \times (a + b + c + d) \]

\[ k = \text{Total} - i - j \]
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 bookkeeping 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:

- 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.]

[legal name of the Auditor] [legal name of the [Beneficiary][Linked Third Party]]
[name & function of authorised representative] [name & function of authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy] [dd Month yyyy]
Signature of the Auditor Signature of the [Beneficiary][Linked Third Party]

2 Supreme Audit Institutions applying INTOSAI-standards may carry out the Procedures according to the corresponding International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions and code of ethics issued by INTOSAI instead of the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 and the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IAASB and the IESBA.
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 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation (to be removed from the Report):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If a Finding was not applicable, it must be marked as ‘N.A.’ ('Not applicable') in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table and means that the Finding did not have to be corroborated by the Auditor and the related Procedure(s) did not have to be carried out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reasons of the non-application of a certain Finding must be obvious i.e.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) if no cost was declared under a certain category then the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) are not applicable;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) if the condition set to apply certain Procedure(s) are not met the related Finding(s) and those Procedure(s) are not applicable. For instance, 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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List here all Findings considered not applicable for the present engagement and explain the reasons of the non-applicability.**

**Exceptions**

Apart from the exceptions listed below, the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] provided the Auditor all the documentation and accounting information needed by the Auditor to carry out the requested Procedures and evaluate the Findings.

**Explanation (to be removed from the Report):**

- If the Auditor was not able to successfully complete a procedure requested, it must be marked as ‘E’ (‘Exception’) in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table. The reason such as the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability of data that prevents the Auditor from carrying out the Procedure must be indicated below.
- If the Auditor cannot corroborate a standard finding after having carried out the corresponding procedure, it must also be marked as ‘E’ (‘Exception’) and, where possible, the reasons why the Finding was not fulfilled and its possible impact must be explained here below.

**List here any exceptions and add any information on the cause and possible consequences of each exception, if known. If the exception is quantifiable, include the corresponding amount.**
Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. The Beneficiary was unable to substantiate the Finding number 1 on ... because ....
2. Finding number 30 was not fulfilled because the methodology used by the Beneficiary to calculate unit costs was different from the one approved by the Commission. The differences were as follows: ...
3. After carrying out the agreed procedures to confirm the Finding number 31, the Auditor found a difference of _____________ EUR. The difference can be explained by ...

Further Remarks

In addition to reporting on the results of the specific procedures carried out, the Auditor would like to make the following general remarks:

Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. Regarding Finding number 8 the conditions for additional remuneration were considered as fulfilled because ...
2. In order to be able to confirm the Finding number 15 we carried out the following additional procedures: ....

Use of this Report

This Report may be used only for the purpose described in the above objective. It was prepared solely for the confidential use of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the [Commission] [Agency], and only to be submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] in connection with the requirements set out in Article 20.4 of the Agreement. The Report may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the [Commission] [Agency] for any other purpose, nor may it be distributed to any other parties. The [Commission] [Agency] may only disclose the Report to authorised parties, in particular to the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.

This Report relates only to the Financial Statement(s) submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] for the Agreement. Therefore, it does not extend to any other of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statement(s).

There was no conflict of interest\(^4\) 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><strong>ACTUAL PERSONNEL COSTS AND UNIT COSTS CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS USUAL COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PERSONNEL COSTS

The Auditor sampled _____ people out of the total of _____ people.

### Ref

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor sampled _____ people out of the total of _____ people.</td>
<td></td>
<td>C/E/N.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSONNEL COSTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the persons included in the sample and working under an employment contract or equivalent act (general procedures for individual actual personnel costs and personnel costs declared as unit costs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 1-5 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o a list of the persons included in the sample indicating the period(s) during which they worked for the action, their position (classification or category) and type of contract;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the payslips of the employees included in the sample;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o reconciliation of the personnel costs declared in the Financial Statement(s) with the accounting system (project accounting and general ledger) and payroll system;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>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>o applicable national law on taxes, labour and social security and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o any other document that supports the personnel costs declared.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor also verified the eligibility of all components of the retribution (see Article 6 GA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

2) Personnel costs were recorded in the Beneficiary's accounts/payroll system.

3) Costs were adequately supported and reconciled with the accounts and payroll records.

