GRANT AGREEMENT

NUMBER 822682 — POPREBEL

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, Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies, Corinna AMTING,

and

on the other part,

1. ‘the coordinator’:

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON (UCL), established in GOWER STREET, LONDON WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom, VAT number: GB524371168, represented for the purposes of signing the Agreement by Head of European Project Management, ilaria MARSILI

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

2. UNIVERZITA KARLOVA (CUNI), established in OVOCNY TRH 560/5, PRAHA 1 116 36, Czech Republic, VAT number: CZ00216208,

3. UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLONSKI (UJ), established in Ul. Golebia 24, KRAKOW 31007, Poland, VAT number: PL6750002236,

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

5. TARTU ULIKOOL (UTARTU), established in ULIKOOLI 18, TARTU 50090, Estonia, VAT number: EE100030417,

6. UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU - Filozofski fakultet (UBFF), established in CIKA LJUBINA 18-20, BELGRADE 11000, Serbia, VAT number: RS100050474,

7. EDGERYDERS OU (Edgeryders), established in KAI TN 1 KESKLINNA DISTRICT, TALLIN 10111, Estonia, VAT number: EE101972833,
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 ‘Populist rebellion against modernity in 21st-century Eastern Europe: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism’ — ‘POPREBEL’ (‘action’), as described in Annex 1.

ARTICLE 3 — DURATION AND STARTING DATE OF THE ACTION

The duration of the action will be 36 months as of 1 January 2019 (‘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 2,997,961.25 (two million nine hundred and ninety seven thousand nine hundred and sixty one EURO and twenty five eurocents).

5.2 Form of grant, reimbursement rates and forms of costs
The grant reimburses **100% of the action's eligible costs** (see Article 6) (‘reimbursement of eligible costs grant’) (see Annex 2).

The estimated eligible costs of the action are **EUR 2,997,961.25** (two million nine hundred and ninety seven thousand nine hundred and sixty one EURO and twenty five eurocents).

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

(a) for **direct personnel costs**:

- as actually incurred costs (‘actual costs’) 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 (‘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:

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

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

(a) the person works under 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

---

\(^1\) 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:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(i) ‘fixed number of hours’: 1,720 hours for persons working full time (or corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time);

(ii) ‘individual annual productive hours’: the total number of hours worked by the person in the year for the beneficiary, calculated as follows:

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

‘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:

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

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’² directly used for the action are eligible, if:

(a) the value of the large research infrastructure represents at least 75% of the total fixed assets (at historical value in its last closed balance sheet before the date of the signature of the Agreement or as determined on the basis of the rental and leasing costs of the research infrastructure³);

(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

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/EC\(^5\) (or 2014/24/EU\(^6\)) or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC\(^7\) (or 2014/25/EU\(^8\)) must comply with the applicable national law on public procurement.

10.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The beneficiaries must ensure that the Agency, the Commission, the European Court of Auditors

---


(ECA) and the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) can exercise their rights under Articles 22 and 23 also towards the third parties.

11.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

12.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

ARTICLE 13 — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY SUBCONTRACTORS

13.1 Rules for subcontracting action tasks

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

Subcontracting may cover only a limited part of the action.

The beneficiaries must award the subcontracts ensuring the best value for money or, if appropriate, the lowest price. In doing so, they must avoid any conflict of interests (see Article 35).
The tasks to be implemented and the estimated cost for each subcontract must be set out in Annex 1 and the total estimated costs of subcontracting per beneficiary must be set out in Annex 2. The Agency may however approve subcontracts not set out in Annex 1 and 2 without amendment (see Article 55), if:

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

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

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

Beneficiaries that are ‘contracting authorities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC (or 2014/24/EU) or ‘contracting entities’ within the meaning of Directive 2004/17/EC (or 2014/25/EU) must comply with the applicable national law on public procurement.

13.2 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

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

ARTICLE 14 — IMPLEMENTATION OF ACTION TASKS BY LINKED THIRD PARTIES

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
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’:
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 **2,398,369.00** (two million three hundred and ninety eight thousand three hundred and sixty nine 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 **149,898.06** (one hundred and forty nine thousand eight hundred and ninety eight EURO and six 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:

\[
\{ 0.9 \times \text{maximum grant amount (see Article 5.1) } \} \\
\text{minus} \\
\{ \text{pre-financing and previous interim payments} \}
\]

### 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: BARCLAYS BANK PLC
- Full name of the account holder: UCL
- IBAN code: GB93BARC20107985487311

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\textsuperscript{16} and No 2185/96\textsuperscript{17} (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\textsuperscript{18}, 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

\begin{thebibliography}{9}
\bibitem{17} Council Regulation (Euratom, EC) No 2185/1996 of 11 November 1996 concerning on-the-spot checks and inspections carried out by the Commission in order to protect the European Communities' financial interests against fraud and other irregularities (OJ L 292, 15.11.1996, p. 2).
\end{thebibliography}
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
22.5.3.2 If the findings concern **substantial errors, irregularities or fraud** or **serious breach of obligations**: the formal notification will include:

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

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

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

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

- the proposed alternative flat-rate, if accepted

or

- the initially notified flat-rate, if it does not receive any observations or does not accept the observations or the proposed alternative flat-rate.

### 22.6 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

**ARTICLE 23 — EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE ACTION**

23.1 **Right to evaluate the impact of the action**

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

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

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

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

23.2 **Consequences of non-compliance**
If a beneficiary breaches any of its obligations under this Article, the Agency may apply the measures described in Chapter 6.

SECTION 3  RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO BACKGROUND AND RESULTS

SUBSECTION 1  GENERAL

ARTICLE 23a — MANAGEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

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

Beneficiaries that are universities or other public research organisations must take measures to implement the principles set out in Points 1 and 2 of the Code of Practice annexed to the Commission Recommendation on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities\(^\text{19}\).

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 ‘\textit{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.

\subsection*{25.5 Access rights for third parties}

Not applicable

\subsection*{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.

\section*{SUBSECTION 3 RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS RELATED TO RESULTS}

\section*{ARTICLE 26 — OWNERSHIP OF RESULTS}

\subsection*{26.1 Ownership by the beneficiary that generates the results}

Results are owned by the beneficiary that generates them.

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

\subsection*{26.2 Joint ownership by several beneficiaries}

\textsuperscript{20}For the definition see Article 2.1(2) Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘\textit{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 or indirectly controlling a participant.

‘Control’ may take any of the following forms:
(a) the direct or indirect holding of more than 50\% of the nominal value of the issued share capital in the legal entity concerned, or of a majority of the voting rights of the shareholders or associates of that entity;
(b) the direct or indirect holding, in fact or in law, of decision-making powers in the legal entity concerned.

However the following relationships between legal entities shall not in themselves be deemed to constitute controlling relationships:
(a) the same public investment corporation, institutional investor or venture-capital company has a direct or indirect holding of more than 50\% of the nominal value of the issued share capital or a majority of voting rights of the shareholders or associates;
(b) the legal entities concerned are owned or supervised by the same public body.

\textsuperscript{21}For the definition, see Article 2.1(3) of the Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013: ‘\textit{associated country}’ means a third country which is party to an international agreement with the Union, as identified in Article 7 of Horizon 2020 Framework Programme Regulation No 1291/2013. Article 7 sets out the conditions for association of non-EU countries to Horizon 2020.
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 822682”.

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 822682”.

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) not applicable;

(iii) 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 under Point (a)(i) and (iii), 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 822682”.

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

Not applicable

### 30.4 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

### ARTICLE 31 — ACCESS RIGHTS TO RESULTS

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

The conditions set out in Article 25.1 apply.

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 31.4 Access rights of affiliated entities

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

31.6 Access rights for third parties

Not applicable

31.7 Consequences of non-compliance

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

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

SECTION 4 OTHER RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS

ARTICLE 32 — RECRUITMENT AND WORKING CONDITIONS FOR RESEARCHERS

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

The beneficiaries must take all measures to implement the principles set out in the Commission Recommendation on the European Charter for Researchers and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers[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 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.

In addition, the beneficiaries must respect the fundamental principle of research integrity — as set out, for instance, in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity24.

This implies compliance with the following fundamental principles:

- **reliability** in ensuring the quality of research reflected in the design, the methodology, the analysis and the use of resources;

- **honesty** in developing, undertaking, reviewing, reporting and communicating research in a transparent, fair and unbiased way;

- respect for colleagues, research participants, society, ecosystems, cultural heritage and the environment;

- accountability for the research from idea to publication, for its management and organisation, for training, supervision and mentoring, and for its wider impacts

and means that beneficiaries must ensure that persons carrying out research tasks follow the good research practices and refrain from the research integrity violations described in this Code.

This does not change the other obligations under this Agreement or obligations under applicable international, EU or national law, all of which still apply.

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 1290/201325,

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 822682”.

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 822682”.

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 45/200128 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) serious breach of obligations under the Agreement or during the award procedure (including improper implementation of the action, submission of false information, failure to provide required information, breach of ethical principles) or

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

43.2 Amount to be reduced — Calculation — Procedure

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

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

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

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

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

43.3 Effects

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

If the Agency reduces the grant at the payment of the balance, it will calculate the reduced grant amount for the action and then determine the amount due as payment of the balance (see Articles 5.3.4 and 21.4).
If the Agency reduces the grant *after the payment of the balance*, it will calculate the revised final grant amount for the beneficiary concerned (see Article 5.4). If the revised final grant amount for the beneficiary concerned is lower than its share of the final grant amount, the Agency will recover the difference (see Article 44).

**ARTICLE 44 — RECOVERY OF UNDUE AMOUNTS**

44.1 Amount to be recovered — Calculation — Procedure

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

Each beneficiary’s financial responsibility in case of recovery is limited to its own debt, 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 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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ & \text{beneficiary’s costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency} \\
& \times \text{multiplied by the reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned} \\
& \div \text{the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1} \\
& \times \text{multiplied by} \\
& \text{the final grant amount (see Article 5.3)} , \\
& \text{minus} \\
& \{ \text{pre-financing and interim payments received by the beneficiary} \} .
\end{align*}
\]

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

\[
\{ \text{amount calculated according to point (a) for the beneficiary concerned} \}
\]
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:

\[
\text{beneficiary’s costs declared in the final summary financial statement and approved by the Agency multiplied by the reimbursement rate set out in Article 5.2 for the beneficiary concerned}}
\]

divided by

the EU contribution for the action calculated according to Article 5.3.1

multiplied by
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
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:

1. A report on the distribution of payments to the beneficiary concerned and
2. 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:

1. **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.

2. **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,
- was not due to error or negligence on their part (or on the part of third parties involved in the action), and
- proves to be inevitable in spite of exercising all due diligence.

The following cannot be invoked as force majeure:

- any default of a service, defect in equipment or material or delays in making them available, unless they stem directly from a relevant case of force majeure,
- labour disputes or strikes, or
- financial difficulties.

Any situation constituting force majeure must be formally notified to the other party without delay, stating the nature, likely duration and foreseeable effects.

The parties must immediately take all the necessary steps to limit any damage due to force majeure and do their best to resume implementation of the action as soon as possible.

The party prevented by force majeure from fulfilling its obligations under the Agreement cannot be considered in breach of them.

CHAPTER 7 FINAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE 52 — COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES

52.1 Form and means of communication

Communication under the Agreement (information, requests, submissions, ‘formal notifications’, etc.) must:

- be made in writing and
- bear the number of the Agreement.

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\(^{30}\), 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 UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU - Filozofski fakultet, 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

Ilaria MARSILI with ECAS id nmarsiil signed in the Participant Portal on 18/10/2018 at 10:43:50 (transaction id SigId-146338-JMpxBazjzcl2h6wX77UzzzcOnQXx79YJp4F2VdMph1xHzLlyRpkmKNesmUnDbzW4BjJKwileAI3JlyZ5uzmQESpO-J71zxYbymudVzkuCj2Z-gzs6anaS5iXCGolMbr0kkiEzmp2OHIAuRUUESYlx4wy). Timestamp by third party at Thu Oct 18 11:43:57 CEST 2018

For the Agency

Signed by Corinna AMTING with ECAS id amtingco as an authorised representative on 05-11-2018 14:58:51 (transaction id SigId-70303-aL7SHAj80DdzuUNHmxLLK6oQHRzLZgziMG6L5PfikizQMOc2bU7Yk20aPPoJQdJAYlbem5y/6GTQQGxq nonsFwYXGxa-J71zxYb8yrmFBSruTIWB0-n2KkXe6zp6iYGE2vneztRhvOhCjRVVzQyajjy3AezvL) Mon Nov 05 14:59:01 CET 2018
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1.1. The project summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>822682</th>
<th>Project Acronym 2</th>
<th>POPREBEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General information</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title 3</td>
<td>Populist rebellion against modernity in 21st-century Eastern Europe: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting date 4</td>
<td>01/01/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration in months 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call (part) identifier 6</td>
<td>H2020-SC6-GOVERNANCE-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Topic | GOVERNANCE-03-2018  
Addressing populism and boosting civic and democratic engagement |
| Fixed EC Keywords | Transformation of societies, democratization, social movements, Political systems and institutions, governance, Collective memories, identities, lieux de mémoire, oral history, Social structure, inequalities, social mobility, interethnic relations |
| Free keywords | Thin and thick populism, Neo-traditionalism, Neo-feudalism, Semantic social network analysis |

**Abstract 7**

POPREBEL is an inter-disciplinary consortium of researchers focused on explaining and contextualising the recent rise of populism in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). While populism is a phenomenon that has by now emerged in almost every democracy, we believe that regional and cultural-historical dimensions need to be considered in order to improve not only scholarly knowledge, but also policy recommendations. It is urgent for Western Europeans to look into the CEE mirror, just as it is urgent for the CEE region to understand itself. To this end, we will create a typology of populism’s various manifestations, reconstruct trajectories of its growth and decline, investigate its causes, interpret its meanings, diagnose its consequences, and propose policy solutions.

Our focus is on CEE, but we engage in comparisons with populisms elsewhere, particularly Western Europe. While scholars from different disciplines have looked at populism, we argue that the full potential of interdisciplinary research has not been achieved yet. We draw on data and models from various disciplines and combine them into a rich study of forces at play. In addition to established methods of economics, sociology, and cultural studies, at the heart of our approach is a novel methodology whose essence is a large-scale, Europe-wide, multi-lingual online conversation. This is a listening exercise; its aim is a deep understanding of everyday life in Europe challenged by the rise of populism. The method to process this unique ethnographic material is semantic social network analysis.

POPREBEL relies on foresight/future studies, deep involvement with activists, policy makers, and civil society actors to boost the immune system of European democracy. We develop scenarios and share them with all interested parties to reflect, in public debate, on how well they fit both in the CEE region and the rest of Europe. Our focus is not just scholarly; the project serves as a platform for mutual learning.
### 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>UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON</td>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNIVERZITA KARLOVA</td>
<td>CUNI</td>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLONSKI</td>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>BUDAPESTI CORVINUS EGYETEM</td>
<td>CUB</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TARTU ULIKOOLO</td>
<td>UTARTU</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU - Filozofske fakultet</td>
<td>UBF</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EDGERYDERS OU</td>
<td>Edgeryders</td>
<td>Estonia</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>Key concepts</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>52.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Participatory online conversation</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>55.40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>206.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>89.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>79.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>Foresight scenarios</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>Communication and dissemination</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>32.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>Ethics requirements</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 563.85
# 1.3.2. WT2 list of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>WP number&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</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>D1.1</td>
<td>Report on conceptualization of neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Report on diagnosing post transformational dissatisfaction in culture</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Report on the neo-traditionalist turn and its causes</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>Report on religion, national myths and xenophobia(anti-migrant feeling) as elements of neo-traditionalism</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5</td>
<td>Report on economic checks and balances: neo-feudalism in CEE and the region's competitiveness</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6</td>
<td>Report on the territorial disparities in Slovakia and Hungary and its effects on the neo-feudal turn</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Code for multimedia coding committed to GitHub and documented</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Rules of engagement/social contract document</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</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>D2.4</td>
<td>Ontology, first version</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Interactive dashboard, first version</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Ontology, second version</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.7</td>
<td>Report: an ethnography of European populism</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.8</td>
<td>Interactive dashboard, second version</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1</td>
<td>Report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report on new media and right wing populist discourse</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Report on Russian (hidden and overt) influences in populist discourses and public policies</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4</td>
<td>Report on visual manifestations of populism in popular culture</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.5</td>
<td>Report on strategies of resistance</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.6</td>
<td>Report on the politicisation of gender in populist discourses</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Dissemination level</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.7</td>
<td>Report on the strategic use of homophobia and transphobia in populist politics</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.8</td>
<td>Report on communicating and teaching Europe</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.9</td>
<td>Report on visions of Europe in the narratives of cultural institutions</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.10</td>
<td>Polishness and Europeanness in populist discourses</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.11</td>
<td>Report on radical right populism in Estonia and Latvia</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.12</td>
<td>Report on returning migrants and their value systems</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.13</td>
<td>Report on visions of national unity</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.14</td>
<td>Report on the notions of Us and Them / Self and Other</td>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Report: Political populism from fringe</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dissemination level&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Report on illiberal populism and social democratic left in the Czech Republic and Slovakia</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3</td>
<td>Report on populist political parties of former Yugoslavia in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>Report on Euroscepticism and populism in Poland after 2003</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.5</td>
<td>Report on policy recommendations designed to counteract the rise of populism in Europe</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.6</td>
<td>Release of data POPREBEL work Package 4 dataset</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.7</td>
<td>Comparative and theoretical perspectives on political populism</td>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Report on the conceptualisation and theorisation of economic inequality and insecurity</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Database: economic inequality and economic insecurity data collection from existing sources</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>18</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>D5.3</td>
<td>Report: From income inequality to economic insecurity and back: A narrative about the shifting tendencies of priorities as a cause of economic populism</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>Report: The varieties of state capitalism in emerging markets and in CEE</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.5</td>
<td>Report: Do inequality, perceptions and economic insecurity usher in political populism?</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.6</td>
<td>Report: The Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering?</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.7</td>
<td>Report on the rise of economic populism and its structural and institutional impact in the CEE region</td>
<td>WP5</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
<td>Initial scenarios document</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
<td>Summary report of consultations</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
<td>Finalised scenarios report</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.4</td>
<td>Summary report 1 on engagement seminars</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.5</td>
<td>Summary report 2 on engagement seminars</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.6</td>
<td>Report on the study of politics and populism using foresight methods</td>
<td>WP6</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium</td>
<td>34</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>D7.1</td>
<td>Dissemination and communication strategy I</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.2</td>
<td>POPREBEL website</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Websites, patents filing, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.3</td>
<td>Dissemination and communication strategy II</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.1</td>
<td>Project Handbook</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Progress Report II</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Edgeryders Ethics and Impact plan</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.1</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 1</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 3</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number&lt;sup&gt;14&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</td>
<td>WP number&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Type&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Dissemination level&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 4</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 5</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.6</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 6</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.7</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 7</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.8</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 8</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.9</td>
<td>M - Requirement No. 11</td>
<td>WP9</td>
<td>1 - UCL</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package title</th>
<th>Key concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>End month</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives

The main objective of this work package is to define and theorise neo-feudalism and neo-traditionalism, by studying the reasons of their emergence and functions in Central and Eastern Europe, whilst it also aims at developing such theoretical framework within which other cases (European and non-European alike) can be interpreted. The key source of populism and rebellion against the 21st century modernity in Central and Eastern Europe is best defined from two perspectives – economic and the socio-cultural perspectives. In 1990s, the transition period with its inherent difficulties posed by the change from a centrally planned economy to free market capitalism, have caused fear and insecurity among some members of Central and Eastern European region, and a longing for a more stable and reliable social and economic environment. The influx of new ideas, values and lifestyles was an opportunity but at the same time a challenge and a burden for the society as a whole. The anxiety of this period of change brings fruit today in the process that we understand as “delayed transformational fatigue”, providing a fertile ground to populist parties often using a nationalist and right-wing rhetoric. This working project focuses on two key concepts describing this turn: neo-feudalism and neo-traditionalism which are both crucial in understanding of Central and Eastern European societies and which both can be used as cornerstone concepts for interpreting socio-economic phenomena with populist characteristics in other regions.

Description of work and role of partners

WP1 - Key concepts [Months: 1-36]

UJ, CUB

Task 1.1 Conceptualising and theorising neo-traditionalism

Objectives of T 1.1

The concept of neo-traditionalism in the context of formerly communist societies of the region, indicates a new form of conservative, nationalist, close-minded worldview, and a turn towards secure, well-known traditional social and cultural constructs. It emerges as a reaction to insecurity, fast change and globalisation and Europeanisation. Neotraditionalism is not understood here as a call for a return to pre-modern, rural, traditional communities and lifestyles. Its main characteristic is the desire to remain enclosed in stable, defined and secure communities, with set boundaries, united by a shared religion, ethnicity and national identity. An ethnically understood form of nationalism, exploited by populist movements, parties and leaders, is therefore a key frame of reference in discussing neotraditionalism, defined as an escape from the core values of modernity and rebellion against its main tenets, eagerly exploited by populist/illiberal movements.

The main objective of this task (T 1.1) is to define and to conceptualise neo-traditionalism.

- Diagnose the recent turn towards traditionalism and nationalism among the post-communist societies of CEE and see it in a broader, interdisciplinary and diachronic perspective.
- Conceptualise a working model of neo-traditionalism.
- Analyse the factors which influence or alter this model.
- Use empirical material obtained through the application of several methods and relying on the data coming from several sources, including: attitudes, discourses, narratives, representations, as well as ethnographic data.
- Review the literature and develop fresh insights on the key dimensions of neo-traditionalism that include:
  - ethnic, essentialist nationalism
  - conservative, if not fundamentalist religiosity
  - historical revisionism, based on the rejection of guilt and on the glorification of national heroes (old and new)
  - various types of othering (foreigners, migrants, minorities (ethnic, national and sexual)
  - traditional family roles and rejection of feminism
  - distrust of Westernised, Europe-oriented elites, acceptance of illiberal, populist political leaders.
- Test the viability of the new definitions using three case studies:
  - Case-study 1: Polish Catholic Church as an agent of anti-European, nationalist conservatism – ethnographic analysis of key discourses in the Polish Church centred on the community of suffering and threats resulting from (post)modernity.
In particular, Radio Maryja, an ultra-conservative Catholic radio station, represents the most traditionalist and nationalist strand of the Polish Church. The study features an anthropological study of one of the Radio Maryja Family clubs.

- **Case-study 2: Hungarian Neo-Turanism – (re)constructing ancient non-European roots by Hungarian nationalists –** the study focuses on the narratives referring to Hungarian pre-Christian history which trace the roots of the Hungarian nation to the peoples of Central Asia. The influence of Turanism is best understood as a myth of return to the ancient, non-European traditions which can be seen in the speeches of politicians (mostly belonging to Jobbik, but also in Orban’s references to the “half-Asian” origin of Hungarians), as well as in popular cultural motives, for instance in the Nemzeti Rock (National Rock) or in the imagery related to the Hun warriors. At present, the return of Turanism can also be understood as a return to the modern nationalist and fascist versions of Turanism and is linked to anti-European and anti-Western ideas.

- **Case-study 3: Anti-Refugee Attitudes in Central and Eastern Europe –** this case study relies on existing secondary data with the aim of proving the overwhelmingly negative attitude towards refugees in countries of the region. This is demonstrated by different analyses, polls and surveys, based on various Eurobarometer studies, the 2016 Gallup World Poll, European Social Survey, Pew Research and sources by many, other public opinion analysis agencies, as well as reports by research centres, public agencies and think tanks, such as the Center for European Policy Analysis, Council on Foreign Relations, European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (formerly European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia). The case-study investigates links between insecurity and the rejection of modernity.

**Description of work and role of participants**

**Task 1.1 (Involved: UJ)**

- Conceptual work: Zdzisław Mach (10% FT) (Deliverables D 1.1. and 1.3.), Agnieszka Sadecka (5% FT) (D1.2.)
- Zdzisław Mach - supervision of the research assistant (M6-29)
- Case studies: Łucja Piekarska-Duraj (10% FT) (Deliverables D 1.4), Agnieszka Sadecka (10% FT) (D 1.4), András Tétényi (3.75% FT) (D 1.4), 1 Research assistant (50% FT, in M6-29)

**Task 1.2 - Conceptualising and theorising neo-feudalism**

**Objectives of T 1.2**

The main objective of this task (T 1.2) is to define and to theorise the concept of neo-feudalism. Neo-feudalism is understood as the economic subsystem of populist counter-revolution. Its point of departure is a rhetoric construction about the moral and social decline of the ‘developed world’ (or ‘developed West’), emphasising the irreversible and unsustainable demographic, economic and cultural tendencies and envisioning a trade-off between progressive development and security.

Specific objectives include:

- Construct a model of neo-feudalism, as a behavioural and institutional framework of populist (economic) policy, with the aim of redirecting academic discourse from the dominant binary dichotomy of democracy authoritarianism towards reinventing the originally pre-modern concept of feudalism in the postmodern socioeconomic context;
- Scrutinise its interference with nationalistic and exclusivist discourses of neo-traditionalism;
- Clarify how and to what extent neo-feudalism undermines economic, political and social stability and integrity in general and in CEE in particular;
- Identify the potential outcomes of neo-feudal policy regime focusing on counter-balancing the (real or perceived) inherent biases of transition markets and on creating the layer of “national magnates” (oligarchs or politicised firms in academic context);
- Contrast the function of state-backed politicised firms with market-oriented firms, drawing a particular attention to the deficiency in their international competitiveness and on the politicised recruit of human resources;
- Analyse the deterioration of market-led behaviour in neo-feudal capitalism, diverging SMEs and even local subsidiaries of MNCs towards a rent-seeking behaviour.

**Description of work and role of participants**

**Task 1.2 (Involved: CUB)**

- Conceptual work: István Kollai (D1.1, D1.8), Gábor Vigvári (D1.1), István Benczes (D1.1), Research Assistant (D1.1)
- Case studies: István Kollai (D1.5, D1.6), Research Assistant (D1.5, D1.6)

**Participation per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WPI effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>22.80</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>Report on conceptualization of neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.2</td>
<td>Report on diagnosing post transformational dissatisfaction in culture</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3</td>
<td>Report on the neo-traditionalist turn and its causes</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.4</td>
<td>Report on religion, national myths and xenophobia(anti-migrant feeling) as elements of neo-traditionalism</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5</td>
<td>Report on economic checks and balances: neo-feudalism in CEE and the region’s competitiveness</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.6</td>
<td>Report on the territorial disparities in Slovakia and Hungary and its effects on the neo-feudal turn</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D1.1 : Report on conceptualization of neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism [12]**

The two central concepts of POPREBEL are defined and discussed in this report. The section on neo-traditionalism (state of the art and application to contemporary debates) will provide a theoretical overview of texts on neo-traditionalism and conservative nationalism in Central and Eastern Europe, including country-specific analysis of the terms applied to describe the contemporary right-wing turn. The second section, on neo-feudalism (state of the art and application to contemporary debates) – will show how the expression of ‘neo-feudalism’ has been used in the academic discourse in different fields (from sociology to economics; from Latin America to the USA and Europe), and how it is referred to in the contemporary CEE region. Similar or overlapping definitions (e.g. “counter-democracy”, “deep state”) will also be discussed.
D1.2 : Report on diagnosing post transformational dissatisfaction in culture [15]
The general contours of post-transformational dissatisfaction, taking Poland as an example – will be outlined. The piece will review the main trends in the interpretation of the Polish culture after transformation, taking into account both scholarly work on the post-transformational condition of Polish society, and texts of nonfiction, illustrating individual stories of frustration, dissatisfaction, and insecurity.

D1.3 : Report on the neo-traditionalist turn and its causes [33]
The report will deal with the turn towards tradition, conservatism and nationalism in CEE. It will be a comparative analysis of cultural and social change leading to the popularity of right-wing, nationalist movements and political parties in countries of Central and Eastern Europe, based on existing research. The main focus will be on the activation mechanisms of the neo-traditionalist agenda.

D1.4 : Report on religion, national myths and xenophobia(anti-migrant feeling) as elements of neo-traditionalism [20]
Report on a variety of ways in which neo-traditionalism is manifested, through the analysis of three case studies of two national contexts (religiosity in Poland and historical mythmaking in Hungary), and of one cross-country analysis of anti-refugee attitudes in countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Through a combination of approaches - anthropological, historical and sociological - these three case studies will illustrate neo-traditionalist attitudes in the region. It is assumed that the neo-traditionalist turn means a return to conservative values, the safe boundaries of nation, religion and ethnic homogeneity.

D1.5 : Report on economic checks and balances: neo-feudalism in CEE and the region’s competitiveness [20]
This report deals with the influence of neo-feudalism on the long-run competitiveness of the economic system. It analyses, how the confronting form of macro-economic stabilization affects the state of human capital, and shed light whether the struggle for ‘national capitalists’ could develop innovation, global product branding, and FDI outflow.

D1.6 : Report on the territorial disparities in Slovakia and Hungary and its effects on the neo-feudal turn [26]
This case study focuses on the cumulative disparities and ‘backwash effects’ between globally recognised ‘gateway cities’ (primarily capital cities) and their hinterlands in the CEE-region. The research intends to scrutinize the question of emerging and widening urban-rural gaps in a broader regional and international comparison. The aim is to demonstrate that such a regional disparity has a significant effect on the most recent neo-feudalist turn in politics.

<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>Conceptualisation of the project</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Deliverables 1.1 and 1.7 submitted to EC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objectives

Populist themes resonate with a part of the European population. To people who reject populism, this resonance can be hard to understand and empathise with, as it seems at odds with the observed long-term trends towards societal prosperity and openness. Conversely, people who find populism attractive cannot reconcile what they perceive with the optimistic narrative of their political adversaries. WP2 is a structured effort to listen to the voices of the people on the ground. We hope to learn what the rise of populist politics looks like from the point of view of Europeans living their daily life. We pay special attention to supporters of the populist agenda. Ultimately, WP2 provides other WPs with a breakdown of populism that encodes the point of view of the people directly affected by it, supporters and opposers.

Description of work and role of partners

WP2 - Participatory online conversation [Months: 1-36]

Edgeryders, UCL, CUNI, UBFF

Task 2.1 - Convene and seed a large, online, multilingual conversation on populism. Make it a safe and respectful place for all, including supporters of populism.

Objectives of T2.1

- Create and maintain four online fora in: Polish, Czech, Serbian and English. The first three languages are meant for maximum inclusivity of citizens in the respective countries; English is meant as a lingua franca fallback avenue for Europeans who want to participate in the debate, but do not master any of the focal languages. Goal: 2-400 hundred unique participants, 2-5,000 forum posts.
- Train 5 community managers who, between them and with Edgeryders’ senior community managers, can cover the four POPREBEL languages.
- The overall objective is for the conversation to “go deep”, beyond posturing and commonplaces.
- Manage fora tightly, so hard issues can be tackled in an atmosphere of mutual respect. We draw on world-class experience of online community management to do this. Aim: maximum 5 flame wars, squelched within 48 hours.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 2.1 (Involved: EDGERYDERS, UCL, CUNI, UBFF)

- We create a POPREBEL online forum. This happens by customising the existing edgeryders.eu platform. Advantages: robust and scalable (based on Discourse); takes advantage of the existing community using it (4.3K accounts); open source.
- We train community managers via a two-day course by month 2 (requiring physical presence of trainees), followed by online mentoring throughout the project.
- We create a written “rules of engagement/netiquette” document to serve as the social contract underpinning interaction on POPREBEL.
- Community management itself is the responsibility of a cross-partner team, including language-specific community managers and EDGERYDERS trainers-mentors. It happens by spelling out explicitly the rules of interaction and netiquette early on; monitoring the conversation; encouraging and giving positive reinforcement to contributors; drawing specific people into specific conversations. This allows the conversation to ‘go deep’.
- In extreme cases, using the tools provided by the platform for moderation (unpublish offending posts, suspend accounts etc.). This keeps the conversation safe and respectful.
- We deploy a community journalism program. This consists in finding respected voices with a good social media presence and commissioning them high-quality posts on their experience around the populist rebellion. This creates “seed” content that can be re-shared on social media in T2.2 to attract new users and new contribution.

Task 2.2 - Recruit and engage participants

Objectives of T2.2

- Establish and maintain social media presence across the project’s four languages. Use it to disseminate interesting content coming from the platform. This directs traffic back to it, and drives signups. Goal: 2-400 hundred unique participants, 2-5,000 forum posts.
- Run offline events to reach out to less web-savvy strata of the population and elicit new stories and contribution to report back to the platform. Goal: 12 offline events/workshops in the Czech Republic, Poland, Serbia and the rest of Europe.

**Description of work and role of participants**

**Task 2.2 (Involved: EDGERYDERS)**

- We create POPREBEL accounts on the main social media. These are: Facebook (highest penetration all across the EU, except Estonia and Latvia), Instagram and Twitter (ranking second in most of CEE and most of Western Europe respectively). Use them to reach into the social media conversation across POPREBEL languages, sharing interesting content from the platform (starting from the “community journalism” seed posts) and drawing traffic back to the POPREBEL platform.
- We design, organize and run 12 onboarding events, aimed at collecting stories of lived populism. The word “populism” will be with caution, as it has negative connotations in some cultures, and might discourage supporters of the populist agenda. We partner with local organizations to take advantage of their networks. We report faithfully such experiences on the platform, re-share them on social media, which should drive further engagement and so on.
- We participate into third-party events like conferences, political rallies, and other grassroots events. This is both a way to study populist tactics and strategies in action, and a technique to raise awareness around POPREBEL and recruit new members.

**Task 2.3 - Perform ethnographic coding of the conversation in T 2.1**

**Objectives of T 2.3**

- Code participant-generated content as it unfolds on the POPREBEL platform. By “coding”, we mean the ethnographic sense of the word, “iteratively tagging to identify core themes in the conversation”. Goals: the conversation coded in full at month 33.
- Maintain a consistent multi-language and multimedia coding ontology across the project. Goal: each code in each language has exactly one equivalent in each of the other languages.

**Description of work and role of participants**

**Task 2.3 (Involved: EDGERYDERS, UCL, CUNI, UBFF)**

- We code the POPREBEL conversation in-platform. The edgeryders.eu platform, which hosts POPREBEL, comes with an application called Open Ethnographer, which does just that.
- Ethnographers work in teams to ensure intercoder reliability, and report regularly.
- This is done using strategies from Grounded Theory [Corbin & Strauss, 2008] to minimize the impact of researchers’ pre-conceived ideas about data, while acknowledging that no ‘neutral’ or ‘depersonalized’ coding regimen can exist.
- As we code, we produce and maintain a multilingual ontology of codes applied to POPREBEL’s conversation. This takes the form of a regularly updated wiki containing the list of codes in use; their definition; and their equivalent in each of the other POPREBEL languages. From an ethnographic perspective, the construction and interpretation of a cross-lingual ontology is not merely about translating similar terms from one language to another, but has to deal with the much more challenging task of translating between different cultural contexts. The ontology is thus not only cross-lingual but cross-cultural.

**Task 2.4 - Induce, visualize and analyse the semantic social network from the conversation.**

**Objectives of T2.4**

- Ensure data consistency, integrity and long-term stewardship. “Data” in semantic social network analysis consist of primary data (the conversation itself: the posts, organized in threads), and secondary data (the ethnographic annotations and codes). Goal: orderly archiving of the data as open data.
- Create a navigable version of the conversation’s semantic social network. Make sure they can be navigated both at the level of a single country and at the level of the whole multi-language conversation.

**Description of work and role of participants**

**Task 2.4 (Involved: EDGERYDERS)**

- We combine primary and secondary data into a semantic social network (SSN). To do this, we use a Python harvesting script that calls the edgeryders.eu APIs and populates a Neo4j graph database.
- We export the data in a widely used, intuitive format (JSON) and store it for long-term safekeeping. We use zenodo.org as the repository. Reasons: long-term reliable (maintained by CERN); native support for OpenAIRE; supports versioning.
We visualize the data with an interactive dashboard built on Graphryder. This allows visualizing only the strongest connections, drilling down on ethno codes of interest, making inferences on the social networks associated with specific codes, etc. Drawing on network science literature, we test and compare different methods of aggregating data.

Using the SSN as a guide, we produce an ethnography of populism in Europe. Example: https://zenodo.org/record/1186606#.Wp10i4L_pBw

Task 2.5 - Provide technical support to the WP

- Provide functionality for coding multimedia as well as text. Goal: functionality up and running at M7.
- Maintain and improve user experience of in-platform coding application.
- Customise and maintain a POPREBEL platform space.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 2.5 (Involved: EDGERYDERS)

- We set up and configure the POPREBEL online space. This shares the codebase and database with the existing edgeryders.eu platform, but is accessible through its own domain (for example poprebel.eu) and has its own colour schemes. This requires minor extensions to the codebase (Ruby on Rails), and we have experience with it.
- We engage an Ethics Advisor and provide the space with an ethical consent funnel. See WP8 for description.
- We extend Open Ethnographer to support multimedia coding. This happens by building on the annotator.js library, and integrating the functionality in the version of the Discourse platform maintained by EDGERYDERS (https://github.com/edgeryders/discourse)
- We support ethnographers in the coding activity. Though the key functionalities are already implemented, this might require small front-end utilities like coding queues, or drag-and-drop interfaces to re-organize hierarchies of codes. These are implemented in Javascript to stick to browser-based interfaces for simplicity of use.
- We provide technical support and server admin to the whole project.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP2 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55.40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2.1</td>
<td>Code for multimedia coding committed to GitHub and documented</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.2</td>
<td>Rules of engagement/ social contract document</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.3</td>
<td>Data management plan</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4</td>
<td>Ontology, first version</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2.5</td>
<td>Interactive dashboard, first version</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.6</td>
<td>Ontology, second version</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.7</td>
<td>Report: an ethnography of European populism</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.8</td>
<td>Interactive dashboard, second version</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Websites, patents filling, etc.</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D2.1: Code for multimedia coding committed to GitHub and documented [6]
Code for multimedia coding committed to GitHub and documented [6] Deployal and documentation of the technical adaptations and extensions to functionality of edgeryders.eu platform (on Discourse) to allow for ethnographic coding of multimedia specific to POPREBEL.

A written document (commentable by the community) detailing the rights and responsibilities of participant-informants, and the rules of interaction and netiquette presiding on their involvement.

D2.3: Data management plan [6]
A document detailing the governance of the data produced during POPREBEL, during and after the project.

D2.4: Ontology, first version [13]
A regularly updated wiki containing the list of multi-lingual ethnographic codes applied to POPREBEL’s conversation.

D2.5: Interactive dashboard, first version [13]
A software application to generate and refine on the fly visualizations of semantic social networks.

D2.6: Ontology, second version [32]
A regularly updated wiki containing the list of multi-lingual ethnographic codes applied to POPREBEL’s conversation.

D2.7: Report: an ethnography of European populism [34]
A report on populism in Europe from the voices of a cross-section of citizens, researchers and other relevant stakeholders.

D2.8: Interactive dashboard, second version [34]
A software application to generate and refine on the fly visualizations of semantic social 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>MS1</td>
<td>POPREBEL platform launch</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public access to POPREBEL forums on the edgeryders.eu platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
<td>Milestone title</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>POPREBEL platform training</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case/ language specific community managers trained and active; a summary post of learnings and context specific considerations shared on the platform by each trained community manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Community journalism programme finished</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 high quality commissioned posts online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>On-boarding workshops delivered</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12 onboarding workshops delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Ethnographic coding completed</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ethnographic coding finished</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The collapse of state socialism set in train a process of unparalleled social, economic and political transformation. Not only did the Soviet-style economic systems need to be dismantled and new democratic political institutions re-built from scratch but new cognitive frameworks had to be found through which citizens could make sense of the world around them and guide their decisions about whom to trust and with whom to co-operate. In the context of the upheaval triggered by the political and economic transition, ethnic nationalism provided a sense of cohesion and stability by offering a credible explanation of the past and a guide for the present and the future. The intensifying globalisation and European integration, until recently perceived by the formerly communist societies as an opportunity for the modernisation and affirmation of Western values, created new challenges and provoked new anxieties. Diverse ideas, lifestyles and models of society were rejected by some members of the post-communist societies, choosing instead to return to traditions, conservative values and familiar mechanisms of identification and othering. In the context of the upheaval triggered by the political and economic transition, ethnic nationalism provided a sense of cohesion and stability by offering a credible explanation of the past and a guide for the present and the future. The intensifying globalisation and European integration, until recently perceived by the formerly communist societies as an opportunity for the modernisation and affirmation of Western values, created new challenges and provoked new anxieties. Diverse ideas, lifestyles and models of society were rejected by some members of the post-communist societies, choosing instead to return to traditions, conservative values and familiar mechanisms of identification and othering. While this research project focuses on the largely understood region of Central and Eastern Europe, its findings will illustrate various examples of populist rebellion, particularly against the forces of globalisation and integration, the trajectories of which can be observed around the globe.

After the fall of communism, many ‘male’ professions (e.g. miners, factory workers) were devalued and women’s contributions to the overall household income increased, undermining traditional gender roles and threatening the gender identities of both men and women. When key social identities such as gender are threatened, groups strive to uphold the traditional status quo and define more narrowly who is and is not a true member of the group. Those not adhering to traditional gender and sexual norms are often constructed as a threat to stability and an affront to religious values and thus face marginalisation, discrimination, hostility and violence.

Apart from the figures of otherness based on ethnic exclusion or gender-based discrimination, new out-groups emerged. Whether the “other” denotes unwanted historical figures, alien newcomers such as non-European migrants and refugees, or political and ideological opponents, it gains new visibility through illiberal narratives of narrowly understood national unity against a foreign threat. Europe, despite becoming more open and accessible to citizens of CEE, is also cast in the image of the other. Europe, symbolising openness and participation in a large, multinational and multicultural community, is the complete opposite of the traditionalist world desired by right-wing movements in the region. The rejection of Europe and casting it in the role of the threatening force, ruled by distant Brussels elites, is a key factor in the populist rebellion that can be observed in across various EU countries. The aim of WP3 is thus to examine how populist politicians use specific cultural tropes – understood here as the ideas, customs and social behaviours – to ‘thicken’ populism and thereby legitimise the marginalisation or exclusion of women, LGBT citizens, ethnic minorities, refugees and progressives. The research will examine both the demand for ethnic politics and traditional gender and sexual norms as well as the use of anti-Europeanism, antiliberalism, xenophobia, patriarchy and homophobia by populist politicians to appeal to prospective voters.

**WP3 - Culture [Months: 1-36]**

**UJ, UCL, CUNI, UTARTU, UBFF**

**Task 3.1- New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans**

**Objective of T3.1**

This task focuses on the use of new media in the propagation of both left and right populist policies and the promotion of populist movements and actors in the Western Balkans. For over two decades the Western Balkans has been going through the process of political and economic transition with less than impressive results. The advent and popularization of new media and social networks coincided with the crisis of 2008, exacerbating existing problems caused by low economic growth, high unemployment, frequent political crises and unresolved grievances from the Yugoslav wars. Serbia continuously tops the ranks of the Facebook users in Europe, with over three million users in June 2017. Due to their limited presence in the traditional media, populist, radical and extremist parties and movements used new media as the channel of choice for communicating and propagating their ideas. An underdeveloped political culture...
and belief system based on anti-liberalism, anti-individualism, anti-intellectualism and anti-modernity contribute to the
pervasiveness of various types of populism, among which the most prominent ones being nationalist, “strong-arm” and
antimarket populism.

Objectives include:
● Study the significance of new media for spreading populist ideas in comparison with traditional media;
● Analyse the content of the populist messages disseminated on new media;
● Observe, describe and analyse how political actors are adjusting their messages to perceived public opinion.

Methods: content analysis, discourse analysis, interviews.

Task 2.2 - Recruit and engage participants

Task 3.1 (Involved: UBFF)
● Conceptual, analytical work - Haris Dajc (10% FT) M1-10, supervision of RAs (M10-29), analysis (M21-36)
● Conceptual work, analytical work, - Isidora Jaric (10% FT), analysis (M21-36)
● Collecting data: 2 research assistants (Ninkovic 50% FT and Krek 25% FT) (M10-29), analysis (M21-36)

Task 3.2 - South-East European populism, post-conflict transitional stress and Russian influence

Objectives of T3.2
South-Eastern Europe is lagging behind CEE in the processes of Europeanisation, democratisation, transition to
capitalism and the accession to Euro-Atlantic security institutions. Unfavourable social structures, poor and dispersed
economic conjuncture and the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia contributed to the slowing down of SEE’s
democratisation and transition, national relations were disrupted, middle-class development delayed, and security
institutions subordinated to the organised resistance of the traditional elites to European and regional integrations and
especially the concepts of European freedoms and individualism. This task tries to explore is the source of the CEE
populism related to the Russian pressures on Baltic, South-Eastern Europe and Ukraine and its cultural consequences.

This task has three major objectives:
● Identify mechanisms of strategic pressures from Russia intended to master the political and social discontents in post-
conflict transition processes which have been additionally burdensome after the violent disintegration of Yugoslavia,
inter-ethnic and religious conflicts, ethnic cleansing, material destruction and social and moral recession;
● Examine whether SEE populism can be linked to CEE populism and the official Russian influence;
● Identify concrete cultural, political and economic problems, and particular social groups, which contribute to the
growth of SEE populism and can be ascribed to Russian influence.