4) Personnel costs did not contain any ineligible elements.
and recalculated the personnel costs for employees included in the sample.

5) There were no discrepancies between the personnel costs charged to the action and the costs recalculated by the Auditor.

Further procedures if 'additional remuneration' is paid

To confirm standard factual findings 6-9 listed in the next column, the Auditor:

- reviewed relevant documents provided by the Beneficiary (legal form, legal/statutory obligations, the Beneficiary’s usual policy on additional remuneration, criteria used for its calculation, the Beneficiary's usual remuneration practice for projects funded under national funding schemes...);
- 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, usual remuneration paid for projects funded by national schemes) 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’).

‘ADDITIONAL REMUNERATION’ MEANS ANY PART OF THE REMUNERATION WHICH EXCEEDS WHAT THE PERSON WOULD BE PAID FOR TIME WORKED IN PROJECTS FUNDED BY NATIONAL SCHEMES.

IF ANY PART OF THE REMUNERATION PAID TO THE EMPLOYEE Qualifies as "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

6) The Beneficiary paying “additional remuneration” was a non-profit legal entity.

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.

8) The criteria used to calculate the additional remuneration were objective and generally applied by the Beneficiary regardless of the source of funding used.

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
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<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>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.</strong></td>
<td>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><strong>Additional procedures in case “unit costs calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices” is applied:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apart from carrying out the procedures indicated above to confirm standard factual findings 1-5 and, if applicable, also 6-9, the Auditor carried out following procedures to confirm standard factual findings 10-13 listed in the next column:</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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o verified that there is no difference between the total amount of personnel costs used in calculating the cost per unit and the total amount of personnel costs recorded in the statutory accounts;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o verified whether actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements and, if so, verified whether those elements used are actually relevant for the calculation, objective and supported by documents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For natural persons included in the sample and working with the Beneficiary under a direct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10) The personnel costs included in the Financial Statement were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice. This methodology was consistently used in all H2020 actions.</strong></td>
<td>10) The personnel costs included in the Financial Statement were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice. This methodology was consistently used in all H2020 actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11) The employees were charged under the correct category.</strong></td>
<td>11) The employees were charged under the correct category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>12) Total personnel costs used in calculating the unit costs were consistent with the expenses recorded in the statutory accounts.</strong></td>
<td>12) Total personnel costs used in calculating the unit costs were consistent with the expenses recorded in the statutory accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>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.</strong></td>
<td>13) Any estimated or budgeted element used by the Beneficiary in its unit-cost calculation were relevant for calculating personnel costs and corresponded to objective and verifiable information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>14) The natural persons worked...</strong></td>
<td>14) The natural persons worked...</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>contract other than an employment contract, such as consultants (no subcontractors). To confirm standard factual findings 14-17 listed in the next column the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary: o the contracts, especially the cost, contract duration, work description, place of work, ownership of the results and reporting obligations to the Beneficiary; o the employment conditions of staff in the same category to compare costs and; o any other document that supports the costs declared and its registration (e.g. invoices, accounting records, etc.).</td>
<td>under conditions similar to those of an employee, in particular regarding the way the work is organised, the tasks that are performed and the premises where they are performed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15) The results of work carried out belong to the Beneficiary, or, if not, the Beneficiary has obtained all necessary rights to fulfil its obligations as if those results were generated by itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16) 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></td>
<td>17) The costs were supported by audit evidence and registered in the accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For personnel seconded by a third party and included in the sample (not subcontractors) To confirm standard factual findings 18-21 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary: o their secondment contract(s) notably regarding costs, duration, work description, place of</td>
<td>18) Seconded personnel reported to the Beneficiary and worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | work and ownership of the results; | 19) The results of work carried out belong to the Beneficiary, or, if not, the Beneficiary has obtained all necessary rights to fulfil its obligations as if those results were generated by itself.
  | o if there is reimbursement by the Beneficiary to the third party for the resource made available (in-kind contribution against payment): any documentation that supports the costs declared (e.g. contract, invoice, bank payment, and proof of registration in its accounting/payroll, etc.) and reconciliation of the Financial Statement(s) with the accounting system (project accounting and general ledger) as well as any proof that the amount invoiced by the third party did not include any profit; |  
  | o 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; | If personnel is seconded against payment:  
  | o any other document that supports the costs declared (e.g. invoices, etc.). |  
  |     | 20) 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:  
  |     | 21) The costs declared did not exceed the third party's cost as recorded in the accounts of the third party and were supported with documentation. |  
  | A.2 | PRODUCTIVE HOURS | 22) The Beneficiary applied method [choose one option and delete the others]  
  |     | To confirm standard factual findings 22-27 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: | [A: 1720 hours]  
  |     |     | [B: the ‘total number of hours |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result (C / E / N.A.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|     | o the 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 workable hours’. The Auditor can only do this if the calculation of the standard annual workable hours can be supported by records, such as national legislation, labour agreements, and contracts.  