Methods: discourse analysis of legal documents, public documents and testimonies, archive materials, media contents
etc. relevant to current and historical relations between Russia and SEE, and the republics of the former USSR and
countries of post-Yugoslav space.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 3.2 (Involved: UBFF)
● Conceptual, analytical work - Nikola Samardzic (20% FT) (M1-8) with RAs (M9-29), analysis (M21-36)
● Conceptual work, analytical work - senior researcher (20% FT) (M1-8), analysis (M21-36)
● Collecting data 2 research assistants (Milivoj Beslin 20%FT + research assistant 25% FT), analysis (M21-36)

Task 3.3: Populism and popular culture in Central and South-Eastern Europe: an ambivalent relationship?

Objectives of T 3.3
After the fall of communism, according to current political rhetoric, the former communist countries should have quickly
adapted to the Western market economy and cultural strategies. The rapid ‘Westernization’ of East European art and
culture dictates the main trends, strategies and even what art and cultural production should be critical about.
As a reaction to these pressures cultural production from the region has started to display more “cultural traditions”
and “neo-traditional styles.” Thus, cultural productions are politicised and used in debates on European integration or
religious values. This task aims to disentangle the realm of popular culture and art’s relation to populism. Populist parties
in CEE identify themselves with formats of cultural productions which oppose, resist or critique “high culture” on the
grounds that there is an antagonism between the general will and taste of the people and elite’s culture and aesthetic
taste. However, there is a conflation between “high culture” and elitism as well as between popular culture and people’s
culture. In this framework, a rich category of mass films, comedy as a genre, pop & hip-hop music, and media provide
a valuable insight in both promoting and contesting populist ideology.

The main objectives of the task are:
● Describe and analyse the nature of the relationship between populism and popular culture;
● Determine to what extent popular culture can generate and support populism;
● Identify instances when popular culture contests populist claims. Investigate popular culture’s potential for resistance to populism;
● Offer general insights about the relationship between popular culture and support for populism;
● Prepare recommendations for the work in WP6 on policy foresight scenarios.

Methods: discourse analysis of print, internet sources, visual media, films, literary productions, graffiti, stencils, posters. Interviews with cultural producers (amateur and professional) and with populist entrepreneurs; ethnographic observation;
Critical Visual Analysis; combined analysis of visual and textual data

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.3 (Involved: CUNI)
● Maria Asavei time: 40% FT Months 1-36
Role: Conceptual work, supervision of research assistant, collecting data, analytical work.

Task 3.4 - Gender identities in transformation: patriarchy, misogyny and homophobia as elements of populist politics’ discourses in Serbia

Objectives of T3.4
This task will examine the construction of different gender identities within populist discourses and the public articulation of the possible resistance to this stereotypical reduction of particular identity positions within Serbian society. Special attention will be paid to examining how current populist political measures (like austerity measures) match, on the level of discourse, the needs and demands of different gender groups.

The key objective of this task is to analyse the relationship between populism and particular gender identity positions, seeking to understand how and why ‘acceptable’ and ‘unacceptable’ gender norms are discursively constructed by populists, how and why such constructions change in particular social and historical circumstances and how different gender groups respond to and resist these constructions.

Specific objectives include:
● Determine if there is any change in people’s ‘desires’ and reconstruct the content of culturally desirable constructs of hegemonic masculinity and emphasised femininity;
● Find out if they are framed differently under the impact of populism and determine the direction of this change;
● Analyse changes in male, female and LGBTQ identity positions and analyse how populist discourses shape them;
● Explore how members of different gender groups articulate their point of agitation and its causes;
● Observe, describe and analyse the ways in which members of different gender groups frame their discontent and articulate possible strategies of resistance to populist discourses.

Methods: content and discourse analysis (using Post-Structuralist Discourse Theory) of: (1) official documents that regulate social spheres, (2) speeches and media statements by populist politicians in Serbia on issues of gender and sexuality to discern the meanings they attach non-traditional gender and sexual norms, their legitimisation strategies and attempts to render their meanings hegemonic; and (3) media content.

The project will also make use of Semantic Social Network Analysis to map the evolution of attitudes towards issues of gender and sexuality among networks of the ‘left behind’ to assess their views on the changes in traditional gender and sexual norms and trace their deliberations as to the appeal of populist narratives on gender and sexuality.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.4 (Involved: UBFF)
● Conceptual, analytical work - Isidora Jaric (20% FT) M1-10, and supervision of research assistants (M10-29), analysis (M21-36)
● Conceptual work, analytical work - Nikola Samardzic (10%FT) M1-10, analysis (M21-36)
● Collecting data: 2 research assistants (Danica Laban 40%FT + Maja Krek 25% FT) (M10-29), analysis (M21-36)

Task 3.5 - Homophobia and populist politics in Poland, Czech Republic and Germany

Objectives of T3.5
While populists in Poland have instrumentalised the high levels of homophobia in a bid to appeal to the ‘left behind’ by presenting themselves as the champions of traditional values, Czech politicians with equally robust populist credentials have been less willing to adopt this strategy, while German populists actively court the LGBTQ community. So, while post-communist populists share an antipathy towards the EU, ethnic minorities, migrants and refugees, their stance on homosexuality is more ambiguous.
The aim of this task is to analyse the relationship between populism and homosexuality, seeking to understand the appeal of homophobic discourse to the ‘left behind’ and why some populist politicians consider homophobia a useful political strategy, while others are more neutral and others still seek out the support of the LGBTQ community.

Objectives:
- Discern the meanings populist politicians attach to non-traditional gender and sexual norms, their legitimisation strategies and attempts to render their meanings hegemonic.
- Determine the circumstances under which the homophobic discourse appeals to the ‘left behind’
- Find out under what conditions is homophobia considered a useful political strategy for populists
- Determine if some populists seek to marginalise the LGBTQ community, while others actively court them
- Understand the interrelations between the supply and demand of populist policies on homosexuality to what extent does populism fuel homophobia or homophobia fuels populism?

Methods: discourse analysis (using Post-Structuralist Discourse Theory) of a broad corpus of official documents, speeches and media statements by populist politicians in Poland, the Czech Republic and Germany on issues of gender and sexuality. The project will then make use of Semantic Social Network Analysis to (1) map the evolution of views towards issues of gender and sexuality among the ‘left behind’, (2) assess their views on the changes in traditional gender and sexual norms and (3) trace their deliberations as to the appeal of populist narratives on gender/sexuality.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.5 (Involved: UCL)
- Richard Mole: Conceptual work, analytical work, supervision of research assistants (M13-36) 20% FTE

Task 3.6 - Othering Europe: constructing the relations between the national community and Europe in political and cultural realms

Objectives of T3.6

This task focuses on the representations of Europe by Polish political elites and institutions, and casting it in the role of the Other. By “Othering Europe” we mean presenting the EU institutions as a bunch of bureaucratic ‘mad men,’ obsessed with the liberal, self-destructing ideology of multiculturalism, and representing values alien to “true Europeans”. Populist parties of Central and Eastern Europe pursue a policy of cultural homogeneity, nationalism and freedom from any control from the EU, presenting this policy as the only chance for CEE to remain safe from terrorism and cultural destruction. The task features three case studies, focusing on educational programmes, institutional strategies and political elites regarding the image of European Union and European integration in Central and Eastern Europe.

Case study 1: Failure to Educate about Europe in CEE Countries
It can be observed that CEE elites failed in making Europe – and the EU – accessible, understandable and approachable to citizens, which resulted in a deep alienation from Europe, exploited by populist parties. The EU represented Western civilisation to which CEE societies aspired, but it was also identified with a somewhat suspicious, liberal way of life, unfamiliar values, pluralism, cultural otherness and cultural uncertainties. The EU funds were much appreciated, but Europe as a cultural space remained alien. Intellectual elites and educators, especially liberal ones, often assumed that it would be enough to install instruments, institutions and mechanisms of liberal society and change would automatically follow. This did not happen and no strong and sustainable European identity was created.

The objectives of this case study are:
- Evaluate the strategies of educating about Europe and the EU;
- Investigate comprehensive educational curricula (including education process itself, teacher training, teaching materials etc.) in selected CEE countries;
- Study the policies of the main discourse-shaping institutions: state organs, political parties, and the Catholic Church;
- Make policy recommendations on educational strategies about Europe and European integration processes;

Methods: a comprehensive analysis of educational curricula, discourse analysis based on existing sources (policies, recommendations, state regulations in the field of education).

Case study 2: Othering Europe. The Re-interpretation of Europe's image in Poland in the context of rising Euroscepticism
The aim of this case study is to analyse multilevel and complex processes of redefinition of Europe's image which stem from Poland facing the rise of Euroscepticism. This redefinition is not only limited to Europe's image but also to the self-image of Poland (within the community of EU members) and Pole (within the community of EU citizens). Thus it provokes tensions between two opposite axiologies: national pride (sovereignty, independence etc.) vs. European integration.
Objectives:
- Examine Europe’s image in Poland vis-à-vis rising Euroscepticism;
- Analyse top-down and bottom-up processes at work and the role of state institutions and local actors in them, e.g. national cultural institutions and museums (the Museum of the Second World War) and state organs (the President, the government and its agencies, the Parliament);
- Describe and understand discursive practices, with which the redefinition of Europe's image is done, with particular attention paid to the notion of sovereignty, national pride, democracy, solidarity;
- Analyse the image of Europe in the époque of Central European fatigue with the EU political integration.

Methods: critical analysis of chosen elements of the anti-European and illiberal discourse in Poland leading to and based on the image of Europe as significant Other. Participant observation, in depth interviews with employees of the institutions, evaluative research questionnaires and selected methods of content analysis.

Case Study 3 Polish “national pride” and visions of Europeanness among political elites
The changes in real politics introduced by the 2015 Polish government were accompanied by the rise of a powerful narrative of Polish nationhood and new poetics regarding Poland’s place within the international context and especially its role and place in Europe.

The objective of this task is:
- Analyse the changing discourses about the Polish nation, Europe and the EU by key Polish political leaders;
- Focus on how the Polish nation, Polish national interest, Poland’s place in Europe are understood and defined by political leaders and how they relate Poland to the EU and see the interdependencies and interconnectedness within the EU (analysis of the content);
- Determine how those narratives are built through the use of language (analysis of the poetics). This would necessarily require the analysis of who “the Other” is and how the understanding of “the Other” has changed;
- Answer the questions whether the 2015 elections sealed and further strengthened the dominant narrative on the centre-periphery and West versus East dichotomy, alongside with inherent to populist narrative deepening of elite versus non-elite (‘ordinary people’) discourse.

Methods: discourse analysis and qualitative content analysis based on, in-depth interviews with selected Polish political leaders, analysis of public speeches and interviews (based on their appearances on the media - from 2015)

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.6 (Involved: UJ)
- Case study 1: Conceptual work, analytical work - Zdzislaw Mach (5% FT) M1-36, supervision of research assistants (M6-29), Collecting data: 2 research assistants at 25% FT (M6-29)
- Case study 2: Conceptual work, collecting data, analysis - Krzysztof Kowalski (20% FT)
- Case study 3: Conceptual work, collecting data, analysis - Joanna Orzechowska-Waclawska (12,5% FT)

Task 3.7 - The refugee crisis and the populist and radical right in the Baltic States

Objectives of T3.7
The Baltic States are the three most successfully consolidated democracies within the post-Soviet space. However, radical right and populist movements increasing find support in their societies. This task will focus on: Estonia and the party of EKRE (Estonian Conservative People’s Party), and Latvia and the party of National Alliance. EKRE, set up in 2012, delivered an impressive performance in the latest parliamentary elections (2015), garnering 8.1% of the vote, and has been polling third among the electorate for the past several months. The National Alliance has been participating as a coalition partner in Latvia’s current government and has been a part of every government since 2011. This task will clarify how populist and radical right-wing parties adapt to specific national settings and how the political circumstances may provide (or not) opportunity structures for the emergence of populist and radical right-wing parties in certain countries and during certain periods. EKRE and the National Alliance have been capitalising on the virtual politics of (anti)immigration in the two societies since 2015. This task addresses the alarmism over the ‘imminent threat of Islamisation’, in the rhetoric of various political actors across CEE, despite the actual absence (or minuscule presence) of Muslim war refugees in these societies.

The objectives of this task include:
- Describe and analyse the special features of EKRE and the National Alliance as populist and radical right-wing parties that operate in Estonia and Latvia; situate EKRE and the National Alliance along a political continuum between the populist right and the more radical (or identitarian) right-wing parties that operate in CEE;
- Find an answer to the question as to why these two parties systematically centre on the virtual politics of anti-immigration in their campaigns;
Generalise about the role of virtual politics in the rising popularity of populism.

Method: paired comparison, functioning as an intermediate step between a single case-study, which suggests a general relationship, and a multi-case analysis that tests or refines a theory. Qualitative and discourse analysis of EKRE’s and National Alliance’s public statements, their party-programmes, and selected interviews with party-affiliates and academic experts. Sources such as public surveys and articles from the Estonian, Latvian and international press will be of complementary importance.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.7 (Involved: UTARTU)
- Conceptual work, collecting data, analysis - Louis Wierenga (25% FT) and Vassilis Petsinis (25% FT)

Task 3.8: Returning migrants: agents of change?

Objectives of T3.8
Many young people emigrated from Central and Eastern Europe to the West of Europe in search for better jobs. Some of them were successful and they still live in “the old Europe”. But those who were not successful, who became bitter and frustrated, often returned home. Since they did not feel that they belonged to the Western European community, they were often disappointed with their experience abroad and would sometimes be attracted to alternative models of integration (Visegrad, Three-Seas), proposed by the populist governments in the region.

Objectives:
- Verify a hypothesis that returning migrants become more nationalistic and xenophobic than before;
- Analyse attitudes of especially young people in CEE towards Western European culture and way of life;
- Describe and analyse attitudes of young people in CEE towards young people in Western Europe and those in their region, observe mechanisms of cultural inferiority/superiority;
- Develop some generalisation about the impact of migrations and mobility on young people’s views of Europe, its culture and institutions, and their role in the rise of traditionalism, populist nationalism and Euroscepticism.

Methods: in-depth interviews in four CEE countries (Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, and Poland).

Description of work and role of participants
Task 3.8 (Involved: UJ)
- Conceptual work, supervision of research assistants (M6-M29), analytical work: Zdzisław Mach (5%)
- Collecting data: 2 research assistants (25%) M6-M29

Task 3.9 - Othering Ourselves, Othering the “Enemy” - mechanisms of exclusion in Polish public discourses on Self and Other post-2015

Objectives of T3.9
The task aims at investigating processes of othering and identity construction on the basis of the Self/Other binary in Polish context. Two case studies are used to illustrate this:

Case study 1: Imagining and re-imagining the past: visions of Us and Them in narratives of politicians and activists
The case study will investigate the processes of national heritage construction and the idea of self in Poland under the rule of Law and Justice. The data gathered for analysis of the subproject will come from two main sources: interviews about Poland’s history in the eyes of opinion-makers, which will be conducted with political leaders and activists and several public intellectuals. The main idea is to encourage interviewees to talk about Poland as a country, its specifics and uniqueness, its past and identity. A key question would involve the mechanisms of Othering: which groups are, in the new retelling of Polish history, deemed to be included, and which are marginalised. New figures of Self and Other will be identified in order to track how the national community is constructed and who the new heroes and significant actors of history are.

Objectives:
- Determine how national identity is constructed on the basis of understanding of history by politicians and opinion makers, both linked with the party at government and the opposition;
- Identify what are the main patterns of narrating national unity and national heritage;
- Among these narratives, to define who is included in the national community, and who is not and analyse mechanisms of exclusion or promotion of certain figures and events of history.

Methods: interviews, discourse analysis, field studies of heritage sites (museums).

Case study 2: Representations of the symbolic enemy in Polish media discourses post-2015
Polish right-wing narratives have for a long time featured representations of enemy largely based on historical animosities, as well as those of an anti-Semitic character. This case study focuses on the idea of the enemy constructed in recent years, drawing on old stereotypes, recycled and presented in a new light, often linked to popular conspiracy theories.

It can also involve new stereotypes formed about groups that formerly did not occupy a significant place in Polish discourses, particularly non-European migrants and refugees. Yet further types of internal enemy recently emerged in these discourses: leftist hipsters, environmentalists protesting against Białowieża national park deforestation, feminists, and free-thinkers (often invoking age-old conspiracy theories, such as those on illuminati, freemasons or organisations sponsored by George Soros).

Objectives:
- Map and describe the images of “the enemy” in right-wing narratives;
- Categorise various types of “the enemy” figures and embed them in the Polish cultural context, taking into account historical enmities, existing narratives of racism, anti-Semitism and xenophobia;
- Explore the circulation of such images of the threatening other and link them to existing conspiracy theories;
- Examine the role of the image of “enemy” in the binary logic of self and other in order to draw conclusions on the role of the figure of the other in contemporary Polish identity-building.

Methods: analysis of media discourses in three leading right-wing monthly magazines, including visual and textual materials, in the period of 2015-2018. Participant observation of right-wing Gazeta Polska Clubs.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP3 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>94.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>206.80</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>Report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.2</td>
<td>Report on new media and right wing populist discourse</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliverable Number</td>
<td>Deliverable Title</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.3</td>
<td>Report on Russian (hidden and overt) influences in populist discourses and public policies</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4</td>
<td>Report on visual manifestations of populism in popular culture</td>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.5</td>
<td>Report on strategies of resistance</td>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.6</td>
<td>Report on the politicisation of gender in populist discourses</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.7</td>
<td>Report on the strategic use of homophobia and transfobia in populist politics</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.8</td>
<td>Report on communicating and teaching Europe</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.9</td>
<td>Report on visions of Europe in the narratives of cultural institutions</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.10</td>
<td>Polishness and Europeanness in populist discourses</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.11</td>
<td>Report on radical right populism in Estonia and Latvia</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</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>D3.12</td>
<td>Report on returning migrants and their value systems</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.13</td>
<td>Report on visions of national unity</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.14</td>
<td>Report on the notions of Us and Them / Self and Other</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables

D3.1 : Report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 [12]
The report will provide definitions and brief discussions of the major concepts employed in the package studies. They will include: culture, visual culture, new media, cyber-politics, gender, narratives of nationhood, radical right populism, other/othering, heritage; politics of memory, inclusion/exclusion, national community, identity, nationalism/patriotism/ethnic nationalism, myth/mythologisation, nativism, (neo-)traditionalism, neo-populism from below (and from above), messianic populism, populist entrepreneurs, cultural tradition, cultural movement.

D3.2 : Report on new media and right wing populist discourse [24]
The report will examine the use of new media in the development of right wing populist discourses and their wider political articulation in the Western Balkans.

D3.3 : Report on Russian (hidden and overt) influences in populist discourses and public policies [24]
The report will chart common motives that could be connected with Russian influences within narratives of populist politicians in the region of Western Balkans on the level of their interpretative strategy as well as on the level of rhetorical organisation of narratives.

D3.4 : Report on visual manifestations of populism in popular culture [30]
This report will employ multidisciplinary approaches to analyse the nature of the relationship between populism and popular culture by focusing on how populist entrepreneurs begin to organize and attract potential supporters using the rhetoric of “popular culture”, “traditional culture” and localism in visual productions.

D3.5 : Report on strategies of resistance [32]
The aim of this report is to explore potential strategies of resisting populism through contemporary arts and popular culture by analysing patterns of interaction that make certain cultural productions and their creators more effective than others in contesting populist ideology.

This report will demonstrate how populist politicians use gender-specific cultural tropes to ‘thicken’ populism and thereby seek to legitimise the marginalisation, silencing and/or exclusion of particular gender minority groups. In particular, it will analyse the ways in which members of different gender minority groups frame their discontent and articulate possible strategies of resistance to populist discourses.

D3.7 : Report on the strategic use of homophobia and transphobia in populist politics [32]
This report will examine the use of homophobic and transphobic discourses by populist politicians and demonstrate why - unlike the othering of migrants, refugees and ethnic minorities - it fails to resonate with the 'left behind' the same way in different states.

D3.8 : Report on communicating and teaching Europe [24]
The goal of this report is to outline how Europe and the European Union have been communicated to citizens of Central and Eastern European countries. The top-down institutional discourses, in particular the educational curricula and teaching practices, will be analysed in order to discern the images of Europe and the EU, the references to common values, shared culture, heritage and historical memory. Evaluating the strategies of teaching about Europe and presenting Europe in institutional discourses will lead to the formulation of policy recommendations in this area.

D3.9 : Report on visions of Europe in the narratives of cultural institutions [32]
A report exploring narratives and images of Europe in the area of culture and heritage, summarizing the findings from anthropological research on narratives presented by museums, as well as the narratives of the institutions of culture. The main goal of this report is to investigate the notions of Europeanness and Polishness in cultural narratives and the processes of othering and (re)nationalization.

D3.10 : Polishness and Europeanness in populist discourses [32]
The report focuses on the notions of Polishness and Europeanness in discourses of politicians and opinion-makers. It will explore the perceptions of the European Union and Poland’s place in the integrated Europe in the discourses of populist politicians, as well as the notions of national identity, patriotism and citizenship.

This report will outline the commonalities, as well as the divergent trajectories, in the emergence of right-wing populist trends in Estonia and Latvia. Particular attention will be paid to the intersections among right-wing populism, Euroscepticism, and ‘old’ (i.e. the question of the Russophone minorities) as well as ‘new’ (i.e. the refugee crisis and LGBT issues) identity-politics in the two societies. This report will rely on a qualitative and discourse analysis of party-programmes and public statements by the main populist right-wing parties (Estonia: EKRE, Latvia: National Alliance), and selected interviews with party-affiliates, political activists, individuals employed in the NGO sector and academic experts. Sources such as public surveys and articles from the Estonian, Latvian and international press will be of complementary importance.

D3.12 : Report on returning migrants and their value systems [27]
This report will outline the findings from the interviews with young returning migrants, highlighting in particular the values, opinions and beliefs with which they identify. The main question for this research pertains to the impact of the migration experience on young citizens of Central and Eastern Europe and the possible change of views and attitudes upon their return to their home country.

The report will explore how visions and narratives of the nation are constructed and the different ways of understanding national unity through culture, heritages and public discourses.

D3.14 : Report on the notions of Us and Them / Self and Other [33]
The report will focus on the mechanism of inclusion and exclusion in Polish right-wing discourses, the process of constructing the images of the "enemy" as a threat to national identity understood in narrow, neo-traditionalist terms. It will summarise findings from research on right-wing media narratives as well as anthropological research on Gazeta Polska Clubs.