     | **Beneficiary’s productive hours’ for persons working full time shall be one of the following methods:**  
     | **A. 1720 annual productive hours (pro-rata for persons not working full-time)**  
     | **B. The total number of hours worked by the person for the Beneficiary in the year (this method is also referred to as ‘total number of hours worked’ in the next column). The calculation of the total number of hours worked was done as follows: annual workable hours of the person according to the employment contract, applicable labour agreement or national law plus overtime worked minus absences (such as sick leave or special leave).**  
     | **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.**  
     | worked’]  
     | [C: ‘standard annual productive hours’ used correspond to usual accounting practices]  
     | 23) Productive hours were calculated annually.  
     | 24) For employees not working full-time the full-time equivalent (FTE) ratio was correctly applied.  
     | If the Beneficiary applied method B.  
     | 25) The calculation of the number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary.  
     | 25.1) 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).
<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>‘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.</td>
<td>If the Beneficiary applied method C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26) The calculation of the number of ‘standard annual workable hours’ was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary.</td>
<td>27) The ‘annual productive hours’ used for calculating the hourly rate were consistent with the usual cost accounting practices of the Beneficiary and were equivalent to at least 90% of the ‘annual workable hours’.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3</td>
<td><strong>HOURLY PERSONNEL RATES</strong></td>
<td>28) The Beneficiary applied [choose one option and delete the other]:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I) For unit costs calculated in accordance to the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practice (unit costs):</td>
<td>[Option I: “Unit costs (hourly rates) were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices”]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary has a &quot;Certificate on Methodology to calculate unit costs &quot; (CoMUC) approved by the Commission, the Beneficiary provides the Auditor with a description of the approved methodology and the Commission’s letter of acceptance. The Auditor verified that the Beneficiary has indeed used the methodology approved. If so, no further verification is necessary.</td>
<td>[Option II: Individual hourly rates were applied]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary does not have a &quot;Certificate on Methodology“ (CoMUC) approved by the Commission, or if the methodology approved was not applied, then the Auditor:</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>
|     | o reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;  
     | o 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. | For option I concerning unit costs and if the Beneficiary applies the methodology approved by the Commission (CoMUC):  
29) 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. | |
| II) For individual hourly rates:  
The Auditor: | o reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;  
     | o 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;  
     | o (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. | For option I concerning unit costs and if the Beneficiary applies a methodology not approved by the Commission:  
30) The unit costs re-calculated by the Auditor were the same as the rates applied by the Beneficiary. | |
| “UNIT COSTS CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS USUAL COST ACCOUNTING PRACTICES”: | IT IS CALCULATED BY DIVIDING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF PERSONNEL COSTS OF THE CATEGORY TO WHICH THE EMPLOYEE BELONGS VERIFIED IN LINE WITH PROCEDURE A.1 BY THE NUMBER OF FTE AND THE ANNUAL TOTAL PRODUCTIVE HOURS OF THE SAME CATEGORY CALCULATED BY THE BENEFICIARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROCEDURE A.2.  
HOURLY RATE FOR INDIVIDUAL ACTUAL PERSONAL COSTS:  
IT IS CALCULATED FOLLOWING ONE OF THE TWO OPTIONS BELOW:  
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 | For option II concerning individual hourly rates:  
31) The individual rates re-calculated by the Auditor were the same as the rates applied 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></td>
<td><strong>VERIFIED IN LINE WITH PROCEDURE A.2 (FULL FINANCIAL YEAR HOURLY RATE);</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>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).</strong></td>
<td>31.1) 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></td>
<td>31.2) The hourly rates do not include additional remuneration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TIME RECORDING SYSTEM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o description of the time recording system provided by the Beneficiary (registration, authorisation, processing in the HR-system);</td>
<td>32) 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)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o its actual implementation;</td>
<td>33) Their time-records were authorised at least monthly by the project manager or other superior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o time records were signed at least monthly by the employees (on paper or electronically) and authorised by the project manager or another manager;</td>
<td>34) Hours declared were worked within the project period and were consistent with the presences/absences recorded in HR-records.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the hours declared were worked within the project period;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the hours charged to the action matched those in the time recording system.</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><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>35) There were no discrepancies between the number of hours charged to the action and the number of hours recorded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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) The exclusive dedication is supported by a declaration signed by the Beneficiary and by any other evidence gathered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>B COSTS OF SUBCONTRACTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).  
To confirm standard factual findings 37-41 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed the following for the items included in the sample:  
- the use of subcontractors was foreseen in Annex 1;  
- subcontracting costs were declared in the subcontracting category of the Financial Statement;  
- supporting documents on the selection and award procedure were followed;  
- 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). |
|     | 37) The use of claimed subcontracting costs was foreseen in Annex 1 and costs were declared in the Financial Statements under the subcontracting category.                                                                                                                                                                                                 |                       |
|     | 38) 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.  
*(When different offers were not  
...)* |