<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>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The populisms that have emerged in contemporary Europe have been largely of the political right, framing ‘the people’ in nationalist and nativist terms and viewing the nation as expressed by set conservative, traditionalist or religious values. Often this has developed into assertive forms of right-wing euroscepticism allowing even dominant governing parties to frame themselves as populist outsiders: in such discourses authentic national communities and national sovereignty are presented as under attack by (neo-)liberal elites in Brussels, aided and abetted by domestic minorities. The political experience of populism in Central and South-Eastern Europe illustrates these trends in often stark terms. It also highlights the complex linkages between (social/electoral) ‘demand’ and party-political ‘supply’; historically rooted political traditions and external pressures; performance-driven economic concerns, delayed reaction to years of market reform and shifting narratives and identities that underpins the rise of populist parties. At the same time, the region’s experience of populist politics has diverged from that of Western Europe in important ways. In older West European democracies, the most typical vehicle for populism are, for the moment, new or previously marginal illiberal challenger parties which confront an essentially liberal, non-populist mainstream by exploiting socio-cultural divisions opened by globalisation and Europeanisation. The politics of Central and South-Eastern Europe, however, underline that populism cannot always be understood purely in terms of outsider parties confronting the mainstream, nor is always the preserve of the political right. Far from challenging the mainstream, populists have themselves emerged through, or as, the mainstream.

The aim of WP 4 is to examine these relatively advanced forms of populist politics in Central and South-Eastern Europe, considering both the emergence and supply of populist ideas, narratives and political identities; the importance and impact of more dominant populist parties; and the variegated and changeable forms of populism the region exhibits.

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP4 - Politics [Months: 1-36]**

**UBFF, UCL, UJ, UTARTU**

Task 4.1 - The emergence of an illiberal populist left in Central Europe

**Objectives of T4.1**

Task 4.1 examines key CEE countries, where illiberal populism has expressed itself most strongly on the left through transformation or realignment of mainstream social democratic parties, politicians and milieux. It will assess the phenomenon of illiberal populism on the social democratic left – and anti-populist responses to it within the social democratic left - through comparative studies of Czechia and Slovakia. It will deal primarily with the Czech Social Democratic Party (ČSSD); the re-entry into politics (2009) and election as Czech president of ČSSD’s former leader Miloš Zeman (2013, 2018); and the development of Slovakia’s strongest party Smer – Social Democracy (S-SD).

To achieve these overall goals the task will have the following objectives:

- Establish the extent to which a distinct ideology of “illiberal social democracy” framed in populist terms has emerged or is emerging on the social democratic left in Czechia and Slovakia;
- Track debates on the centre-left in these countries between advocates and opponents of an illiberal populist turn.
- Develop a typology of social democratic parties’ responses to (radical) right populists and other populist challengers, understood in terms of co-operation, competition and co-optation;
- Assess the effectiveness of such responses through a paired comparison of the Czech and Slovak cases;
- Develop a framework to assess the extent to which the adoption (patterns of adoption) of illiberal populist and strategies explain the greater success
- Undertake a small-medium N comparison taking in Poland, Slovenia and other CEE cases;
- Establish extent to which a distinct ideology of “illiberal social democracy” has emerged on the social democratic left in Czechia and Slovakia;
- Assess the responses of social democratic parties in Central Europe to the emergence (radical) right populists and other populist challengers;
- Assess the extent to which the adoption of illiberal populist appeals and strategies explain the greater success of Smer compared to ČSSD (and other social democratic parties in Central Europe);
● Formulate long-term and short-term policy recommendations for combating the erosion of democracy in Central and Eastern Europe based on findings;
● Investigate how findings concerning the crosscutting of centre-left parties by socio-cultural divisions; debates on the social democratic left about if (and how) to engage with conservative nationalism and social conservatism; and centre-left responses to populist challengers have Europe-wide resonance. Feed into our foresight and policy recommendation package (WP 7).

Methods: case-comparison and process tracing to examine contrasting the responses of social democratic groupings in Czechia and Slovakia be supplemented with configurative comparative approaches such as Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA). Data will be drawn from documentary analysis of programmatic materials by parties and their associated milieux (think tanks, foundations), as well as writings, statements and media discussion. Fieldwork interviews with politicians, party officials and intellectuals, treated as “political-cultural entrepreneurs”.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 4.1 (Involved Seán Hanley)
● Hanley will review secondary literatures on social democracy and populism; left/social populism, social democracy as a political ideology;
● Hanley will review of relevant literature and public sources on social democracy in Czech Republic and Slovakia;
● Hanley will undertake fieldwork in Czech Republic and Slovakia. Interviews with politicians, party officials and intellectuals who can be classified as “political-cultural entrepreneurs” and write a related working paper relating to the above;
● Hanley will review of comparative literatures on coalition formation and social democrats’ response to radical populist competitors (in Western Europe) and develop comparative framework and undertake analysis of cases and will write a related working paper;
● Hanley will review and synthesize literatures on populist parties, communist successor parties (CSPs);
● Hanley will analyse of Slovak and Czech cases and develop a comparative analysis of Central European cases and will write a working paper;
● Hanley will contribute to the production of a policy paper/policy brief giving a description and evaluation of the success (or failure) of civic and political tactics and activism aimed preventing or defusing populist dynamics with input from all involved in WP4.

Task 4.2 - History of populist political parties in Yugoslavia and post-Yugoslav states

Objectives of T4.2

Task 4.2 examines the history of populist political parties in Yugoslavia and the post-Yugoslav states. This offers important opportunities for better understanding the initial “raw” demand for populism in historical context since the end of the Cold War and in the last three decades.

The history of populist mainstream parties in post-Yugoslav states is connected to both external and internal challenges. In the first period of their existence, they mostly drew from populist policies related to internal challenges, fear of other ethnic and religious groups, or domestic enemies. In the period after 2000s, and especially after 2008 and the Eurozone crisis, however, they gained new momentum due to increasing Euro-scepticism and xenophobia in the region. Task 4.2 researching on these parties will focus on populist discourse and the need for public opinion/constituencies for the contents of these parties’ programmes, as well as on the social and economic results that they produced in the period from 1991 to 2017. The events that caused, spread and enabled clashes and wars in Yugoslavia to last almost ten years (from Slovenia in 1991 to Kosovo and Macedonia in 1999 and 2000) were connected to the activities of mainstream populist parties. Their appearance, political success, social impact and evolution, especially after 2000s is related to the failure and significant tardiness of modernization, economic transition and European integration in the former Yugoslav space compared to Central Europe.

Dominant populist parties in former Yugoslavia - SPS (Serbia), HDZ (Croatia), DPS (Montenegro), Bosnia and Herzegovina (SDA), those of Macedonia (VMRO-DPMNE) - dominated the political space in wartime and in the early 2000s and - after short period when they were excluded from executive rule - later returned to the political centre stage with a new generation of party leaders, who successfully embraced populist rhetoric.

This task will have the following specific objectives:
● Trace and analyse the role of the Communist Party in paving the way for the development of populist parties in Yugoslav republics;
● Assess the extent to which the historical roots of populism have influenced contemporary trends in the post-Yugoslav states;
● Analyse the political and social consequences of the strengthening of national populist parties after the fall of the Berlin Wall;
● Reflect on strategies to change the negative heritage of the past.

Methods: critical discourse analysis (statements, media reports, interviews with the key party officials).

Description of work and role of participants
Task 4.2 (Involved Haris Dajc, Milivoj Beslin, two research assistants, 1 administrative assistant)
● The administrative assistant will provide continuous administrative support to other team members throughout the task (M1-36); Dajc will manage and supervise the research team throughout the period they are working on the task (M6-24);
● Beslin and two research assistants will collect data, undertake fieldwork in case study countries and analyse it;
● Dajc will write a working paper on findings with regard to the role of the Communist Party in paving the way for development of populist parties in Yugoslav republics;
● Beslin and two research assistants will write three articles on the political and social consequences of the strengthening of national populist parties in Yugoslavia after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Each will single-author one article)
● Dajc will co-author a monograph on historical roots of the populism in the post-Yugoslav states.
● Dajc, Beslin and two research assistants will produce an edited collection on populist parties of former Yugoslavia;
● Beslin and two research assistants will write three articles on the political and social consequences of the strengthening of national populist parties in Yugoslavia after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Each will single-author one article)
● Dajc will co-author a monograph on historical roots of the populism in the post-Yugoslav states.
● Dajc, Beslin and two research assistants will produce an edited collection on populist parties of former Yugoslavia;
● Team members will coordinate the release of Work Package 4 dataset on POPREBEL website as part of open data principle liaising with all involved in WP 4.

Task 4.3 - Regime performance and support for populist parties in Central and Eastern Europe

Objectives of T 4.3
Task 4.3 will systematically scrutinize the links between macro-level indicators of regime performance, popular evaluations and attitudes, and patterns of support for populist actors in all post-communist EU member states over a period of nearly 30 years – from the first democratic multi-party elections to the present. Understanding the demand side of populism, as well as the interaction between demand and supply, is central to understanding the success of political ‘suppliers’ of populism and the appeals they make, which we cover in other tasks in WP4.

It is generally assumed that rising support for populist parties and candidates is rooted in popular feelings of discontent with the status quo, as well as in lack of trust in mainstream political actors and that such sentiments, in turn, are related to “objective” deficiencies in the political and economic performance of democratic regimes. However, the question of what constitutes good or bad regime performance, especially in the context of post-communist transition or other types of rapid change, multi-level governance and globalization, is subject to debate. Moreover, popular perceptions of performance vary widely not only between but also within countries: the link between performance and perceptions thereof is, therefore, not straightforward and is likely to be mediated by a host of factors including socio-structural characteristics, ideology, identity, and party allegiances. There are notable cross-national and subnational differences in how voters attribute blame and credit for political and economic outcomes. Further research is also needed on the impact on political trust and the propensity to support populists on socio-tropic versus pocket-book considerations; retrospective versus prospective evaluations; and short-term versus long-term assessments of performance.

Specific objectives seek to:
● Determine the relationship between objective measures of economic and political performance, subjective perceptions of such performance, and support for populist political actors;
● Determine how this relationship varies across countries and over time;
● Identify factors, which account for the pattern variation observed;
● Determine which individual and group-level factors mediate the relationship between perceived regime performance, satisfaction with mainstream political actors and support for populists;
● Analyse how different social groups vary in their assessment of political and economic performance and in their propensity to support populist political forces;
● Assess where the broad patterns of within-country variation are uniform across the region;
● Investigate and assess how voters attribute responsibility for political and economic outcomes in a system of multilevel governance such as the European Union.

Method: quantitative analysis using three main types of data
● Measures of regime satisfaction, evaluations of the political system, evaluations of the economic situation both at national and individual level; information on vote choice or vote intention in survey data from sources such as the
Description of work and role of participants

Task 4.3. (Involved Piret Ehin and one researcher)
- Ehin and research assistant will compile a dataset of CEE countries on country-level political and economic performance indicators, survey data and electoral outcomes in order to perform statistical analysis of the links between regime performance and popular political preferences toward populism and other political actors;
- Ehin will prepare two policy papers (by M24) contributing to D4.5 and D4.7 at (a) a comparison between the determinants of political preferences before and after the economic crisis of 2009-2010 [is CEE populism linked to economic crisis?, and (b) the current period of heightened populism 2016-2018 [how are populists in the political system and in government affecting political preferences and electoral choices?];
- Ehin will produce three peer-reviewed journal articles on the empirical analysis in more theoretical detail;
- Dataset will be made available with documentation for other researchers as part of the EU’s open data initiative and as a component of deliverable D4.6.

Task 4.4 - Populist Euroscepticism in Poland

Objectives of T4.4
Task 4.4 investigates the determinants of EU contestation in Poland and assesses the extent to which populist Euroscepticism in Poland is a phenomenon of the political right. Anti-European rhetoric emerged in new post-communist EU member states alongside European integration, which accompanied the processes of transformation and modernization, but also the general trend of globalisation. Euroscepticism has also often been linked with the populism that appears both in the mainstream and at the margins of the political spectrum. Observation of populist political parties, their rhetoric and initiatives highlights that many populist slogans are, at the same time, anti-European. This is not only the case in newer member states, but also in countries such as Austria, the Netherlands and France, where populists are already in the political mainstream. However, anti-European populism is especially interesting in the case of Poland, a new member state that is the biggest beneficiary of EU funds and one of the most pro-European societies in the EU.

Task 4.4 will assess these goals by addressing the following specific objectives:
- Map the positions and rhetoric of relevant political parties, as well as anti-party parties and political organisations (foundations, associations);
- Assess the extent to which the populist rhetoric in Poland is anti-European;
- Assess how and why contesting Europe is so visible on the political right;
- Identify the key factors driving this phenomenon.

Methods: qualitative research conducted in Poland and in Brussels (EP and expert interviews), including semistructured interviews, surveys and discourse analyses.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 4.4. (Involved Natasza Styczyńska - months 1-36; research assistant months 1-24)
- Natasza Styczyńska will review literature on right-wing populism, populism in CEE, Euroscepticism;
- Natasza Styczyńska and research assistant will prepare a database of politicians, party officials and experts;
- Natasza Styczyńska will write a working paper on Euroscepticism and populism in Poland;
- Natasza Styczyńska will develop questionnaire and organise pilot study;
- Natasza Styczyńska and research assistant will code material;
- Natasza Styczyńska will undertake preliminary analysis of cases;
- Natasza Styczyńska will write an analysis of the Polish case (article or a chapter);
- Natasza Styczyńska will write a broader comparative analysis of Central European cases (article or a chapter)

Task 4.5 – Populist imageries and popular geopolitics

Objectives of T4.5
Task 4.5 will look at populism through the lens of popular geopolitics, a discipline that studies attitudes to spaces, borders and identities existing beyond political elites, which manifest themselves through performative practices, vernacular discourses (including myths, stereotypes, misperceptions, conspiracy theories) and images. It will undertake this by examining and researching the cases of three target countries: Estonia, Poland and Slovakia. Popular geopolitics contributes to the debate on populism by focusing more specifically on non-official and often non-central discourses and imageries produced beyond the narrow circles of political elites, policy makers and other power holders. Popular
geopolitics is mainly interested in voices coming from non-professional yet politically engaged milieus, including celebrities, cultural producers, artists, and civil activists. It deals not with a relatively unified discourse emanating from one centre of power, but with a variety of discourses clashing with each other on both ideological issues and practical policies. This is what Gerard Toal called “affective geopolitics” that triggers powerful sentiments and feelings beyond rationalities of governance.

Task 4.5 raises a set of cross-cutting issues of relevance to other WP 4 tasks focusing on populist actors: populists are constantly putting forward new imageries and discourses. In focusing on populist imageries at the initial stages of their fruition, it contributes to unpacking their genealogies and tracking their further trajectories. To address these overall goals, task 4.5 will address the following specific objectives:

- Identify the nodal points constitutive for populist imageries of Self and Others;
- Determine how these nodal points are articulated as elements of populist “discursive chains”;
- Assess the limitations in constructing these chains, and how dislocated or incomplete they are;
- Observe and analyse the importance emotional investments as parts of the “populist reason”.

Methods: methodological premises developed by Ernesto Laclau who approached populism as a discursive logic articulated through chains of equivalential demands that relate to each other and a plethora of nodal points constitutive for populist discourses. It will use both textual material (speech acts) and visual material.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 4.5 (Involved Andrey Makarychev)

- Makarychev will draft a conceptual paper on the applicability of popular geopolitics for comparative study of Baltic and Central European populisms;
- Makarychev will do field research in Estonia, Poland and Slovakia, including interviews with public intellectuals, artists, performers;
- Makarychev will co-author a scholarly article to be submitted to a peer review journal;
- Makarychev will submit for publication a book chapter on comparative analysis of populisms as seen from the popular geopolitical perspective;
- Makarychev will summarize the practice-oriented outcomes of the WP research in a policy paper / memo to be published online (PONARS Web site or other appropriate web).

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP4 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>34.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>39.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number 14</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type 15</th>
<th>Dissemination level 16</th>
<th>Due Date (in months) 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4.1</td>
<td>Report: Political populism from fringe to mainstream: a conceptual framework for WP4</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.2</td>
<td>Report on illiberal populism and social democratic left in the</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including</td>
<td>24</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>D4.3</td>
<td>Report on populist political parties of former Yugoslavia in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.4</td>
<td>Report on Euroscepticism and populism in Poland after 2003</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.5</td>
<td>Report on policy recommendations designed to counteract the rise of populism in Europe</td>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.6</td>
<td>Release of data POPREBEL work Package 4 dataset</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.7</td>
<td>Comparative and theoretical perspectives on political populism</td>
<td>6 - UBFF</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description of deliverables

**D4.1 : Report: Political populism from fringe to mainstream: a conceptual framework for WP4 [12]**
This report will outline a shared conceptual framework for studying the spread and development of party-based political populism beyond right-wing outsider parties.

**D4.2 : Report on illiberal populism and social democratic left in the Czech Republic and Slovakia [24]**
The report comprises three subsections on: - The emerging ideology of illiberal social democrats in Czech Republic and Slovakia - Social democratic responses to right-wing populism: a comparative study of Czechia and Slovakia - The populist challenge and the centre-left in East Central Europe. The key question of this section is: Why social democratic parties failed? It will also review findings on populism and comparative success of social democratic parties in post-communist Central Europe.

**D4.3 : Report on populist political parties of former Yugoslavia in the aftermath of the fall of the Berlin Wall [24]**
The report will have three substantive subsections on: - Social egalitarianism as a foundation for the development of populist popular culture - the role of the Communist Party in paving the road for development of populist parties in Yugoslav republics - Yugoslav socialism as a forerunner: historical foundations of contemporary populism in post-Yugoslav space - on historical roots of the populism in the post-Yugoslav states - The political and social consequences of the strengthening of national populist parties in Yugoslavia after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

**D4.4 : Report on Euroscepticism and populism in Poland after 2003 [24]**
The report's three substantial subsections will deal with: - Euroscepticism and populism in Poland after 2003 - Euroscepticism in the rhetoric of Polish populist radical right parties - Euroscepticism and populism in Polish political discourse

D4.5 : Report on policy recommendations designed to counteract the rise of populism in Europe [24]
This report will deal with two issues: - Economic crisis and the growth of populism in CEE: how determinate was the Great Recession? The economic crisis of 2009/2010 and the growth of populism in CEE - Defusing the rise of populism - A description and evaluation of the success (or failure) of civic and political tactics and forms of activism aimed preventing or defusing populist dynamics

D4.6 : Release of data POPREBEL work Package 4 dataset [28]
Release of Work Package dataset on political populisms on POPREBEL website as part of open data principle

D4.7 : Comparative and theoretical perspectives on political populism [36]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule of relevant Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WP 5 concentrates on the socio-economic dimensions of populism within the discipline of political economy. It aims at studying the socio-economic roots and policy consequences of populism along a “demand” and “supply” division. On the demand side, WP 5 focuses on income inequality and economic insecurity, two mutually reinforcing but not necessarily overlapping phenomena. On the supply side, the package offers a comprehensive assessment on how varieties of state capitalisms have changed over time from a comparative perspective. While the demand side focuses mostly on the embryonic stage of the rise of (economic) populism and, in turn, critically assesses the effects of economic globalisation in general and the most recent economic and financial crisis in particular, the supply side analysis is more concerned about the matured (or in government) stage of populism. Both demand and supply side will lean heavily on the conceptualisation and theorisation developed in WP 1. It is also informed by the inputs and main findings of WP 2 and WP 3.6 as a source. WP 5 has a particular focus on the question of how the demand (as defined as the priority of the society given to the perception of economic insecurity) meets the supply (as defined as the “protest”, “anti-establishment” responses of the populist parties) using CEE countries as case studies. WP 5 identifies the perception of economic (in)security which is fuelled by and highly interconnected with income inequality as the main causes of the rise of populism in the CEE region. It is argued that building upon the fear of economic insecurity and adopting certain elements of state capitalist regimes (such as the increasing share of state ownership, the intimate relationship between the political and business elites, etc.), in addition to the cultural (WP 3) and political (WP 4) supply, a special form of economic populism has emerged in CEE. Such populism with strong CEE–specific characteristics significantly differs from both its Western and Eastern counterparts. This WP coins a new term catching this phenomenon, the so-called ‘neo-feudal capitalism’ (WP 1), a central concept of POPREBEL.

**Objectives**

WP 5 concentrates on the socio-economic dimensions of populism within the discipline of political economy. It aims at studying the socio-economic roots and policy consequences of populism along a “demand” and “supply” division. On the demand side, WP 5 focuses on income inequality and economic insecurity, two mutually reinforcing but not necessarily overlapping phenomena. On the supply side, the package offers a comprehensive assessment on how varieties of state capitalisms have changed over time from a comparative perspective. While the demand side focuses mostly on the embryonic stage of the rise of (economic) populism and, in turn, critically assesses the effects of economic globalisation in general and the most recent economic and financial crisis in particular, the supply side analysis is more concerned about the matured (or in government) stage of populism. Both demand and supply side will lean heavily on the conceptualisation and theorisation developed in WP 1. It is also informed by the inputs and main findings of WP 2 and WP 3.6 as a source. WP 5 has a particular focus on the question of how the demand (as defined as the priority of the society given to the perception of economic insecurity) meets the supply (as defined as the “protest”, “anti-establishment” responses of the populist parties) using CEE countries as case studies. WP 5 identifies the perception of economic (in)security which is fuelled by and highly interconnected with income inequality as the main causes of the rise of populism in the CEE region. It is argued that building upon the fear of economic insecurity and adopting certain elements of state capitalist regimes (such as the increasing share of state ownership, the intimate relationship between the political and business elites, etc.), in addition to the cultural (WP 3) and political (WP 4) supply, a special form of economic populism has emerged in CEE. Such populism with strong CEE–specific characteristics significantly differs from both its Western and Eastern counterparts. This WP coins a new term catching this phenomenon, the so-called ‘neo-feudal capitalism’ (WP 1), a central concept of POPREBEL.

**Description of work and role of partners**

WP5 - Economy [Months: 1-36]
CUB, CUNI, UJ
Task 5.1 - From income inequality to economic insecurity and back: A narrative about the shifting tendencies of priorities as a cause of economic populism

T 5.1 elucidates the demand side of the rise of populism as embedded in its historical context, whilst it also conceptualises and quantifies the underlying terms used throughout WP 5. The goal of T 5.1 is to investigate how the narratives concerning inequality and economic insecurity have changed over time, how to best quantify these terms, whilst it also to identifies those historical, socio-economic factors that affect the rise (or fade) of these two concepts after World War II. This task assumes that it is imperative to establish the historical context and to overview the shifting priorities of the society given to inequality and to economic insecurity as these two concepts are believed to be the prerequisite of the rise of populism. It is hypothesised here that populism is a Polanyian counter-movement against marketisation (Polanyi 1944) and against the negative effect of globalisation. This narrative is built upon the increasing gap between the elite and the bottom half.