(When different offers were not...
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 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:

<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>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)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39) The subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries of the consortium.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40) All subcontracts were supported by signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41) There was evidence that the services were provided by the subcontractors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>COSTS OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.1</td>
<td>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).</td>
<td>42) All minimum conditions were met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Auditor verified that the following minimum conditions were met:</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>a) the maximum amount of financial support for each third party did not exceed EUR 60 000, unless explicitly mentioned in Annex 1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>D.1</td>
<td>COSTS OF TRAVEL AND RELATED SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Auditor sampled \[\text{cost items selected randomly}\] (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 the highest).

The Auditor inspected the sample and verified that:

- 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;
- 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;
- no ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared (see Article 6.5 MGA).

43) Costs were incurred, approved and reimbursed in line with the Beneficiary's usual policy for travels.

44) There was a link between the trip and the action.

45) The supporting documents were consistent with each other regarding subject of the trip, dates, duration and reconciled with time records and accounting.

46) No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure was declared.

| D.2 | DEPRECIATION COSTS FOR EQUIPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE OR OTHER ASSETS |

The Auditor sampled \[\text{cost items selected randomly}\] (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 the highest).

For “equipment, infrastructure or other assets” [from now on called “asset(s)"] selected in the sample the Auditor verified that:

- the assets were acquired in conformity with the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures;

47) Procurement rules, principles and guides were followed.

48) There was a link between the grant agreement and the asset charged to the action.

49) The asset charged to the action was traceable to the accounting records and the underlying documents.
- They were correctly allocated to the action (with supporting documents such as delivery note invoice or any other proof demonstrating the link to the action).
- They were entered in the accounting system;
- The extent to which the assets were used for the action (as a percentage) was supported by reliable documentation (e.g., usage overview table);

The Auditor recalculated the depreciation costs and verified that they were in line with the applicable rules in the Beneficiary’s country and with the Beneficiary’s usual accounting policy (e.g., depreciation calculated on the acquisition value).

The Auditor verified that no ineligible costs such as deductible VAT, exchange rate losses, excessive or reckless expenditure were declared (see Article 6.5 GA).

50) 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.

51) The amount charged corresponded to the actual usage for the action.

52) No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared.

**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

53) Contracts for works or services did not cover tasks described in Annex 1.

54) Costs were allocated to the correct action and the goods were not placed in the inventory of durable equipment.

55) The costs were charged in line with the Beneficiary’s accounting policy and were adequately supported.