The specific objectives are as follows:

- Synthesise the historical narratives with the aim of understanding the changing priority of the society given to inequality and economic insecurity in the post-World War II era;
- Conceptualise the terms of absolute and relative inequality and the term of economic insecurity;
- Quantify the concepts of absolute, relative inequality and economic insecurity;
- Identify tendencies in inequalities and economic across regions;
- Analyse how the patterns of these tendencies differs across regions, in developed and developing countries;
- Develop a new course on economic inequality and income insecurity.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 5.1.
While working on drawing historical narratives, establishing conceptual clarity and quantifying the terms used throughout WP 5 we will have the following specific objectives in mind:
● Synthesise and critically assess the literature: describe and analyse the cause and consequences of globalisation from a historical perspective;
● Historical discourse analyses and historical comparative approach: identify the impact of the historical roots and causes of populism;
● Conceptualise and quantify absolute income inequality with a special focus on its material dimensions;
● Conceptualise and quantify relative inequality with a special focus on intra-state, inter-state inequality enriched with time dimension;
● Conceptualise and quantify economic insecurity by introducing Sen’s approach and the term of perception;
● Comparative analysis: identify main tendencies in the variables of interest;
● Analyse the real and/or alleged negative effects of economic globalisation, by concentrating mostly on free trade, free flow of capital, and free flow of labour

Conceptual work and historical narrative: Krisztina Szabó and András Tétényi
Gábor Vigvári (D 5.1)
Database: Krisztina Szabó, Gábor Vigvári, András Tétényi, Research Assistant (D 5.2)
Empirical work: Krisztina Szabó, András Tétényi, Research Assistant (D 5.3)

Task 5.2 - Varieties of state capitalisms: Historical experiences and current tendencies – A supply side approach to (economic) populism

Objectives of T 5.2
State capitalist regimes as reference points for economic success are often used in the narratives of the Hungarian government. The dynamic successes of these state-led market economies (e.g. China or India) are often contrasted with the presumed fade of Western free market economies, including many advanced European markets and the EU itself. T 5.2 aims at assessing the rise of state capitalism across the globe, with an explicit interest in the question of whether populist incumbents in CEE can actually learn anything from these countries, including highly autocratic regimes such as China or Russia and more democratic ones like South Korea, Singapore and Brazil. While these countries are not necessarily flirting with the principles offered by economic populism directly, they are highly engaged to state interventionism and to maximising state properties, which are shared characteristics with CEE populist governments. Special attention is dedicated to the study of how exactly these economies attack on the autonomy of domestic and international economic institutions, such as regulatory agencies, independent central banks, or global trade rules [Rodrik 2018].

T 5.2 offers a conceptual and analytical framework for understanding the supply side of economic populism. It interprets the phenomenon of economic populism rather broadly (e.g. by elaborating on concepts such as economic nationalism or mercantilism), and aims at providing a comprehensive comparative and analytical assessment of the variants of state capitalist regimes and economic populism across the world. The ultimate aim is to contrast these findings with the experience of CEE countries and to identify some degree of similarities.

The specific objectives are as follows:
● Study the inward-looking Latin American origins of economic populism;
● Contrast the previous regime with the outward-oriented developmental state experiment of East Asia;
● Differentiate between left-wing (or welfare) economic populism and state-led, stability-oriented (or right-wing) economic regimes (and populism);
● Understand the origins of the most recent rise of active state interventionism in different parts of the world, especially in democratic emerging markets such as India, Brazil, Argentina or South Africa;
● Identify the institutional infrastructure, procedures, mechanisms and economic policy tools of state capitalism(s).

Description of work and role of participants
Task 5.2.
While developing our own historical-institutional and analytical approach to the rise of state capitalism and economic populism worldwide, we will be guided by the following specific objectives:
● Historical-institutional analysis: identify and critically assess the origins of macroeconomic populism by focusing mostly on the experience of Latin America;
● Comparative analysis: contrast the experience of Latin America with the developmental state models of East Asian countries;
● In line with T 5.1, critically analyse and describe the most recent economic causes of economic populism, i.e. the perverse effects of globalisation and liberalisation;
● Comparative analysis across countries and by time; identify the main variants of state capitalism across the world, and conducting a comparative analysis of populist regimes both in developed and developing countries;
Case studies on how autonomous (and quasi autonomous) economic institutions, such as regulatory agencies, independent central banks, international (and multilateral) institutions are altered by state capitalist governments.

Conceptualisation and historical-institutional analysis: István Benczes, Judit Ricz, Gábor Vigvári, Research Assistant (D 5.4)

Task 5.3 – Demand meets supply: Economic insecurity driven populism in CEE – The rise of neofeudalism

Objectives of T 5.3
Building upon the main findings of T 5.1 and T 5.2, this task aims at revealing the economic roots and consequences of economic populism in CEE, using Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia as case studies. Task 5.3 argues that the current (post-crisis) rise of populism in CEE does have a strong inclination towards anti-austerity and antiglobalisation sentiments, but it also indicates a distinct shift away from ‘welfare populism’ towards a kind of ’security populism’. The renewal of economic populism (especially in CEE) does not simply imply a pure renaissance of such an old-style rhetoric; instead, it represents a shift from the promise of well-being to the promise of personal and collective security, not only in an economic sense but also in a perceptive and political sense. It also underlines the direct and indirect impacts of the social and economic costs of the transition period in the CEE region and the disillusionment in EU accession.

T 5.3 also wishes to demonstrate that on the supply side these regimes in CEE have shown a solid tendency of moving away from the model of free market capitalism and getting closer to a special form of the state-led capitalism. This shifting tendency is best understood as a response to the most recent global and European economic and financial crisis. In order to synthesise the findings, by building upon the main findings of WP 1 and T 5.1 and T 5.2, T 5.3 directly applies the concept of ‘neo-feudalism’ (WP1) in the context of CEE.

The specific objectives are as follows:
● Introduce and analyse economic insecurity in the context of CEE;
● Identify the sources of economic insecurity in CEE based on capabilities and perceptions;
● Assess whether there is a growing divergence between economic fundamentals and the perceptions of the population as supported by the inputs provided by WP2;
● Explore the prevailing views and mainstream political and social attitudes using discourse analysis regarding inequality, economic insecurity, and urban-rural disparities;
● Map the fractures and cleavages in society between the majority population and the ‘othered’ groups using the inputs from WP3 and analyse the role of insecurity in othering;
● Conduct analysis on the prevailing market structures in CEE;
● Assess the effectiveness of market regulation

Description of work and role of participants

Task 5.3.

While developing methods for a comparative and analytical analysis of inequality, economic insecurity, urban-rural disparities, and the effectiveness of market regulation in CEE, our objectives will include:
● Describe and critically analyse tendencies in economic insecurity in the context of CEE;
● Describe and analyse mechanisms linking income inequality and economic insecurity in CEE;
● Assess and describe the growing divergence between economic fundamentals and the perceptions of the population as supported by the inputs provided by WP2;
● Clarify how and to what extent diverging transition strategies contributed to the rise of populism in Poland and Hungary;
● Explore the prevailing views and mainstream political and social attitudes regarding inequality, economic insecurity, and urban-rural disparities using discourse analysis and based on the outputs of WP1 and WP2;
● Map the fractures and cleavages in society between the majority population and the ‘othered’ groups, using the output produces by WP1 and WP3 Task 3.6;
● Assess the effectiveness of market regulations in CEE;
● Investigate business-government relations.

Conceptual work: Krisztina Szabó (D5.5 - D5.7), András Tétényi (D5.5 - 5.7), Joanna Orzechowska-Waclawska (D5.5, D5.7), Karel Svoboda (D5.7), István Benczes (D5.7), István Kollai (D5.7)

Historical narrative: Gábor Vigvári (D5.6)

Discourse analysis: István Kollai and Research Assistant (D5.7)

Empirical work: Krisztina Szabó (D5.5 - D5.7), András Tétényi (D5.5 - D5.7), Joanna Orzechowska-Waclawska (D5.5, D5.7), István Benczes (D5.7), Karel Svoboda (D5.7), István Kollai (D5.7), Research Assistant (D5.5 - D5.7).
## Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP5 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 - CUNI</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>70.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## List of deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable Number</th>
<th>Deliverable Title</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Due Date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.1</td>
<td>Report on the conceptualisation and theorisation of economic inequality and insecurity</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.2</td>
<td>Database: economic inequality and economic insecurity data collection from existing sources</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3</td>
<td>Report: From income inequality to economic insecurity and back: A narrative about the shifting tendencies of priorities as a cause of economic populism</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.4</td>
<td>Report: The varieties of state capitalism in emerging markets and in CEE</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.5</td>
<td>Report: Do inequality, perceptions and economic insecurity usher in political populism?</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.6</td>
<td>Report: The Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering?</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.7</td>
<td>Report on the rise of economic populism and its structural and institutional impact in the CEE region</td>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of deliverables

D5.1 : Report on the conceptualisation and theorisation of economic inequality and insecurity [12]
This deliverable will conceptualise, theorise and quantify economic inequality and economic insecurity.

D5.2 : Database: economic inequality and economic insecurity data collection from existing sources [18]
This deliverable will provide economic inequality and economic insecurity data collected from existing databases.

D5.3 : Report: From income inequality to economic insecurity and back: A narrative about the shifting tendencies of priorities as a cause of economic populism [24]
This will be the first version of a paper on the changing regional patterns of inequality and insecurity – a synthesis of the historical events and the patterns of change in inequality/insecurity.

D5.4 : Report: The varieties of state capitalism in emerging markets and in CEE [24]
This report will present the work on the origins and rise of state capitalism, with a special focus on emerging markets and also detailing state interventionism and regulatory frameworks. The report will also reflect upon the relevance of state capitalist development trajectories in the context of CEE economies.

D5.5 : Report: Do inequality, perceptions and economic insecurity usher in political populism? [24]
The sources and prevalence of inequality and insecurity in CEE, with a special focus on initial conditions, economic fundamentals, transition strategies, and perceptions will be analysed.

D5.6 : Report: The Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering? [30]
This report will present preliminary results of the study on the changes in insecurity and increase of othering in the population.

D5.7 : Report on the rise of economic populism and its structural and institutional impact in the CEE region [36]
The report highlights the main causes and effects of economic populism in general and in the CEE region in particular.

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>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work package number 9

WP6  Foresight scenarios

Lead beneficiary

5 - UTARTU

Start month 1  End month 36

Objectives

The central task of this WP will be to develop a foresight dimension for the POPREBEL programme, putting together a series of analytical scenarios based on the collected input from the other WPs and their studies of populism in Eastern Europe. The scenarios will be sensitive to different forms of the populist phenomenon, and interrelate them to different societal, technological, political and economic evolutions (drivers) that may come to pass. A second stage of the WP, in collaboration with WP 7, will be to engage three specific target groups -- scholars, policy-makers and members of the public -- in a structured discussion of these scenarios. These engagement seminars will not only appraise the completeness of the scenarios, but more importantly they will elicit specific reactions to how leaders and society should react to different futures. In so doing, we will gain a better appreciation for the kinds of responses that may be needed depending on the confluence of events. The WP will prepare materials and develop strategies for dissemination of results and policy recommendations, in particular on the measures to be undertaken in order to boost awareness about the future stakes of populism and democratic resilience. Our dissemination and communication activities are organised in WP7.

Description of work and role of partners

WP6 - Foresight scenarios [Months: 1-36]

UTARTU, UCL, CUB

Task 6.1 - Preparation of driver reflection and horizon scanning seminar

Objectives of T 6.1

The first task in this WP will be to develop a driver reflection and horizon scanning seminar, in which the central researchers in the programme and invited guests will meet to discuss what are the key macro-level processes (drivers) as well as future challenges/threats linked to populism in Eastern Europe. The aim will be to harness the collective expertise and input of the POPREBEL consortium during the beginning of the scenario construction process. As part of this task, more precise responsibilities will include:

- Compile relevant methodological materials regarding foresight and scenario building (for distribution to the entire consortium and for use with subsequent target groups);
- Prepare group exercises and reflection activities for the seminar;
- Draft seminar round-up memo;
- Draft initial scenarios document (4-5 scenarios based on combination of drivers and horizon scanning).

Description of work and role of participants

Task 6.1 (Involved: UTARTU)

- Pettai and Vilson will prepare relevant materials for the initial consortium seminar
- Pettai and Vilson will prepare the seminar report
- Pettai and other senior researchers in the Consortium will draft the initial scenarios document

Task 6.2 - Preparation of an engagement seminar with academics, policy-analysts, journalists

Objectives of T 6.2

Based on the initial scenarios document, a broad-scale consultation with academics/scholars, policy-analysts, journalists and other observers of public affairs will take place in order to calibrate the structure and sharpen the narrative of the scenarios. This will be organised in collaboration with and using some resources of WP 7 and inputs from all other WPs, particularly WP 2. The diversity of these external input sources will serve to strengthen the overall integrity of the scenarios. Precise responsibilities will include:

- Format initial scenarios document for use in input sessions;
- Finalise scenarios document.

Description of work and role of participants

Task 6.2 (Involved: UTARTU)

- Pettai will liaise with intl. area studies conference organizer to slot an engagement seminar with academics
- Vilson will liaise with consortium partners about organizing local engagements seminars where possible
- Vello Pettai and Maili Vilson will lead international engagement seminar with academics
- Vello Pettai and Maili Vilson will prepare summary report of consultations
Vello Pettai will produce finalised scenarios document

Task 6.3: Preparation of an engagement seminars with politicians and policy-makers

Objectives of T 6.3
The heart of the WP is the preparation of engagement seminars with two key target groups – politicians/policy-makers and members of the public – in order to gauge not only their impressions of the scenarios, but also their perceptions of what needs to be done (what they would do) under one or another scenario condition. Task 6.3 will target politicians and policy-makers via small (max. 20 people) engagement seminars to be held in each of the consortium partner capital cities and organised with the help of resources dedicated to WP 7. The objective is to put participants in a real mindset in order to work through the precise implications of one scenario or another, and thereby gain insight into how future behaviours may evolve. Each seminar will be chaired by the WP leader, but individual work groups will be organised and facilitated by local WP collaborators. Where deemed necessary or preferable in order to improve participant engagement, local-language discussions may also be used and later summarised back into English. Precise responsibilities will include:
- Design the format of each engagement seminar (with group activities, proper discussion formats, etc.);
- Prepare a report on each engagement seminar with appendices of materials used or generated in collaboration with WP 7, preparing a summary report and set of analytical conclusions regarding the engagement seminars with politicians and policy-makers.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 6.3 (Involved: UTARTU and all consortium partners)
- Vilson will liaise with consortium partners about holding engagement seminars with politicians and policy-makers in each capital city and for recruiting a broad sample of participants
- Pettai and Vilson will carry out the engagement seminars together with help from local consortium partners
- Vilson will prepare the synopsis report following each engagement seminar
- Pettai will prepare the summary report and set of analytical conclusions

Task 6.4 - Preparation of an engagement seminars with members of the public

Objectives of T 6.4
Task 6.4 will prepare materials to engage members of the public into the reflection and analysis process. The scenarios document will be prepared and presented to up to 10 focus groups (again, in different consortium partner countries) to assess how average citizens perceive these scenarios and how they would react to different outcomes (coordinated with T 7.4). An important component here will be to examine participants’ perceptions of how social media play into crises and how they would obtain and filter information under certain future conditions. The materials generated by these focus groups will be analysed to determine what participants expect from politicians/policy-makers when confronted with difference scenarios. Precise responsibilities will include:
- Designing the format of each engagement seminar (with group activities, proper discussion formats, etc.);
- Help to prepare (with resources of WP 7) the engagement seminars in each consortium partner capital city, including recruiting a socially diverse array of participants;
- Prepare a report on each engagement seminar with appendices of materials used or generated;
- Prepare a summary report and set of analytical conclusions regarding the engagement seminars.

Description of work and role of participants
Task 6.4 (Involved: UTARTU and all consortium partners)
- Vilson will liaise with consortium partners about engagement seminars with members of the public (Months 12-14)
- Pettai and Vilson will carry out the engagement seminars with help from local consortium partners (Months 16-24)
- Vilson will prepare the synopsis report following each engagement seminar (Months 17-25)
- Pettai will prepare the summary report and set of analytical conclusions (Months 28-30)

Task 6.5 - Preparation for dissemination of conclusions

Objectives of T 6.5
The concerted process of foresight activities and scenario engagement will yield important conclusions on how different target groups view the burgeoning of populism now and in the future. Task 6.5 will involve preparing materials for disseminating these insights to broader audiences through a series of intermittent dispatches (blogs, briefs, media articles) as well as the publicizing of the WP’s final conclusions and policy recommendations through WP 7, particularly T 7.1). Specific responsibilities will include:
- Create blogs and discussion platforms where input into initial scenarios document can be collected and promoted;
- Write longer research briefs and media articles about the insights of the emerging scenarios;
- Prepare public synopses of the engagement seminars that bring out certain overarching currents of thought as they emerge from the seminars;
- Compile a catalogue and evaluation of policies that have/ not worked in preventing/defusing populist dynamics;
- Write translated articles for media outlets in consortium partner countries comparing the engagement seminars between politicians and members of the public in the respective country;
- Write pieces for online forums that debate the politics and populism in CEE (RFE/RL, Jamestown Foundation).

Description of work and role of participants
Task 6.5 (Involved: UTARTU and all consortium partners)
- Pettai and Vilson will help coordinate the completion of various dissemination activities and publications.
- Pettai will contribute a final peer-reviewed article on using foresight for populism research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation per Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner number and short name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - CUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - UTARTU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of deliverables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliverable Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of deliverables
Report: initial set of scenarios for use in on-line and audience-based consultations. The report will lay out the preliminary structure of the scenarios.
D6.2 : Summary report of consultations [13]
Summary report of all feedback, reactions and recommendations received concerning the initial scenarios document.
D6.3 : Finalised scenarios report [14]  
Report: completed scenarios document that will be used in engagement seminars.

D6.4 : Summary report 1 on engagement seminars [20]  
Summary report analysing the results of the first two engagement seminars with members of the public and politicians/policy-makers.

D6.5 : Summary report 2 on engagement seminars [24]  
Summary report analysing the results of the second two engagement seminars with members of the public and politicians/policy-makers.

D6.6 : Report on the study of politics and populism using foresight methods [34]  
The report will have two parts: - A summary of analytical insights and policy recommendations regarding populism in Central and Eastern Europe gained via the foresight scenarios and engagement seminars. - An analysis of how foresight techniques in general can be used for the study of political phenomena

<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>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since POPREBEL is designed for maximum impact and immediate policy relevance, the communication and dissemination strategies are at its heart. Therefore, we devote to them Sections 2.2a and 2.2.b of Annex 1, Part B. Here we summarize our main objectives.

WP7 aims to ensure that the research activities, findings, original methods of civic engagement and policy recommendations prepared by the consortium enjoy maximum visibility, multimedia versatility as well as use and engagement by a range of relevant audiences. The specific objectives of the work package are:

- Formulate a joint dissemination strategy. It will be refined over the course of the project based on the feedback from target audiences;
- Provide a platform for the consortium that makes it easy to engage policy-makers, targeted practitioners and other stakeholders to profile, disseminate and put to discussion results and publications;
- Use academic research findings for making feasible policy recommendations;
- Fully harness multimedia and data visualisation tools to communicate the research findings in engaging ways;
- Convene a series of workshops, a research road-show and conference for different target audiences to facilitate essential face-to-face communication and discussion of results and to lay the foundations for policy impact and deeper policy to research dialogue in the future.

WP7 - Communication and dissemination

UCL, CUNI, UJ, CUB, UTARTU, UBFF, Edgeryders

Task 7.1 - Interactive communications platform, website and other communication tools

For POPREBEL, by far the most important and original communication platform is a large, multi-lingual online conversation that is at the heart of WP 2 (particularly T 2.1). In a sense, this is simultaneously a listening device, to learn how ordinary Europeans experience the rise of populism in society, and a public (online) forum where people can communicate with each other and POPREBEL researchers. We launch this large-scale online conversation that spans the whole continent and is carried out in four of its languages, as method of creating the corpus of original ethnographic ‘data’, but also as a unique method of communicating and disseminating information about our work. We also rely on more ‘traditional’ electronic dissemination methods that include a website to provide a range of electronic distribution and engagement channels (incl. newsletter distribution service, syndication relationships, discussion and comments functionalities). Each partner will be responsible for providing research findings in the forms of case studies reports, survey reports, state-of-the-art and theory reports as well as workshop and conference reports. We will stimulate online forum discussions involving citizens in the targeted countries. In addition to individual articles and research reports, POPREBEL plans a range of policy briefs and educational materials.

Task 7.2 - Scholarly conferences and participation in congresses

To facilitate the travel logistics and reduce the cost of, a special panel session will be sought at a major international area studies conference (in order to engage, in a first instance, academics). Individual consultations will be organized by consortium partners in their capital cities to gather input from policy analysts and journalists. We will also prepare a summary report of consultations (in collaboration with WP 6).

Task 7.3: Translation of academic research into evidence-based policy

WP7, under this task, will ensure the translation of academic research into evidence-based policy and the dissemination of POPREBEL's findings to as wide an audience as possible. The task leader will be responsible for:

- Organise research-to-policy workshops, at which academic researchers and members of the Advisory Board and various stakeholder communities will discuss the research findings and develop them into evidence-based strategies. These workshops will be co-hosted by local anti-populist organisations;
- Organise a series of research seminars to disseminate the project’s research findings. A two-day conference will be held to present the key theoretical findings to a largely activist audience;
Based on the work of T 6.3, organise a research road show, whereby groups of POPREBEL researchers will visit CEE cities and organise a series of engagement seminars aimed at different target audiences, i.e. workshops for anti-populism activists, advisory meetings with local politicians, seminars with academics and students, etc.

Task 7.4: Engagement with the public

Concomitantly with the process of engaging politicians/policy-makers and on the basis of the materials prepared in Task 6.4, the objective of this task is to incorporate members of the public into the reflection and analysis process. The scenarios document (prepared in WP 6 with close collaboration with WP2) will be presented to up to 8 focus groups (again, in different consortium partner countries) to assess how average citizens perceive these scenarios and how they would react to different outcomes. An important component here will be to examine participants’ perceptions of how social media play into crises and how they would obtain and filter information under certain future conditions. These focus groups will also investigate what participants expect from politicians/policy-makers when confronted with difference scenarios.

Task 7.5: Impact conference

A final impact conference, targeting not only academics, but also – and especially – activists, politicians, journalists. Comparing notes, learning from each other, with POPREBEL functioning as a way to find and systematize the existing experiences. This is meant to boost the immune system of Europe’s democracy by giving extra tools to the people in its frontline (EDGERYDERS - as per Section 2.2 of Annex 1, Part B).
First version of the Dissemination and communication strategy.

D7.2 : POPREBEL website [4]
POPREBEL website

D7.3 : Dissemination and communication strategy II [24]
Second version of the Dissemination and communication strategy.

### 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>Publication of dissemination and communication strategy</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deliverable 7.1 submitted to EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Launch of POPREBEL website</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Website publically available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>Research seminar 1</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Research seminar with policy-makers/activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>Research seminar 2</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Research seminar with policy-makers/activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>Research seminar 3</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Research seminar with general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>Research roadshow</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research roadshow, disseminating research outcomes in four cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14</td>
<td>Impact conference</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>A final impact conference bringing together academics, activists, politicians, journalists and engaged citizens to compare notes and tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS15</td>
<td>Panel session</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Panel session at a major international area studies conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS16</td>
<td>Research-to-policy workshop</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Research-to-policy workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives

This work package is tasked with (1) the effective administration, management and governance of POPREBEL and (2) ensuring that the research is conducted in line with professional ethical standards. POPREBEL’s management philosophy is built on the wiki-based – thus decentralized, collaborative and transparent – principles of proposal writing, budgeting, and project execution. The management of the project incorporates duties covering all aspects of project monitoring, reporting, financial and contractual administration, ensuring proper communication within the consortium and implementing the project’s collaborative governance and decision making structures as laid out in Section 3.2 of Annex 1, Part B.