56) No ineligible costs or excessive or reckless expenditure were declared. For internal invoices/charges only the cost element was charged, without any mark-ups.
the Beneficiary’s internal guidelines and procedures, in particular:

- if 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 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);

*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.

| 57) Procurement rules, principles and guides were followed. There were documents of requests to different providers, different offers and assessment of the offers before selection of the provider in line with internal procedures and procurement rules. The purchases were made in accordance with the principle of best value for money. (When different offers were not collected the Auditor explains the reasons provided by the Beneficiary under the caption “Exceptions” of the Report. The Commission will analyse this information to evaluate whether these costs might be accepted as eligible) |
| 58) 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. |
In the cases that a positive ex-ante assessment has been issued (see the standard factual findings 58-59 on the next column),

The Auditor ensured that the beneficiary has applied consistently the methodology that is explained and approved in the positive ex ante assessment;

In the cases that a positive ex-ante assessment has NOT been issued (see the standard factual findings 60 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 60 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.

59) Any difference between the methodology applied and the one positively assessed was extensively described and adjusted accordingly.

60) The direct costs declared were free from any indirect costs items related to the Large Research Infrastructure.

D.5 Costs of internally invoiced 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).

To confirm standard factual findings 61-65 listed in the next column, the Auditor:

- obtained a description of the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice to calculate costs of internally invoiced goods and services (unit costs);
- reviewed whether the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice was applied for the Financial Statements subject of the present CFS;
- ensured that the methodology to calculate unit costs is being used in a consistent manner, based on objective criteria, regardless of the source of funding;
- verified that any ineligible items or any costs claimed under other budget categories, in particular indirect costs, have not been taken into account when calculating the costs of

61) The costs of internally invoiced goods and services included in the Financial Statement were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary's usual cost accounting practice.

62) The cost accounting practices used to calculate the costs of internally invoiced goods and services were applied by the Beneficiary in a consistent manner based on objective criteria regardless of the source of funding.

63) The unit cost is calculated using the actual costs for the good or service recorded in the Beneficiary's accounts, excluding any ineligible
internally invoiced goods and services (see Article 6 GA);

- verified whether actual costs of internally invoiced goods and services were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements and, if so, verified whether those elements used are actually relevant for the calculation, and correspond to objective and verifiable information.

- verified that any costs of items which are not directly linked to the production of the invoiced goods or service (e.g. supporting services like cleaning, general accountancy, administrative support, etc. not directly used for production of the good or service) have not been taken into account when calculating the costs of internally invoiced goods and services.

- verified that any costs of items used for calculating the costs internally invoiced goods and services are supported by audit evidence and registered in the accounts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>USE OF EXCHANGE RATES</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) For Beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euros</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Auditor sampled __________ cost items selected randomly and verified that the exchange rates used for converting other currencies into euros were in accordance with the following rules established in the Agreement (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest):

Costs recorded in the accounts in a currency other than Euro shall be converted into Euro at the average of the daily exchange rates published in the C Series of Official Journal of the European Union (https://www.ecb.int/stats/exchange/eurofxref/html/index.en.html), determined 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, conversion shall be made at the average of the monthly accounting rates established by the Commission and published on its website (http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts_grants/info_contracts/inforeuro/inforeuro_en.cfm),

| 64) The unit cost excludes any costs of items which are not directly linked to the production of the invoiced goods or service. |
| 65) The costs items used for calculating the actual costs of internally invoiced goods and services were relevant, reasonable and correspond to objective and verifiable information. |
| 66) 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.**

| [legal name of the audit firm] |
| [name and function of an authorised representative] |
| [dd Month yyyy] |
| <Signature of the Auditor> |
MODEL FOR THE CERTIFICATE ON THE METHODOLOGY

- For options *in italics in square brackets*: choose the applicable option. Options not chosen should be deleted.
- For fields in [grey in square brackets]: enter the appropriate data.
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Terms of reference for an audit engagement for a methodology certificate
in connection with one or more grant agreements financed
under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

This document sets out the ‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ under which

[OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’) ] [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’) ]

agrees to engage

[insert legal name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’)

to produce an independent report of factual findings (‘the Report’) concerning the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual accounting practices for calculating and claiming direct personnel costs declared as unit costs (‘the Methodology’) in connection with grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme.