The specific objectives of this work package are:
- Encourage decentralised, collaborative and transparent collective decision making;
- Ensure the efficient and effective management of POPREBEL through the implementation of the project’s governance and decision-making structures;
- Ensure effective communications both internal (within the consortium) and external (liaison with the European Commission and third parties);
- Monitor and report on the project’s progress and identify aspects requiring attention;
- Ensure that work and tasks are completed on time, within budget and according to high quality standards;
- Monitor progress between planned and actual activities, identify any aspects requiring attention to ensure goals are achieved within the stated time frame;
- Ensure that the contractual, project management and financial aspects of POPREBEL are carried out in an efficient, transparent and correct manner and in accordance with European Commission rules;
- Provide effective linkage and communication between the EC, partners and other interested parties;
- Ensure that gender equality matters are adequately addressed;
- Ensure that all research projects are granted ethical approval in advance of data collection and that good ethical practice is maintained throughout the research process.

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP8 - Management [Months: 1-36]**

**UCL, Edgeryders**

The day-to-day management of POPREBEL will be performed in collaboration between the Principal Investigator, the Co-Investigator and the representative of ERIO (European Research and Innovation Office) at UCL who will be responsible for the financial, administrative and contractual issues.

The strategic and technical management aimed at defining, planning, coordinating, leading and facilitating the human, financial and technological resources for the purpose of accomplishing the stated objectives will be defined, developed and facilitated by the WP leaders and appointed representative of each organisation through project’s governance and decision-making structures (Supervisory Board, Advisory Board and Principal Investigator). During the entire project duration, the General Assembly and the Principal Investigator will be in charge of ensuring the adherence to rules established in the Grant Agreement and the Consortium Agreement (CA).

Task 8.1: Financial, contractual and administrative management

The ERIO Project Manager will ensure the day-to-day management of the financial, administrative and contractual aspects of the project by:
- Liaising with the European Commission on behalf of the Principal Investigator and the Consortium;
- Administering the EU grant by appropriately allocating funds between partners and activities in accordance with the Grant Agreement and the decisions taken by the Consortium;
- Coordinating the submission of Periodic and Final reports to the EC (see task 6.2 below). The ERIO Project Manager will be in charge of obtaining financial statements from each of the partners and certificates on financial statements when required;
- Advising the consortium members on the H2020 financial rules;
The ERIO Project Manager will ensure that the CA is maintained and updated (if needed) throughout the duration of the Project. The POPREBEL Consortium Agreement will set out in detail the rights, responsibilities, and liabilities of participants to each other and towards the European Commission. The management of knowledge and intellectual property will be determined and regulated within the CA;

The ERIO Project Manager will advise the partners in relation to their contractual obligations and will ensure that Amendments to the Grant Agreement are submitted in accordance with the H2020 rules.

Task 8.2: Monitoring and reporting

Interim reports
The ERIO Project Manager, in collaboration with the Principal Investigator, will monitor progress of the project in terms of achievement of objectives and resource consumption through internal six-monthly reports delivered by all partners. All partners will provide the following information: (i) description of work carried out over the 6 months; (ii) achievements reached during the 6 months (e.g. deliverables, milestones, publications); (iii) planned achievements in the following 3-6 months; and (iv) resource usage per WP. Customised templates will be drafted and relevant instructions circulated to the partners. Information will be then collated by the ERIO Project Manager, reviewed and analysed by the Principal Investigator and reported to the General Assembly, which in turn will propose and ensure that corrective actions are implemented.

Periodic and final reports
Customised templates, in line with the EC official ones, will be drafted and relevant instructions circulated to the partners in order to collect both financial and technical/scientific information needed for the preparation and submission of the Periodic and Final reports to the EC. Information will be collated by the ERIO Project Manager, reviewed by the Work Package Leaders and the Principal Investigator and finally submitted through the EC Portal.

Task 8.3: Ethics
Researchers based at universities will follow national and institutional regulations on research ethics and ensure that ethical approval is obtained from the Research Ethics Committee of their own institutions. Researchers based at Edgeryders will follow the company’s own procedures, set out in Section 5.1 of Annex 1, Part B.

Participation per Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner number and short name</th>
<th>WP8 effort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>22.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>10.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>32.91</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>Project Handbook</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Progress Report II</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.3</td>
<td>Edgeryders Ethics and Impact plan</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>Report</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the</td>
<td>2</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></td>
<td>consortium (including Commission Services)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Description of deliverables

Contains general operational information including description of the main consortium bodies, reporting processes, planning and protocols for communication within and outside the consortium, document templates for internal reports and deliverables, numbering methods, logos, etc.

D8.2 : Progress Report II [24]
Report including summary of the project’s progress in terms of achievement of objectives and milestones, resource consumption and risks analysis.

D8.3 : Edgeryders Ethics and Impact plan [2]
First draft of ethics and impact plan specific to WP2 and Edgeryders methodology (reference Section 5 of Annex 1 - Part B) in place and accessible as agile wiki.

## 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>MS4</td>
<td>Launch of POPREBEL website</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Website publically available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Presentation of completed research</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Final conference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives

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

### Description of work and role of partners

**WP9 - Ethics requirements [Months: 1-36]**

**UCL**

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>D9.1</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 1</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.2</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 2</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.3</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 3</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.4</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 4</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.5</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 5</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.6</td>
<td>H - Requirement No. 6</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</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>D9.7</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.8</td>
<td>POPD - Requirement No. 8</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D9.9</td>
<td>M - Requirement No. 11</td>
<td>1 - UCL</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.

**D9.1 : H - Requirement No. 1 [4]**  
The procedures and criteria that will be used to identify/recruit research participants must be submitted as a deliverable.

**D9.2 : H - Requirement No. 2 [4]**  
The informed consent procedures that will be implemented for the participation of humans must be submitted as a deliverable.

**D9.3 : H - Requirement No. 3 [4]**  
Templates of the informed consent/assent forms and information sheets (in language and terms intelligible to the participants) must be kept on file.

**D9.4 : H - Requirement No. 4 [4]**  
Details on incidental findings policy must be submitted as a deliverable.

**D9.5 : H - Requirement No. 5 [4]**  
The applicant must clarify whether vulnerable individuals/groups will be involved, and the measures to protect them and minimise the risk of their stigmatisation must be submitted as a deliverable.

**D9.6 : H - Requirement No. 6 [4]**  
Copies of opinions/approvals by ethics committees and/or competent authorities for the research with humans must be kept on file.

**D9.7 : POPD - Requirement No. 7 [4]**  
The applicant must confirm compliance with applicable data protection law, and detail measures that will be put in place for implementation, including in relation to anonymisation, special safeguards for sensitive data, data subject rights, DPO, etc. A detailed description of compliance with data protection obligations during the project must be submitted as a deliverable.

**D9.8 : POPD - Requirement No. 8 [4]**  
In case of further processing of previously collected personal data, an explicit confirmation that the beneficiary has lawful basis for the data processing and that the appropriate technical and organisational measures are in place to safeguard the rights of the data subjects must be submitted as a deliverable.
D9.9 : M - Requirement No. 11 [4]
Risk assessment and details on measures to prevent misuse of research findings must be submitted as a deliverable.

<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>

Schedule of relevant Milestones
### 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>POPREBEL platform launch</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public access to POPREBEL forums on the edgeryders.eu platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2</td>
<td>POPREBEL platform training</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Case/ language specific community managers trained and active; a summary post of learnings and context specific considerations shared on the platform by each trained community manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS3</td>
<td>Publication of dissemination and communication strategy</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Deliverable 7.1 submitted to EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS4</td>
<td>Launch of POPREBEL website</td>
<td>WP7, WP8</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Website publically available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS5</td>
<td>Conceptualisation of the project</td>
<td>WP1</td>
<td>3 - UJ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Deliverables 1.1 and 1.7 submitted to EC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS6</td>
<td>Community journalism programme finished</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 high quality commissioned posts online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS7</td>
<td>On-boarding workshops delivered</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12 onboarding workshops delivered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS8</td>
<td>Ethnographic coding completed</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>7 - Edgeryders</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ethnographic coding finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS9</td>
<td>Presentation of completed research</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Final conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS10</td>
<td>Research seminar 1</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Research seminar with policy-makers/activists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS11</td>
<td>Research seminar 2</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Research seminar with policy-makers/activists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS12</td>
<td>Research seminar 3</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Research seminar with general public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS13</td>
<td>Research roadshow</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Research roadshow, disseminating research outcomes in four cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS14</td>
<td>Impact conference</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>A final impact conference bringing together academics, activists, politicians, journalists and engaged citizens to compare notes and tools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS15</td>
<td>Panel session</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Panel session at a major international area studies conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone number</td>
<td>Milestone title</td>
<td>WP number</td>
<td>Lead beneficiary</td>
<td>Due Date (in months)</td>
<td>Means of verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS16</td>
<td>Research-to-policy workshop</td>
<td>WP7</td>
<td>1 - UCL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Research-to-policy workshop</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>Lack of interest: the community does not materialise. The convener may have overestimated the attractiveness or urgency of the problem she wishes to discuss</td>
<td>WP2, WP3, WP6</td>
<td>The events of 2016-2018 (Brexit, elections in many European and non-European countries) have heightened public awareness of the rise of populism as a global trend. We plan to position POPREBEL as a participatory exercise linked to upcoming elections or other high participation events in the target countries, including the European elections in 2019. We expect this to help the project get traction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>First post syndrome: Even when people sincerely want to collaborate around an issue, they prefer to join already buzzing, animated spaces for collaboration. This produces a waiting game: all parties prefer not to be early adopters of the conversation. The equilibrium of this game is no engagement, as parties try to wait each other out</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>We have already identified an initial group of people who wish to have the POPREBEL conversation. The idea for the project comes from post-Brexit discussions in the edgeryders.eu online community. Experienced community managers provide a nurturing environment encouraging less digitally skilled citizens to speak up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Empty platform syndrome: Communities engaged in deep, frequent, high quality exchange are relatively rare. Those that exist are typically invested in their existing platforms and communication channels and refuse to migrate to new ones. Assembling one from scratch takes a longtime and significant resources</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>We start from an existing online community, EDGERYDERS’, with already 4,300 registered users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Insufficiently inclusive culture. Many online discussions end up appealing only to small, homogenous groups of people. For example, women, minorities, or people with disabilities reportedly find many participation spaces uncomfortable. As they disengage, diversity is reduced and the collective intelligence atrophies</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>POPREBEL benefits from the tried-and-tested (a) onboarding policy and (b) moderation policy of EDGERYDERS. New users are personally greeted and welcomed into the conversation by community managers connecting their interests with opportunities to join a discussion, collaborate on a project, participate in a community event. In case of offending behaviour, moderators have full powers to delete the offending content; but only one (relatively minor) episode of breach has been recorded in five years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Conflict and controversy make for a poorer conversation. Supporters (opponents) of populism are immediately and harshly</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>The POPREBEL conversation happens on a platform completely controlled by the consortium (EDGERYDERS). Additionally, EDGERYDERS takes charge of online community management, where it can boast world-class expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk number</td>
<td>Description of risk</td>
<td>WP Number</td>
<td>Proposed risk-mitigation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>criticized by its opponents (supporters). Everyone defaults to insult and shouting matches. The rich lived experience of informants on both sides of the political fence is drowned by information poor controversy</td>
<td></td>
<td>(including the supervision of John Coate’s the world’s first professional online community manager). Rules for engagement (D2.2) are posted early and enforced with care. The community management team spends time on the platform every day. The platform (based on <a href="http://www.discourse.org">www.discourse.org</a>) has state-of-the-art community management tools. Inflammatory posts can be provisionally unpublished, while the community management team contacts the offending poster to resolve the problem. Offending accounts can be “frozen” and prevented from posting pending resolution of any issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Spamming, trolling and bot armies Many online political fora are plagued by spam content, contentious individuals, and – recently – even software agents disguised as real persons that intimidate and disgust others, and generally lower conversation quality</td>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>Writing on the project’s platform is restricted to registered users; further, it’s carefully policed; and we won’t need to report users in breach of netiquette to any third parties, because our community managers have full powers of moderating content, freezing accounts and so on. Problems of spam have been endemic, but most users hardly noticed them, because we are fast at removing the offending content and blocking out their authors. Such behaviour can probably not be avoided, but it can be neutralized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No participants in specific case study willing to participate</td>
<td>WP3, WP4</td>
<td>Flexibility will be maintained with regard to choice of case study, subject to latter meeting key criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Archives fail to produce desired information</td>
<td>WP3, WP4</td>
<td>Oral testimonies will complement the materials in meaningful and illuminating ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Overload of project management, which could result in lack of coordination</td>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>UCL’s project coordination strategy includes the project coordinator (Prof. Jan Kubik), a professional project manager within UCL’s European Research and Innovation Office and a scientific project administrator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Threat of physical violence and intimidation at public events</td>
<td>WP6, WP7</td>
<td>Advice on safety will be sought from local activists, academics and staff of NGOs.</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>Total Person/Months per Participant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>44.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>112.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>70.13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>106.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>39.20</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>142.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>54.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Person/Months**

- WP1: 52.86
- WP2: 55.40
- WP3: 206.80
- WP4: 89.0
- WP5: 79.13
- WP6: 20.25
- WP7: 27.50
- WP8: 32.91
- WP9: 563.85
### 1.3.7. WT7 Tentative schedule of project reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review number</th>
<th>Tentative timing</th>
<th>Planned venue of review</th>
<th>Comments, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RV1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>TBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Brussels</td>
<td>Unless a panel session or conference is organised at M36 elsewhere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Project number

The project number has been assigned by the Commission as the unique identifier for your project. It cannot be changed. The project number should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B) to prevent errors during its handling.

2. Project acronym

Use the project acronym as given in the submitted proposal. It can generally not be changed. The same acronym should appear on each page of the grant agreement preparation documents (part A and part B) to prevent errors during its handling.

3. Project title

Use the title (preferably no longer than 200 characters) as indicated in the submitted proposal. Minor corrections are possible if agreed during the preparation of the grant agreement.

4. Starting date

Unless a specific (fixed) starting date is duly justified and agreed upon during the preparation of the Grant Agreement, the project will start on the first day of the month following the entry into force of the Grant Agreement (NB: entry into force = signature by the Commission). Please note that if a fixed starting date is used, you will be required to provide a written justification.

5. Duration

Insert the duration of the project in full months.

6. Call (part) identifier

The Call (part) identifier is the reference number given in the call or part of the call you were addressing, as indicated in the publication of the call in the Official Journal of the European Union. You have to use the identifier given by the Commission in the letter inviting to prepare the grant agreement.

7. Abstract

8. Project Entry Month

The month at which the participant joined the consortium, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

9. Work Package number

Work package number: WP1, WP2, WP3, ..., WPn

10. Lead beneficiary

This must be one of the beneficiaries in the grant (not a third party) - Number of the beneficiary leading the work in this work package

11. Person-months per work package

The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

12. Start month

Relative start date for the work in the specific work packages, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all other start dates being relative to this start date.

13. End month

Relative end date, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all end dates being relative to this start date.

14. Deliverable number

Deliverable numbers: D1 - Dn

15. Type

Please indicate the type of the deliverable using one of the following codes:

- R Document, report
- DEM Demonstrator, pilot, prototype
- DEC Websites, patent filings, videos, etc.
- OTHER
- ETHICS Ethics requirement
- ORDP Open Research Data Pilot

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

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

17. **Delivery date for Deliverable**

Month in which the deliverables will be available, month 1 marking the start date of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

18. **Milestone number**

Milestone number: MS1, MS2, ..., MSn

19. **Review number**

Review number: RV1, RV2, ..., RVn

20. **Installation Number**

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

21. **Installation country**

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

22. **Type of access**

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

23. **Access costs**

Cost of the access provided under the project. For virtual access fill only the second column. For trans-national access fill one of the two columns or both according to the way access costs are declared. Trans-national access costs on the basis of unit cost will result from the unit cost by the quantity of access to be provided.
Populist rebellion against modernity in 21st-century Eastern Europe: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism

(POPREBEL)

Application for funding under the call ‘Addressing populism and boosting civic and democratic engagement’
## History of changes

### Part A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>CUNI decreased personnel budget from 77,520 to 73,800 and increased ODC from 14,880 to 18,600. UTARTU increased personnel budget from 214,972 to 221,173.00 and decreased ODC from 40,720 to 34,519.00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistencies</td>
<td>Fixed deliverables and milestones (dates, missing titles and/or description, etc).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>UB was replaced with UBFF. EDGE was replaced with EDGERYDERS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Numbering updated to match Part A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
<td>Short names updated: UB was replaced with UBFF. EDGE was replaced with EDGERYDERS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>UCL Consultants replaced with UCL Business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>Summary of staff effort and other direct cost items updated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Submission 11/09/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A</td>
<td>Effort updated for CUNI and UJ. Budget updated for UBFF (not final yet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1 Deliverables</td>
<td>D1.1 – D1.6 changed level of dissemination from ‘PU’ to ‘CO’. D1.7 title slightly revised and delivery date postponed from M10 to M12. D1.8 removed. D1.12 merged with D1.11 – now D1.10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3 Deliverables</td>
<td>D3.15 – D3.26 changed level of dissemination from ‘PU’ to ‘CO’. D3.7 and D3.8’s titles have been changed. D3.28 – D3.35 changed level of dissemination from ‘PU’ to ‘CO’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP5 Deliverables</td>
<td>D5.2 delivery date postponed. D5.3’s title and description have been slightly modified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.5</td>
<td>removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.6</td>
<td>title and description modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.7–D5.9</td>
<td>delivery date postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.10</td>
<td>removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.11</td>
<td>level of dissemination changed from ‘PU’ to ‘CO’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.12</td>
<td>delivery date postponed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.13–D5.14</td>
<td>merged into one (current D5.11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WP6 Deliverables:
- D6.1, D6.2, D6.4, D6.12, D6.15, D6.16 have been removed as the content of some is included in the deliverables left in WP6
- D6.8, D6.10, and D6.11’s titles have been slightly modified

WP8 Deliverables:
- Minutes of the consortium meetings have been removed and D8.1 ‘Project Handbook’ and D8.2 ‘Progress Report’ added

New list of Milestones has been produced

‘EDGE’ replaced with ‘EDGERYDERS’

### Part B

First shortcoming included in the ESR - Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation - regarding the work package structure has been addressed

Shortcoming included in the ESR - Criterion 1 - Excellence - regarding the validity of POPREBEL methodology for a broader comprehension of populism beyond CEE countries is not fully substantiated

Shortcoming included in the ESR - Criterion 2 - Impact - regarding stakeholders’ engagement has been addressed

‘Programme Director’ has been replaced with ‘Principal Investigator’ in Supervisory Board description

Instead of every six months, a new timeline for interim reports will be discussed and agreed by the consortium at the kick off meeting, taking into account the project’s reporting periods (M1 – M12 / M13 – M36).

Table with list of KPIs inserted.

Second shortcoming included in the ESR - Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation - regarding insufficient information about innovation management has been addressed

Table 3.4: Summary of staff effort has been updated for partner CUNI and UJ. CUNI person months have been re-allocated with no impact on the total. Total UJ person months has been decreased from 144.53 to 112.80
Table 3.4b: ‘Other direct cost’ items have been updated including details on travels and other goods and services for all partners except UBFF.

| Answer to shortcoming included in EthSR regarding research activities carried out in non-EU countries has been added. | Section 3.4 Resources to be committed |
| Section 5 Ethics and Security |

### SUBMISSION 28/09/2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Budget

**CUB**

**Travel:** CUB confirms that the € 11,000 is the correct amount for the planned study trip which includes also the return flight. The current per diem rate for the US, as advertised on the EC’s webpage, is € 343 (€ 343 x 30 days = € 10,290).

- [https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/annexe_h_taux_dindemnites_journalieres_per_diem_0.pdf](https://eeas.europa.eu/sites/eeas/files/annexe_h_taux_dindemnites_journalieres_per_diem_0.pdf)

**OA:** the budget allocated as Cost of editing and the proofreading of articles (€ 12,000.00) will be mainly needed to proofread and editing. CUB plans to publish 8-10 manuscripts. Of these only those few written in the early stages of POPREBEL could be granted Open Access.

Info regarding costs for access to a database and conduct surveys to be provided with next submission

### UJ

**Travel:** The number of people travelling to international conferences had been decreased from 6 to 4. The remaining budget available has been allocated to Open Access fees

**OA:** Cost of editing and proofreading of articles now includes also budget for Open Access and it has been increased. UJ will approximately publish 15 articles

### CUNI

Waiting for feedback

### UTARTU

**Travel:** Costs for attendance to one conference in EU for 2 people is € 1,580.00. Costs for attendance to a second conference in EU for 8 people is € 6,320.00.

**OA:** As for OA, UTARTU intend to follow a Green OA approach in that the University of Tartu has an open research portal called D-Space (dspace.ut.ee), which conforms to EU green OA requirements. Additionally, individual scholars have their own webpages via the Estonian Research Information System, [www.etis.ee](http://www.etis.ee), where they can upload final publications, in compliance with any additional embargo rules.
**EDGERYDERS**

OA: EDGERYDERS only have one deliverable in POPREBEL that could be published via open access which is the Report: an ethnography of European populism (D2.7). EDGERYDERS normally publish their work through the green open access research repository, Zenodo.