The procedures to be carried out for the assessment of the methodology will be based on the grant agreement(s) detailed below:

[title and number of the grant agreement(s)] (‘the Agreement(s)’)

The Agreement(s) has(have) been concluded between the Beneficiary and [OPTION 1: the European Union, represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)][ OPTION 2: the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom,) represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)][OPTION 3: the [Research Executive Agency (REA)] [European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA)] [Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA)] [Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)] (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’).

The [Commission] [Agency] is mentioned as a signatory of the Agreement with the Beneficiary only. The [European Union] [Euratom] [Agency] is not a party to this engagement.

1.1 Subject of the engagement

According to Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement, beneficiaries [and linked third parties] that declare direct personnel costs as unit costs calculated in accordance with their usual cost accounting practices may submit to the [Commission] [Agency], for approval, a certificate on the methodology (‘CoMUC’) stating that there are adequate records and documentation to prove that their cost accounting practices used comply with the conditions set out in Point A of Article 6.2.

The subject of this engagement is the CoMUC which is composed of two separate documents:

- the Terms of Reference (‘the ToR’) to be signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor;

- the Auditor’s Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’) issued on the Auditor’s letterhead, dated, stamped and signed by the Auditor which includes; the standard statements (‘the Statements’) evaluated and signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party], the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) performed by the Auditor and the standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) assessed by the Auditor. The Statements, Procedures and Findings are summarised in the table that forms part of the Report.
The information provided through the Statements, the Procedures and the Findings will enable the Commission to draw conclusions regarding the existence of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual cost accounting practice and its suitability to ensure that direct personnel costs claimed on that basis comply with the provisions of the Agreement. The Commission draws its own conclusions from the Report and any additional information it may require.

1.2 Responsibilities

The parties to this agreement are the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor.

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]:

- 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:

- 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.*]

[legal name of the Auditor] [legal name of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]]
[name & title of authorised representative] [name & title of authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy] [dd Month yyyy]
Signature of the Auditor Signature of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]

---

1 Supreme Audit Institutions applying INTOSAI-standards may carry out the Procedures according to the corresponding International Standards of Supreme Audit Institutions and code of ethics issued by INTOSAI instead of the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 and the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IAASB and the IESBA.
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 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.

…..

Explanation of possible exceptions in the form of examples (to be removed from the Report):

i. the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] did not agree with the standard Statement number ... because...;

ii. the Auditor could not carry out the procedure ... established because .... (e.g. due to the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability or inconsistency of data);

iii. the Auditor could not confirm or corroborate the standard Finding number ... because ....

Remarks

We would like to add the following remarks relevant for the proper understanding of the Methodology applied by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or the results reported:

Example (to be removed from the Report):

Regarding the methodology applied to calculate hourly rates ...

Regarding standard Finding 15 it has to be noted that ...

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] explained the deviation from the benchmark statement XXIV concerning time recording for personnel with no exclusive dedication to the action in the following manner:

…..

Annexes

Please provide the following documents to the auditor and annex them to the report when submitting this CoMUC to the Commission:

1. Brief description of the methodology for calculating personnel costs, productive hours and hourly rates;

1 Financial Statement in this context refers solely to Annex 4 of the Agreement by which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement.
2. Brief description of the time recording system in place;
3. An example of the time records used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party];
4. Description of any budgeted or estimated elements applied, together with an explanation as to why they are relevant for calculating the personnel costs and how they are based on objective and verifiable information;
5. A summary sheet with the hourly rate for direct personnel declared by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and recalculated by the Auditor for each staff member included in the sample (the names do not need to be reported);
6. A comparative table summarising for each person selected in the sample a) the time claimed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in the Financial Statement(s) and b) the time according to the time record verified by the Auditor;
7. A copy of the letter of representation provided to the Auditor.

Use of this Report

This Report has been drawn up solely for the purpose given under Point 1.1 Reasons for the engagement.

The Report:
- is confidential and is intended to be submitted to the Commission by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in connection with Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement;
- may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the Commission for any other purpose, nor distributed to any other parties;
- may be disclosed by the Commission only to authorised parties, in particular the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.
- relates only to the usual cost accounting practices specified above and does not constitute a report on the Financial Statements of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

No conflict of interest exists between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party] that could have a bearing on the Report. The total fee paid to the Auditor for producing the Report was EUR _______ (including EUR _______ of deductible VAT).

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’.

#### Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Use of the Methodology</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I. The cost accounting practice described below has been in use since [dd Month yyyy]. | Procedure:  

- The Auditor checked these dates against the documentation the Beneficiary has provided.  

**Factual finding:**  

1. The dates provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with the documentation.  

II. The next planned alteration to the methodology used by the Beneficiary will be from [dd Month yyyy]. |

| **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. | 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.  

- The methodology was generally applied by the Beneficiary as part of its usual costs accounting practices.  

[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:]  

- ...]
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>C. Personnel costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<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>The Auditor draws a sample of employees to carry out the procedures indicated in this section C and the following sections D to F. [The Auditor has drawn a random sample of 10 employees assigned to Horizon 2020 action(s). If fewer than 10 employees are assigned to the Horizon 2020 action(s), the Auditor has selected all employees assigned to the Horizon 2020 action(s) complemented by other employees irrespective of their assignments until he has reached 10 employees.]. 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. [Please describe the ‘budgeted or estimated elements’ and their relevance to personnel costs, and explain how they were reasonable and based on objective and verifiable information, present your explanation to the Auditor and annex it to this certificate].</td>
<td>iii. they were remunerated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual 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>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>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</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>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
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>and grants awarded by bodies other than the Commission/Agency for the purpose of implementing the EU or Euratom budget in the same period, unless the Beneficiary can demonstrate that the operating grant does not cover any costs of the action).</td>
<td>✓ to the extent that actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, the Auditor carefully examined those elements and checked the information source to confirm that they correspond to objective and verifiable information;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If additional remuneration as referred to in the grant agreement(s) is paid</td>
<td>✓ if additional remuneration has been claimed, the Auditor verified that the Beneficiary was a non-profit legal entity, that the amount was capped at EUR 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>5. The employees in the sample were employed directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable national law and were working under its sole supervision and responsibility.</td>
</tr>
</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: ]  

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>remuneration was paid: a) the Beneficiary is registered in the grant agreements as a non-profit legal entity; b) it was paid according to objective criteria generally applied regardless of the source of funding used and c) remuneration was capped at EUR 8,000 per full-time equivalent (or up to up to the equivalent pro-rata amount if the person did not work on the action full-time during the year or did not work exclusively on the action).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Productive hours

XVI. The number of productive hours per full-time employee applied is [delete as appropriate]:

A. 1720 productive hours per year for a person working full-time (corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time).

B. the total number of hours worked in the year by a person for the Beneficiary

C. the standard number of annual hours generally applied by the beneficiary for its personnel in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices. This number must be at least 90% of the standard annual workable hours.

If method B is applied

XVII. The calculation of the total number of hours worked was done as follows: annual workable hours of the person according to the employment contract, applicable labour agreement or national law plus overtime worked minus absences (such as sick leave and special leave).

XVIII. ‘Annual workable hours’ are hours 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.

XIX. The contract (applicable collective labour agreement or national working time legislation) do specify the working time enabling to calculate the

Procedure (same sample basis as for Section C: Personnel costs):

- The Auditor verified that the number of productive hours applied is in accordance with method A, B or C.

- The Auditor checked that the number of productive hours per full-time employee is correct.

- 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.

- 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.

Factual finding:

General

12. The Beneficiary applied a number of productive hours consistent with method A, B or C detailed in the left-hand column.