### WP1 Deliverables:
- D1.1 is the result of the merge of D1.1 [M10] and D1.7 [12]. It has a new title and description and new delivery date [12]
- D1.2 Title and description slightly revised
- D1.3 Title and description slightly revised. Delivery date anticipated to [M33]
- D1.4 – D1.6 merged into D1.4 with a new title and description. Delivery date [20]
- D1.7 merged in D1.1
- D1.8 is now D1.5 although it will be submitted in the form or a report rather than an article
- D1.9 [24] and D1.10 [28] have been merged into D1.6 [M26]

### WP3 Deliverables:
- D3.1 is a brand new conceptual deliverable
- D3.2, D3.3 and D3.4 have been merged into the new D3.2 with new title and description
- D3.5 and D3.6 have been merged into the new D3.3 with new title and description
- D3.7 is now D3.4. Description has been updated
- D3.8 is now D3.5
- D3.9 and D3.11 have been merged into the new D3.6
- D3.10, D3.12, D3.13 and D3.14 have been merged into the new D3.7
- D3.15, D3.16 and D3.17 have been merged into the new D3.8
- D3.18, D3.19 and D3.20 have been merged into the new D3.9
- D3.21, D3.22, D3.23 and D3.24 have been merged into the new D3.10
- D3.25, D3.26 and D3.27 have been merged into the new D3.11
- D3.28 and D3.29 have been merged into the new D3.12
- D3.30 and D3.31 have been merged into the new D3.13
- D3.32 - D3.35 have been merged into the new D3.14

### WP4 Deliverables:
- D4.1 is a brand new conceptual deliverable
- D4.1 – D4.3 have been merged into the new D4.2
- D4.5 and D4.8 have been merged into the new D4.3
- D4.16, D4.17 and D4.18 have been merged into the new D4.4
- D4.12 and D4.4 have been merged into the new D4.5
- D4.9 is now D4.6
- D4.10, D4.11, D4.14, D4.15, D4.19, D4.21 have been merged into the new D4.7

### WP5 Deliverables:
- D5.1 is a brand new conceptual deliverable
- D5.2 has been removed. It will be reported in the frame of the dissemination and communication plan
- D5.3 is now D5.2
- D5.4 is now D5.3 although it will be submitted in the form or a report rather than an article

1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP
D5.5 is now D5.4 title and description slightly revised
D5.6 and D5.7 have been removed. They will be reported in the frame of the dissemination and communication plan
D5.8 is now D5.5 Description slightly revised. It will be submitted in the form or a report rather than an article
D5.9 has been removed. It will be reported in the frame of the dissemination and communication plan
D5.10 is now D5.6. Description slightly revised. It will be submitted in the form or a report rather than an article
D5.11 is now D5.7 Description slightly revised. It will be submitted in the form or a report rather than an article

WP6 Deliverables:
D6.1 Description slightly revised. Dissemination level changed from ‘PU’ to ‘CO’
D6.2 and D6.3 are now D6.2
D6.4 and D6.5 are now D6.3
D6.7 is now D6.4
D6.8 is now D6.5
D6.10 is now D6.6
D6.6, D6.9 and D6.11 will be reported as part of the Dissemination and communication strategy

WP7 Deliverables:
D7.3 New deliverable added ‘Dissemination and communication strategy II’ [24]
Previous D7.3 – D7.9 have now become milestones

WP8 Deliverables:
D8.3 ‘Ethics and Impact plan’ added [M2]. This will allow EDGERYDERS to start WP2 outreach and consultation activities before the rest of WP9 Ethics deliverables are submitted at [M3]

New milestones added as suggested by PO. These were the old D7.3 – D7.9 deliverables
Research seminar 1 [12]
Research seminar 2 [18]
Research seminar 3 [24]
Research roadshow [30]
Panel session [36]
Research-to-policy workshop [36]
Impact conference [33]

1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP

1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP

1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones

Part B

Statement about the methodology, that will be used to ensure that the costs related to POPREBEL and FATIGUE’s joint activities are correctly attributed, has been included

The below sentence has been included in order to answer to shortcoming included in EthSR regarding research activities carried out in non-EU countries
“In case activities undertaken in non-EU countries raise ethics issues, appropriate measures, to ensure that the research conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State, will be taken”

1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones

Section 3.4 Resources to be committed

Section 5 Ethics and Security

SUBMISSION 08/10/2018
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBFF</strong></td>
<td>Participant Portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3 person months have been decreased of 2pm whilst WP4 person months have been decreased of 1.2pm to match the total personnel budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDGERYDERS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2 has been decreased of 8.6 pm and WP8 has been increased of 3.6pm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The total person months for the project has been updated accordingly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2</td>
<td>1.3.4. WT4 List of milestones and relevant WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives of T2.2.: The offline events/workshops in the Czech Republic, Poland, Serbia and the rest of Europe are now 12 and not 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS1 POPREBEL platform launch has been postponed from M2 to M3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS2 POPREBEL platform training. The Means of verification has been updated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.1 title has been updated as follows: “Report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3”</td>
<td>1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP8</td>
<td>1.3.2. WT2 List of deliverables and relevant WP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of Co-Investigator has been added</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title and description of D8.3 has been slightly revised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part B</strong></td>
<td>Section 3.2 Management structure and procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the Co-Investigator (Dr. Richard Mole, UCL) has been added. The CO-I will support the PI in the performance of his tasks where necessary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUNI</strong></td>
<td>Section 3.4 Resources to be committed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs table updated. Budget has been shifted from the ‘Research Trips’ to ‘Open Access’ fees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UJ</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10K from the ‘Cost of editing and proofreading of articles’ original budget have been allocated to OA fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CUB</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>does not need budget for OA fees. CUB will publish through the Green route and will deposit the final manuscripts at CUB’s repository (Corvinus Research <a href="http://unipub.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/">http://unipub.lib.uni-corvinus.hu/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs related to surveys: in Hungary it costs approximately 5-6000 EUR to ask a survey question with a reputable agency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cost of buying access to databases would be used for obtaining data for instance from the Hungarian Statistical Office which is not published online.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UBFF</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs table updated including details on travels and other goods and services</td>
<td>Total person months decreased of 3.20 pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total person months decreased of 3.20 pm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EDGERYDERS
Total person months decreased of 5 pm to match the total personnel budget.

Total person months for the project has been updated accordingly. The percentage of the other direct costs compared to the total costs has been updated – it is now 27.98%

| All partners reviewed and amended where necessary their ‘Role in the Project’ | Section 4 Members of the consortium |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION 10/10/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Sentence “None of the FATIGUE MSCA Fellows will participate in POPREBEL research activities nor will they claim any costs.” added before table showing how FATIGUE and POPREBEL costs related to meetings, workshops, etc are split

| Explanation “To attend POPREBEL events: meetings of the General Assembly and the Supervisory Board, methodological training sessions and research meetings during the project duration.” has been added to UCL Table 3.4.2: ‘Other direct cost’ items to provide details for the flights NYC-London |
| Section 3.4 Resources to be committed |

| Sentence “Dr Vasileios Petsinis will start working on the project once his MSCA Fellowship ends after April 2019.” added under Dr Vasileios Petsinis’ Profile / UTARTU |
| Section 4 Members of the consortium |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION 10/10/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The budget for the 6 Return flights NYC-London (6,000.00 euros) has been removed. 6,000.00 euros have been allocated for travel and subsistence costs of the Advisory Board members.

| Section 3.4 Resources to be committed |
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1. Excellence

1.1 Objectives

POPREBEL aims at taking stock of the recent rise of populism – in its various forms – in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), including the Western Balkans. Its trajectory is not just interesting in and of itself: it is also the harbinger of a possible future for the whole continent. It is urgent for Western Europeans to look into the CEE mirror, just as it is urgent for the CEE region to understand itself. We describe the phenomenon, create a typology of its various manifestations, reconstruct trajectories of its growth and decline, investigate its causes, interpret its meanings, diagnose its consequences, and propose policy solutions. Our focus is on the CEE region, but we will engage in comparisons with populisms in other parts of the world, particularly Western Europe.

The present wave of populist mobilizations in Europe is more politically consequential than any of the previous waves and it has already produced an ‘extraordinary’ [Brubaker 2017a, 2017b] reconfiguration of the political map of Europe. Populist parties have become significant political players in several countries, including Italy, Holland, Austria, France, UK, and Germany, and their number has almost doubled since 2000 (from 33 to 63) [Eiermann et al. 2018].

Brexit vote in the UK might have gone the other way had it not been for the campaigning by the populist UKIP.

At the beginning of 2018, right wing populists govern single-handedly in two countries on the continent – Hungary and Poland – and in several other countries of the region they have emerged as serious contenders for political power. In some countries (Germany, Austria, Italy) they entered parliaments or governing coalitions. ‘Populists are the strongest in Eastern Europe,’ concludes a recent comprehensive report [Eiermann et al. 2018]. We propose, therefore, to study the rise of populism in this part of Europe in order to draw lessons that will be applicable also to other countries. No doubt Eastern Europe has some specific features, but since the phenomenon is so intensely pronounced in that part of the continent we believe it is easier to diagnose the causes of its emergence, reconstruct its basic features, and formulate policy recommendations that may be helpful also in other contexts. We will, however, rely also on comparisons with other parts of Europe and the world when our specific tasks call for them.

Since 1989, many CEE states have struggled with corruption and the oligarchisation of politics, the high costs of often-botched economic reforms and cultural disorientation generated by the fast pace of change. But roughly until the mid-2000s the political processes, although moving at various speeds and in a variety of directions, had features recognisable from the earlier waves of democratisation. There was also a certain path-dependent predictability in the country-specific dynamics initiated in 1989/91. While some countries were moving closer to the ideals of liberal democracy and others were drifting away, the cast of political actors ranged predictably from the left to the right, dominant constitutional dilemmas revolved around the choice of presidential or parliamentary systems, economic debates and conflicts focused on the choice of type of capitalism and welfare state optimal for a country or – more often – a given interest group, to take just a few examples. Importantly, the liberal strands of political cultures were strong enough to matter politically, achieving in some states a rather unchallengeable – it seemed – position.

However, around the mid-2000s these ‘predictable’ processes stalled and the political trajectories of several countries veered off in a new direction, whose key feature is the emergence of populist parties and movements that play fast and loose with democratic procedures. They range from left-leaning Smer in Slovakia, to ‘generically’ populist ANO in the Czech Republic, to right-wing, nationalist Fidesz in Hungary, to right-wing, religious-nationalist PiS in Poland. Their discourses have become acceptable in everyday lives, the media (particularly the new ones) and political debates.

In brief, we argue that the phenomenon that afflicts the whole continent is particularly pronounced in CEE where its features are sharply defined. It is therefore easier to formulate a precise diagnosis and fashion effective remedies.

---

Objective 1. Build a new, interdisciplinary model to describe, interpret and explain the rise of populism in the CEE region.

While scholars from different disciplinary backgrounds have been looking at populism [Rovira Kaltwasser et al. 2017], we propose that the full potential of interdisciplinary research has not been achieved yet. We draw on sources, and apply models from, various disciplines; and combine them into a rich study of the forces at play. We envision contributions from:

1. **Economics.** We explore the hypothesis that populism both drives and is driven by the transformation of the economy on the global, regional and domestic levels. We hope to identify the perception of economic (in)security as the main cause of the rise of populism. We also claim that by building upon the fear of economic insecurity and, in turn, by adopting elements of state capitalist regimes, CEE countries experience the emergence of neo-feudalism, which is a particular form of economic populism.

2. **Sociology.** We look at the populist phenomenon through the lens of cultural neo-traditionalism. Additionally, we create and implement a diachronic model: we want to study populist movements and the societies they inhabit as they develop over time, not as a 'snapshot'.

3. **Political science.** We study the interaction between political actors pushing the populist agenda and civil society groups or individual citizens that decide to support them, or, vice versa, to push back. We investigate forms of political mobilization, both traditional (marches, rallies) and non-traditional (social media activism, troll farms, bot armies), and how they play out in the political arena.

4. **Anthropology.** We ‘go deep’ into trying to see a populist promise the way ordinary Europeans see it from inside of their own cultures – and that means both supporters of populist movements and opponents thereof. To this end, we use an ethnographic/constructivist approach, for its strength to encode the point of view of the human community being studied.

Objective 2. Use the model to assess the replicability of populism’s trajectory in non-CEE Europe.

Armed with the model in Objective 1, we use it as a mirror in which Northern, Western, and Southern Europe can catch a reflex of themselves. Our main tool here is a fifth discipline, foresight/futures studies. Accordingly, we develop scenarios, and reflect, in public debate, how well they fit European countries, both in the CEE region and outside of it. Needless to say, our goal here is not to generate representative predictions of how societies will respond. Rather, it is to stimulate debate, by helping citizens think about plausible interactions between large-scale events, political decision-making and societal reaction in democratic societies. Also (and importantly) they help gauge cross-national differences in how publics perceive the threat of populism in their countries.

Objective 3. Develop and apply new tools and methodologies for ethnographic analysis to support large-scale, multi-lingual, multi-media data.

As a research method, ethnography is not yet fully equipped for dealing with studies of the scope and ambition needed to contribute to POPREBEL. This calls for some methodological innovation. We extend the reach of ethnography in five directions:

1. **Scale.** Anthropologists routinely study small-scale communities and base their conclusions on interactions with a limited number of people [Geertz 1973]. POPREBEL researchers engage with hundreds of informants, geographically spread out across the continent.

2. **Multilingualism.** For maximum inclusivity, POPREBEL operates across several languages. Running completely separate studies would lose out on the critical dimension of comparability across different languages.

3. **Multimedia.** Populism diffuses and evolves through sharing videos, photos, GIFs etc., at least as much as through text. While examples of multimedia ethnography exist [Munk 2016], we aim to encode all media (including text) within the same data format.

4. **Support for conversational structure.** POPREBEL takes a collective intelligence [Levy 1997] approach to ethnographic work. Its central tenet is that open conversations has, under certain conditions, a self-correcting property. This happens by exposing one’s thoughts to his or her peers’ scrutiny, just like in science, and is similar to the self-correcting behaviour observed in Wikipedia. In terms of data collection, the raw data point is not the interview, but
the contribution to an online platform (a forum). All contributions, in all four languages, are coded directly on the platform. Codes are saved in the same database as the coded material, preserving its conversational context. This is an innovative approach, tested earlier [Cottica et al. 2017], that in this project is extended in new directions.

5. **Computational methods.** The mass of data generated by POPREBEL is likely to exceed the short-term memory capacity of even the best researcher. Accordingly, we borrow methods from network science and encode the conversation (and its ethnographic coding) as a semantic social network [Cottica et al. 2017]. This makes the data (a) reducible and (b) navigable, without any loss of information.

### 1.2 Relation to the work programme

The POPREBEL project is responding to **Addressing populism and boosting civic and democratic engagements (GOVERNANCE-03-2018)**.

This call, part of the Horizon 2020 call ‘Europe in a changing world - Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies’ (H202-SC6-GOVERNANCE-2018-2019-2020), aims to attract and support projects that will diagnose the causes and consequences of the rise of populism in Europe, propose ‘innovative ways of understanding and addressing the causes of populism’ and identify ‘strategies for strengthening democratic values and practices.’ **Our project is designed to realise the three major goals of the call in the manner that is succinctly summarized in the table 1.** The specifics of our approach are developed throughout the proposal, particularly in section 1.4 Ambition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work programme</th>
<th>POPREBEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research should analyse the <strong>phenomenon of populism</strong> and its <strong>consequences</strong> for European democracies and the European project.</td>
<td>POPREBEL aims to <strong>describe and explain</strong> the causes and consequences of populism in a multidisciplinary, context-sensitive and comparative manner. Our team includes accomplished economists, political scientists, sociologists, historians, cultural analysts, anthropologists work in unison, guided by the two central concepts of the project: <strong>neo-traditionalism</strong> and <strong>neo-feudalism</strong>. We employ many methods typical for all the represented disciplines, but we also use a novel, cutting-edge methodology (see the box below). We study primarily Central Eastern Europe where the phenomenon of populism is at the moment most pronounced and thus <strong>easier to diagnose</strong>, but our goal is to develop recommendations for remedies applicable to the whole continent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should identify <strong>innovative ways of understanding</strong> and addressing the <strong>causes</strong> of populism.</td>
<td>POPREBEL deploys a large-scale, Europe-wide, multilingual online conversation. This is a listening exercise; it thus also aims to a deep <strong>understanding</strong> of everyday life in a populist Europe. The conversation is treated as the corpus of ethnography of populism, and processed through an <strong>innovative methodology, semantic social network analysis</strong>, that combines qualitative ethnographic analysis with quantitative metrics from network science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It should identify <strong>strategies</strong> for strengthening democratic values and practices</td>
<td>POPREBEL incorporates input by both credentialed researchers (in WP 1, WP 3, WP 4, WP 5 and WP 6) and by activists (through the listening exercise of WP 2), to define a repertoire of strategies and tactics used in different contexts to challenge populists and strengthen liberal democracy. Critically, we look not only at successes, but face the failures. This translates into two operating manuals, one for policy makers and one for activists and committed citizens (see section 2.2.a).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Concept and methodology

(a) Concept

Project’s key tenets and architecture:

1. POPREBEL draws on knowledge from different disciplines to build a rich, dynamic understanding of populism (multidisciplinarity).
2. POPREBEL focuses on CEE, but produces results that can be generalised (with adaptations) to the whole of Europe. Such results provide Europeans with knowledge of how populism expands, and how it can be contrasted (comparative approach).
3. POPREBEL maintains a large, multi-lingual online conversation. This is used mostly as a listening device, to learn how ordinary Europeans experience the rise of populism in society (online ethnography).

Multidisciplinarity: grounded in our extensive and multifaceted expertise on CEE, we study the rise of populists to political prominence and -- particularly -- their ascendancy to power. We examine the causes and consequences of this phenomenon, as well as offer original policy recommendations. Since the rise of populism and its political consequences are multi-faceted they must be studied in a multi- or even interdisciplinary fashion. Our goal is also to capture the dynamic nature of populist ‘episodes’ with their ebbs and flows. Thus while we rely on many ideas already well established in the literature, we offer here a novel approach that is genuinely interdisciplinary, as we study not only the political field -- as most studies do -- but also the social, cultural and economic processes that are responsible for the transformations of this field. We are interested in identifying and reconstructing both the long-term and more proximal causes of the rise and survival of populist actors on the political stage. Our multidisciplinary approach is based on a structured and continuous dialogue between different work packages that cross-fertilize each other with ideas, information, and inspiration. Our original dataset generated by online ethnography will be both fed by, and utilized as a source by members of all other projects (work packages). Most importantly, the representatives of four partners will be engaged in the community management and ethnographic coding of the online conversation (EDGERYDERS, UCL, UBFF and CUNI) which is very deep and wide inter- and multidisciplinary and cross-consortium collaboration. All the results will be interpreted in the light of the work done in each package, but with an eye on contributing to the understanding of the two central processes/phenomena we study: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism. We will engage each other in regular research seminars and continuous circulation of conceptualizations and data. Moreover, the project brings together not only researchers from various disciplines, but also several academics, including the Principal Investigator, who have a multidisciplinary training.

Comparative approach: the CEE region stands out as the place where European right-wing populists have first come to power. This makes it incredibly interesting for other Europeans, who are now wondering how the populist dynamics will play in their own countries. POPREBEL addresses this concern by deploying foresight tools, like scenario analysis (based on the rich description of populist dynamics). Also, it maps out the strategies and tactics of the populist insurgency across Europe, as well as the strategies and tactics of the counter-insurgency. Both scenarios and strategy/tactics are fed back to the online conversation, where they are further debated to generate insights and unique ethnographic data. This is meant to empower European citizens to take action in defence of our democratic institutions.

Online ethnography: POPREBEL uses a variety of sources and methods, from social critique to economic statistics. This is common to many multidisciplinary projects. What is less common is that we take an extra step of generating our own data: specifically, ethnographic data about the lived experience of people in whose countries populism is ascendant or dominant. We believe this is necessary, because accounts of the people’s actual motivations fuelling the populist rebellion are often drowned in partisan commentary and political controversy. As a result, supporters of the rebellion are all too often dismissed as irrational, ignorant or evil; while their opponents are branded as arrogant ivory-tower types, blinded by privilege. We make a substantial investment in listening to populists’ supporters and their opponents, and try to see the world as they do. To do this, we launch a large-scale online conversation that spans much of continent

---

2 See, for example, such reviews of the work on populism in CEE as Stanley 2017, Mudde 2017, Minkenberg 2015, Pirro 2015, Pytlas 2016.
and four of its languages, and treat it as a source of unique ethnographic data. We use a method called semantic social network analysis to aggregate and analyse this data (see section 1.3.b) as we combine close listening and empathy with scale.

POPREBEL is composed of six substantial work packages whose work is closely coordinated and mutually reinforcing in order to (1) generate an original model of populist rebellion and (2) produce foresight (in WP 6) on how to deal with rising populism and develop counter-rebellion strategies (see Figure 1).

Fig 1 – Project architecture

Semantic social networks - a novel approach to large-scale ethnography

Ethnography in POPREBEL is applied to a large-scale, open-to-all online conversation, which we see as a powerful engine of collective intelligence. From Plato’s dialogues, through the Invisible College’s correspondence and all the way to modern peer-reviewed scientific debate, conversation is a process that augments information, by setting it in a richer context. Such collective intelligence is interactional. It is only by being exposed to each other, by comparing notes, that intelligent individuals give rise to a higher-order collective intelligence.

However, conversations don’t scale well. A hundred people cannot have a conversation, in the sense that they all keep a reasonably similar outlook on what is being discussed and what conclusions are being reached. They have to splinter into smaller groups. A lot of insights are generated and validated; but they are generated and validated locally, by subsets of a few people. How to generalise? How can we tell which insights are solid, and which are the product of a branch of the conversation that simply got it wrong?

POPREBEL does it in four moves:

1. **Text as structured data.** We make sure that the whole conversation is encoded in a database and each contribution is associated with its author and the conversational context it is part of. This comes with the territory of online conversation, which we expect to make up the large majority of POPREBEL original empirical material; offline contributions are documented onto the online platform.

2. **Ethnography.** Ethnography is a qualitative research technique that -- *inter alia* -- results in the close reconstruction of a group’s point of view [Kubik 2009]. Contrary to disciplines such as economics or statistics, the goal of ethnographic work is rarely to test a hypothesis. Instead, ethnographers are predominantly oriented towards the inductive exploration of unstructured experiences and aim to direct their research towards the ‘emic’ perspective, trying to see the world from the ‘native’s point of view’ [Geertz 1974]. This is a key advantage when dealing with new or ‘wicked’ problems, which are still too poorly understood for hypothesis formulation. A common way for ethnographers to aggregate knowledge is by engaging people in conversations and annotating the resulting transcripts. **Annotations** consist of a quotation from what the respondent has said, associated to one or more keywords. As she
goes through the testimonies, the ethnographer codes i.e., creates an ontology of concepts relevant to the studied issue, as seen collectively by respondents. Annotations are linked to contributions they refer to directly in the platform’s database.

3. Social network analysis. We represent the discussion as a social network, where nodes represent people and arcs represent interactions – forum posts [Cottica 2017]. At that point the pattern of connectivity in our conversation is described by a graph. What’s more, there is a rich literature in social science that associates measurable network metrics to social phenomena like brokerage and authoritativeness [Kleinberg 1999]. In general, the network can help us tentatively assign reliability scores to individuals.

4. Combine ethnographic data and social network data to build what we call semantic social networks (SSNs). The ‘atom’ of a SSN is an interaction like that of Figure 2, where Ayman addresses a comment to Ben. On the social networking platform, the comment is made of some text; it has a source, Ayman, and a target, Ben; and it has a timestamp. After the ethnographer has coded the text, it also has one or more ethnographic codes. To know what the comment is about we no longer need to read the full text: all we need to do is glance at the codes.