13. The number of productive hours per year per full-time employee was accurate.

If method B is applied
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>annual workable hours.</td>
<td>14. The number of annual workable hours, overtime and absences was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>calculation of the total number of hours worked was accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If method C is applied</td>
<td>15. The contract specified the working time enabling to calculate the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>annual workable hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. The standard number of productive hours per year is that of a full-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. The number of productive hours per year on which the hourly rate is</td>
<td>16. The calculation of the number of productive hours per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based i) corresponds to the Beneficiary’s usual accounting practices; ii)</td>
<td>corresponded to the usual costs accounting practice of the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is at least 90% of the standard number of workable (working) hours per</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year.</td>
<td>17. The calculation of the standard number of workable (working) hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>per year was corroborated by the documents presented by the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. Standard workable (working) hours are hours during which personnel</td>
<td>18. The number of productive hours per year used for the calculation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are at the Beneficiary’s disposal preforming the duties described in the</td>
<td>the hourly rate was at least 90% of the number of workable (working)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relevant employment contract, collective labour agreement or national</td>
<td>hours per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labour legislation. The number of standard annual workable (working)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hours that the Beneficiary claims is supported by labour contracts, national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>legislation and other documentary evidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[If certain statement(s) of section “D. Productive hours” cannot be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as exception by the Auditor;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Hourly rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hourly rates are correct because:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII. Hourly rates are correctly calculated since they result from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dividing annual personnel costs by the productive hours of a given year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and group (e.g. staff category or department or cost centre depending on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the methodology applied) and they are in line with the statements made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in section C. and D. above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[If the statement of section ‘E. Hourly rates’ cannot be endorsed by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Auditor; “...”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures:
- The Auditor has obtained a list of all personnel rates calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with the methodology used.
- The Auditor has obtained a list of all the relevant employees, based on which the personnel rate(s) are calculated.

For 10 employees selected at random (same sample basis as Section C: Personnel costs):
- The Auditor recalculated the hourly rates.
- The Auditor verified that the methodology applied corresponds to the usual accounting practices of the organisation and is applied consistently for all activities of the organisation on the basis of objective criteria irrespective of the source of funding.
### 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>F. Time recording</strong></td>
<td><strong>Factual finding:</strong> 19. No differences arose from the recalculation of the hourly rate for the employees included in the sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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]; | **Procedure**
| XXV. For persons exclusively assigned to one Horizon 2020 activity the Beneficiary has either signed a declaration to that effect or has put arrangements in place to record their working time; | ✓ The Auditor reviewed the brief description, all relevant manuals and/or internal guidance describing the methodology used to record time. |
| XXVI. Records of time worked have been signed by the person concerned (on paper or electronically) and approved by the action manager or line manager at least monthly; | The Auditor reviewed the time records of the random sample of 10 employees referred to under Section C: Personnel costs, and verified in particular: |
| XXVII. Measures are in place to prevent staff from: | ✓ that time records were available for all persons with exclusive assignment to the action; |
| i. recording the same hours twice, | ✓ 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; |
| ii. recording working hours during absence periods (e.g. holidays, sick leave), | ✓ that time records were signed and approved in due time and that all minimum requirements were fulfilled; |
| iii. recording more than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and | ✓ that the persons worked for the action in the periods claimed; |
| iv. recording hours worked outside the action period. | ✓ that no more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates; |
| XXVIII. No working time was recorded outside the action period; | ✓ 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; |
| XXIX. No more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates. | ✓ 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 calculated. |

*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 procedure.*
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 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:]</td>
<td>charged to Horizon 2020 actions per person per year than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and verified that no time worked outside the action period was charged to the action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factual finding:

20. The brief description, manuals and/or internal guidance on time recording provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with management reports/records and other documents reviewed and were generally applied by the Beneficiary to produce the financial statements.

21. For the random sample time was recorded or, in the case of employees working exclusively for the action, either a signed declaration or time records were available;

22. For the random sample the time records were signed by the employee and the action manager/line manager, at least monthly.

23. Working time claimed for the action occurred in the periods claimed;

24. No more hours were claimed than the number productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates;

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.

26. Working time claimed is consistent with that on record at the human-resources department.

The description of the time recording system must state among others information on the content of the time records, its coverage (full or action time-recording, for all personnel or only for personnel involved in H2020 actions), its degree of detail (whether there is a reference to the particular tasks accomplished), its form, periodicity of the time registration and authorisation (paper or a computer-based system; on a daily, weekly or monthly basis; signed and countersigned by whom), controls applied to prevent double-charging of time or ensure consistency with HR-records such as absences and travels as well as it information flow up to its use for the preparation of the Financial Statements.
**Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[official name of the Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]</td>
<td>[official name of the Auditor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[name and title of authorised representative]</td>
<td>[name and title of authorised representative]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[dd Month yyyy]</td>
<td>[dd Month yyyy]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Signature of the Beneficiary&gt; [Linked Third Party&gt;]</td>
<td>&lt;Signature of the Auditor&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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