Figure 2 – The ‘atom’ of a Semantic Social Network: one interaction in a conversation

When you generalise this approach to a whole conversation, you get a social network whose edges carry semantics: individuals are not only interacting, they are talking about something in particular, and we know what that something is. At this point, we deploy methods from network science and conversation analysis [Moerman 1988] to (a) aggregate and summarise, to get a ‘big picture’ view of the conversation and (b) explore and go deep, to find novelty and unexpected patterns of association between the ethnographic codes. This is collective intelligence, in the following sense: (c) these patterns do not emerge if they are not validated by several individuals in the network, and (d) the individuals whose contributions form them are typically not be aware of the patterns themselves.

Technology readiness levels

In a former project, OPENCARE3, EDGERYDERS and partners have produced software for doing SSN analysis (SSNA). POPREBEL reuses both the methodology [Cottica, 2017] and the software used in OPENCARE, and improves upon both. The software consists of two applications:

- **Open Ethnographer** allows in-platform ethnographic coding. Its main advantage is that it allows secondary data (annotations and codes) to (a) remain linked to the primary data contributions) and (b) be exposed via APIs. Current TRL: 6. Aiming for: 7.

Project’s philosophy: innovation combined with firm grounding in the literature

In this project we use the ideational approach to populism that defines it as a type of (thin) ideology [Mudde 2004 and Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser 2017] that under specific circumstances can be ‘thickened’ (see ‘Thick and thin populism’

---

3 https://opencare.cc
in Project’s key definitions below). Political entities (parties and movements) can espouse this ideology to various degrees, but we focus on those situations when some political actors’ ideologies are predominantly populist and study how their emergence changes the dynamics in a given political and social field.

Our work is based on several conceptual assumptions and empirical generalizations that are already well established in the literature [Mudde and Kaltwasser 2017]. They include:

1. Populism attracts people for various reasons that can be conveniently grouped in two basic categories: economic and cultural [Inglehart and Norris 2016]. There is mounting evidence that what matters most are specific patterns of interaction between factors belonging to both categories in specific spatial and temporal contexts [Gidron and Hall 2017].

2. While the demand for new political solutions has intensified in the last several years, populist solutions gained in attractiveness because of the concerted actions by populist actors (parties and movements) who improved their ‘products’ and increased their supply. Thus we need to study both the demand and supply factors that are responsible for the rise, maintenance, and decline of populist political formations. The rising popularity of populism is a result of a self-reinforcing (vicious or virtuous - depending on the ideology of the observer) cycle of causation in which demand and supply factors influence each other in an iterative fashion. As such, interactions develop across time, we study them within what we call a life-cycle approach. We intend to study the phenomenon we dubbed delayed transformational fatigue, as we noted that populism gained strength after the most stressful phase of transformations was over. There is a powerful lesson here: demand does not automatically stimulate (populist) supply.

3. Recent rising popularity of populist solutions attracts a lot of attention, also among scholars. Political scientists who study the evolution of people’s electoral choices or the decline of ‘traditional’ political systems have shed a lot of light on the phenomenon. But we believe that in order to achieve further progress in this area of study, particularly when it comes to designing viable remedies, we need to cast the conceptual, theoretical and empirical net much more widely. We intend to show that the rising popularity of populism has its roots in both long- and short-term economic, social and cultural processes that underpin political changes. Most importantly, we hypothesise that in each complex European society there are layers of what we call neo-traditionalism that often remain dormant and can be activated by skillful political-cultural entrepreneurs. Populist solutions not only resonate with neo-traditionalism but they also facilitate its ‘awakening’ [Kotwas and Kubik n.d.].

4. When it comes to the relationship between politics and the economy, in the name of combating the inequality and insecurity often associated with globalization, the populists attack not only the autonomy of the markets but also challenge the authority of regulatory agencies, independent central banks, or global trade rules [Rodrik 2018]. They argue for an expansion of state property and tighter state controls over economic mechanisms at the expense of market-driven allocation of resources in the name of a still inchoate ideology that we dubbed neo-feudalism.

**Project’s key definitions**

**Thin and thick populism**

In POPREBEL we adopt Mudde’s definition [2004] who pioneered an ideational approach to populism and accordingly defined it as an ideology. It is:

a thin-centred ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic camps, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite,’ and which argues that politics should be an expression of the volonté générale (general will) of the people [Mudde and Rovira Kaltwasser 2017].

Mudde elaborates further: ‘Populism presents a Manichean outlook, in which there are only friends and foes. Opponents are not just people with different priorities and values, they are evil! Consequently, compromise is impossible, as it “corrupts” the purity’ [2004:544]. Thin populist ideology thus tends to be Manichean and strongly moralistic. There two principal rivals of this populism: elitism and pluralism [Müller 2017].

The intensity of populist ideology varies from one manifestation to another and many political programmes display at least some populist tendencies. Importantly, as a thin ideology populism can be easily combined with other ideologies and in this process ‘thickens.’ We propose to think about thickening, a process via which populist ideology acquires additional features, as one of the central conceptual foci of our project. There are several ideological components that
may be mixed with thin populism to generate its ‘thicker’ versions. (Radical) right-wing populism, an ideological formation of particular interest for many scholars – including us in this project – is an ideology fashioned by thickening thin populism with nativism and authoritarianism [Mudde 2007].

For Mudde, nativism is ‘an ideology, which holds that states should be inhabited exclusively by members of the native group (“the nation”) and that nonnative elements (persons and ideas) are fundamentally threatening to the homogenous nation-state’ [2007:19]. In turn, authoritarianism ‘is defined here as the belief in a strictly ordered society, in which infringements of authority are to be punished severely. In this interpretation, authoritarianism includes law and order and ‘punitive conventional moralism’’ [2007:23]. The manner in which both nativism and authoritarianism feature in concrete versions of populism depends on specific socio-cultural contexts that, moreover, evolve over time.

In our project we will identify and examine also other ‘thickening agents’ [Minkenberg 2015:28]. One candidate is obvious: the exclusivist, nationalized version of Roman Catholicism in Poland. We pay, therefore, attention to the role of (organized) religion in constructing specific populist ideologies, staging public performances and displays, and building organizations. Another candidate is an economic doctrine. As is amply demonstrated in various studies on Latin American populisms, they have been ‘thickened’ by economic ideas coming either from the left (say, Chavez redistributive system) or the right (say, Fujimori’s neoliberalism).

POPREBEL relies predominantly on the ideational definition of populism that facilitates seeing it as an ideology that can be present in political programmes to various degrees. This, in turn, makes comparing many countries – including those where populism is relatively weak – much more valid. Moreover, our work is based on a multi- and cross-disciplinary dialogue between political science, sociology, economics, and ethnography. Such a collaborative approach is necessary, as the phenomenon itself is multifaceted. For example, as has been amply demonstrated by many researchers working on right-wing populism, the causes of its rise are complex and range from economic deprivation to cultural alienation. To examine the relative weight of each factor and understand better their interactions across all European societies, we will engage in several projects that compare the situation in the ‘old’ and ‘new’ members of the EU, but will focus mainly on Central Eastern Europe because: (1) our team has deep and multi-disciplinary knowledge of this part of the continent, (2) we study a part of the EU where the right-wing populist parties are in power and this allows us compare their behaviour both as incumbents and as challengers, and (3) the specific history of CEE will allow us – we believe – to developed a sharp conceptualization of both the economic (neo-feudalism) and cultural (neo-traditionalism) forces driving populism.

Moreover, POPREBEL has planned for an online forum in English (alongside those in Polish, Czech and Serbian) as a channel for Europeans, both East and West, who do not speak those languages to participate in the discussion on populism and its features (as an ideology). We plan to run some engagement activities outside CEE countries, also exploiting opportunities that, we predict, will arise from the 2019 EU elections. Additionally, once we achieved a clearer picture of various forces at play and reconstruct patterns of their interaction, our findings will be applicable to other European countries. Our advocacy, advisory and policy-relevant work – central to our endeavour – will be based on a unique database collected via online ethnography, formulated and honed in a work package on foresight studies (deliberately designed to make our findings pertinent to the countries from outside of the region), and disseminated with the help of our communications package, designed to alert people to the dangers of populism, particularly its right-wing variety.

**Neo-traditionalism**

Most observers concentrate their attention on right-wing populists, as their boldly asserted nationalistic, exclusivist discourses and isolationist actions threaten the stability of European institutions. Importantly, we assume, that this populist, nationalistic and rightward shift of the political scene, not only in CEE, has not been simply manufactured top-down. Over the last several years, it has been presaged, underpinned and fuelled by the emergence of neo-traditional subcultures and trends in several areas of European life. While this process is feeding off the traditional elements of local cultures, it is also steered by populists who skilfully employ both ‘old’ and ‘new’ channels of communication and ‘package’ their ideas in attractive forms. Their political marketing makes the mainstream parties look old-fashioned and outdated, hence (in part) their success with younger voters. This **neo-traditionalism**, related to cultural illiberalism and
conservatism,\(^4\) is characterised by the emphasis placed on outcomes rather than procedures of the political processes; protection of a (national) collective rather than an individual; safeguarding of the ‘traditional’ social, particularly gender, roles; and an overriding concern with protecting the purity of the (national) community against the perceived threats of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism that in the Western Balkans of the 1990s intensified to the level of malignant warfare. In all countries the emergence of neo-traditionalism is associated with efforts to redefine the public cultures, often by suffusing them with religious elements (this process is most pronounced in Poland) and emphasising strict, traditionalist norms of gender and sexuality.

Over the last two decades or so, for many Europeans the world has become a somewhat alien place. The economic forces of globalization have shattered seemingly well-established security, turning many people, particularly young, into precariat. The liberal culture, practiced effortlessly by cosmopolitan elites, has turned out to be out of sync with at least some vernacular sensitivities and has ignored a few unexorcised demons of the past. People began thrashing around in the search for new certainties.

Nowhere has this crisis been more pronounced than in the former communist countries, where for quite a large number of people the anxieties engendered by accelerated modernity combined with the pervasive sense of post-communist uprootedness. Of course, others rejoiced in the fall of the communist system, recalibrated their lives and moved on. Not unexpectedly, post-1989 transformations have produced different reactions among different people. Given the intensity of these experiences, CEE is the best laboratory on the continent to study the processes that afflict many countries.

The communist system, often contested yet familiar and understood (if only in the sense of knowing how to survive, how to make things work, and how to secure available resources), disappeared and was replaced by something largely unknown. The key elements of this new, ‘mysterious’ system were: market economy, often in its crude, brutal version which produced much inequality; democratic institutions which demanded making difficult choices; and individualism which was often seen as too competitive and generating unjustified divisions. Openness towards the West brought an exposure to new cultural patterns, many of them quite different from the pre-1989 way of life. All this demanded new strategies of adaptation. Some reacted ‘constructively’ and positively, started businesses, acquired new competences, and learned new professions and skills (e.g. education boom in Poland of the 1990s). They accepted, or at least came to terms with new ideas and values. For others, however, the change resulted in a significant loss of security. Anxiety and fear of the unknown became widespread. This feeling of insecurity cannot only be understood in economic, political or even physical sense; it generates also an existential angst related to living in a world, which is unfamiliar and poorly understood. We suspect that this loss of mental security not only has led to frustration and disorientation, but has resulted in an inclination to try to escape modernity and hide behind familiar facades of tradition and nationalism. This – in turn – has led to political choices favouring strong leadership or even acceptance of neo-authoritarianism.

Tradition, including traditional religiosity, has emerged as a viable remedy, as it provides ready-made, simple answers, explaining the changing world and thus restoring a sense of security (at least in the mental aspect of it). It has become an alternative to what is perceived as forced, top-down modernisation. In the case of Central and Eastern European societies it leads to anti-Westernisation, refusal to accept new ideas and values, but also to xenophobic rejection of cultural ‘othersness’ increasingly seen as a threat. Those responsible for unwelcome changes at home are singled out (such as elites, post-communists, or the new rich), actual or potential enemies are identified (historical foes, traditional ‘aliens’ such as Jews, but also new ‘others’ such as Muslims). Among those cultural others are minorities, immigrants, Muslims, and the progressives, perceived as representing dangerous, strange, foreign cultures, ways of life, values and social norms. Cultural traditionalism, often closely intertwined with traditional religiosity, appears to be a solution, as restoration of security and much-needed ‘means of orientation:’ it provides a sense of familiarity and homelessness. Otherness is identified with threat to tradition and ‘normality.’ Generally speaking, traditionalism leads to a syndrome known as ‘intolerance, dogmatism and fear’ in which all three elements determine each other [Rokeach 1954].

Studies on neo-traditionalism understood as the rejection of modernity in former USSR and post-colonial countries of Asia and Africa were conducted by a number of scholars [Shekhovtsov and Umland 2009, Zhurzhenko, 2001, Burchardt

& Wohlrab-Sahr, 2013], however, this term has not been widely applied to countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

What is meant here by neo-traditionalism in the context of formerly communist societies of the region, indicates a new form of conservative, nationalist, close-minded worldview. Neo-traditionalism does not call for a return to pre-modern, rural, traditional communities and lifestyles. It is characterised by a wish to remain enclosed in stable, defined and secure communities, with set boundaries, united by a shared religion, ethnicity and national identity. An ethnically understood form of nationalism, exploited by populist movements, parties and leaders, is therefore a key frame of reference. Thus, neo-traditionalism in Central and Eastern Europe can be defined as an escape from the core values of modernity and rebellion against its main tenets, well exploited by populist and illiberal movements.

The return of tradition observed in the recent years is particularly worth of scholarly attention, as it raises questions on the ‘mysterious dormancy’ of traditional or even ultra-conservative values in the societies of the region. Despite apparent modernization, Europeanisation, adoption of new cultural norms and democratic values, international exchange and mobility, intolerance and dogmatism can easily be reawakened. The activation mechanisms vary. On the one hand, fear and anxiety are often generated by moments of crisis, real or perceived (the so-called migrant crisis of 2015, which has hardly affected Central and Eastern European countries, but bred racism and xenophobia, is a case in point). On the other hand, the role of populist, nationalist, often extreme movements, as well as charismatic leaders, cannot be overlooked. It is linked to a central question posed in this research project: what are the triggers and conditions for the emergence of neo-traditionalist values and attitudes, and how do illiberal populist movements respond to this demand?

**Neo-feudalism**

POPREBEL aims at capturing a phenomenon called ‘neo-feudalism in Central and Eastern Europe’ which is best defined as an economic subsystem of populist counter-revolution, strongly characterised with nationalistic, exclusivist and isolationist discourse. Its point of departure is a rhetoric construction about the moral and social decline of the ‘developed world’, emphasising the irreversible and unsustainable demographic tendencies and predicting a negative trade-off between progressive development and security. Neo-feudalism does not lie solely on relativising progressive narratives but on formulating a real policy regime, which offers security for locals against global insecurity and which ensures prosperous living standard (e.g.: price cut in electricity and gas, low inflation). Yet, parties with neo-feudal characteristics do not aim at promising a catching-up with the West. Given its conflict-oriented attitude, populist economic policy promises solutions for some inherent problems caused during the period of transition, but its apparent anomalies are tabooed (such as the deterioration of business actors under neo-feudal circumstances and its de-motivating effect on improvement of competitiveness).

The concept of neo-feudalism (in other words: modern feudalism, neo-feudal capitalism) was originally coined in 1950s and 1960s, as a criticism against the state–dominated economies. As George Reisman argues in his article written in 1961 about Galbraith’s thought on stronger public authority over US markets [Galbraith 1958]: ‘As was the case with the feudal lords of the pre-capitalist era, “public authority” is to have an unquestioned claim to a regular share of the fruits of others’ industry; it will distribute the products of others in accordance with what it, and not they, deems to be in “relative need”. And, just as in old Prussia or Tsarist Russia, the servants of public authority—the government officials and their intellectual flunkies in the tax supported schools and universities—will have prestige, while the businessman, who supports them, if not considered vulgar, will be regarded as unimportant’ [Reisman 1961]. Feudalism, as a generally pejorative concept, has appeared in different contexts, primarily referring to the possible overpowering authority of state elites [Wallerstein 1992] or corporations [Sinclair 2004]. Attacking the general (or mainstream) view on conservatism and especially neo-conservatism in the US, Zafirovsky [2007] tried to re-conceptualise American (neo)conservatism in terms of European feudalism (and medievalism) as neo-feudalism (and neo-medievalism). As far as the economy is concerned, he likened the economic system of the Southern Bible Belt to a neo-feudal master-servant economy [Zafirovsky 2009:145]. More recently, the concept of ‘neo-feudal capitalism’ has been recycled and used for depicting Vladimir Putin’s crony capitalist system that can undermine political and social stability [Aslund 2017]. Such deteriorating tendencies, however, are not unique to Russia and appear also in Central and Eastern Europe. Intensified state interventionism, the emergence of a new national capitalist elite (going hand in hand with corruption scandals), direct attacks on domestic, regional or global institutions, organisations or even firms are present in Hungary, Poland, Slovakia or Romania, too. Unfortunately, survey data suggest that people in CEE prefer market economy over planned...
economy much less than their Western European peers. The situation is hardly any better with regard to the comparison between democracy and autocracy [EBRD 2016]. Consequently, in many respects, neo-feudalism has become the twin-sister of neo-traditionalism.

Inequality and insecurity

The economic approach to populism is best understood by incorporating two, seemingly interrelated but in fact, quite different concepts; i.e., inequality (both in absolute and relative terms) and economic insecurity. On the one hand, inequality is conceptualised from a purely material approach. One of the most popular estimation for the traditional material inequality is the Gini coefficient (plotting the share of population against the share of income received). Based on this consideration, this research focuses upon measuring income inequality based on inequality in terms of wage earnings, non-wage earnings (e.g. pension, scholarship etc.) and capital earnings. Besides defining inequality as an absolute term, relative inequality is also conceptualised linking income inequality to economic insecurity. In order to conceptualise relative inequality, three dimensions are determined and studied:

1. ‘The grass is always greener on the other side’ approach; intra-state inequality (e.g.: urban vs. rural inequality)
2. ‘Good old days’ approach; intra-state inequality with time dimension (tendencies in inequality over time within the countries)
3. ‘Green with envy’ approach; inter-states inequality (tendencies in inequality over time between countries).

It is crucially important to understand relative inequality as it is built upon the concept of absolute inequality and the perception of it. The perception per se and the perception of economic opportunities (as a broader term) lead us to the concept of economic inequality.

The concept of economic insecurity is based upon the adaptation of Sen’s [1993] capabilities approach and by adding in the factor of perception or cultural construction. According to this project, economic insecurity incorporates the ‘capability approach’ and the term of ‘perception.’ Hence, economic inequality refers to the capability of achieving the kind of lives people have reason to value irrespective of the socially constructed groups, of race, of gender and of the country of origin. At the same time, it is assumed that the capability of achieving certain goals contributing to the well-being of individuals are highly dependent on perceptions, on what others have achieved, and on how others were incentivised and supported. According to Western et al. [2012:342] "insecurity describes the risk of economic loss faced by workers and households as they encounter the unpredictable events of social life". Dominitz and Manski [1997] provide a similar definition by stating that economic insecurity is the ‘individual’s perception of the risk of economic misfortunes’, while Jacobs [2007:1] successfully combines the two approaches of inequality stating that ‘economic insecurity is perhaps best understood as the intersection between “perceived” and “actual” downside risk’. Thus, not only is it necessary to focus on actual risk (measured in loss of wages, higher inflation, spiraling mortgage etc.), but also on the perception of negative tendencies exacerbating it (which is being endlessly communicated by populists). Bossert and D’Ambrosio [2013:1018] go one step further and state that ‘economic insecurity is the anxiety produced by the possible exposure to adverse economic events and by the anticipation of the difficulty to recover from them.’

(b) Methodology

Methodology in ethnography

POPREBEL aims to develop deep knowledge about how populism plays out at ‘street level’, in the everyday life of Europeans in CEE and outside of it. To do this, we deploy an open online conversation as a knowledge engine. Methodologically, this translates into a process that can be broken down into the following phases. All of them translate into WP2 activities. The brackets at the end of each bullet point indicate the related tasks (T), milestones (MS) and deliverables (D):

---

5 Corruption is the highest amongst developed economies in CEE countries like Slovakia, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Poland, Latvia and Slovenia [WEF 2016].
1. Don’t build a platform and hope a community will adopt it, but start from an existing online community and steer it towards understanding populism. The existing Edgeryders community and platform provide a core of early adopters for POPREBEL (T 2.1, MS 1).

2. To surface a full range of perspectives on how populism is perceived by its supporters and its opposers, seed it with high quality content from carefully selected early adopters, and rely on them to carry the POPREBEL information across their social networks. Do this through a strong, consistent social media presence (T 2.1, MS 6).

3. Constantly harvest, analyse, summarize content, and feed it back to the community for sense making. This makes it possible for any newcomer to understand what is being discussed at any point and maximises opportunities for interaction (T 2.1).

4. Manage closely the interaction between participants. Political discussion online tends to degenerate into posturing and shouting matches. We bring to POPREBEL world-class experience in community management: EDGERYDERS’ senior community manager, John Coate, was the first professional online community manager in the world, and more or less defined the field (T 2.1, D 2.2, MS 2).

5. Treat conversation as (ethnographic) data. A project at the scale of POPREBEL needs to be working with information in standard format, amenable to be processed by algorithms. In other words, the testimonies of POPREBEL informants, as well as the annotations made by ethnographers about them, have to be conceived of as data. Our concept of Semantic Social Network provides us with a data model (see above, 1.3.a). For results to be consistent, we document and standardised across the research group our practices of ethnographic research. We use tools such wikis, GitHub, etc. (T 2.3 and 2.4, D 2.3, D 2.4, D 2.5, D 2.6 and D 2.8).

6. Embrace open/free technology, data and knowledge. We are committed to make all results of POPREBEL, including its raw data, available to and accessible by all. This approach does not stem solely from our own values: placing POPREBEL’s outputs firmly in the commons we ensure a fairer deal with the community we convene, and therefore remove an important roadblock to participation (T 2.4).

7. Integrate seamlessly online and offline discussion environments. POPREBEL lives both on the online platform and in offline workshops, seminars, events etc. Integration with the online platform takes place through rigorous documentation: live feeds, media outputs and tight engagement in the follow up of events (T 2.2).

8. Distributed collaboration and ‘working out loud’. POPREBEL is committed to account for diversity and honour individual ways of engaging online. To maximize opportunities for meaningful participation we make use of tools and methods available in the social web, including: blog posts to show work-in-progress and document results ('working out loud'); wikis and shared documents to involve the community and project partners in content production; collaborative event building; community calls (through VOIP) for on-boarding and dissemination; distributed social media team to increase the reach of messages (T 2.1 and 2.2, WP 7).

Methodology in economics: methods for measuring inequality and economic insecurity

Inequality is measured on a material basis. One of the most popular estimation for the traditional material inequality is the Gini coefficient (plotting the share of population against the share of income received). Based on this consideration and incorporating more material aspects rather than only income, this research focuses upon measuring material inequality by using a 5x4 matrix in which wage earnings, non-wage earnings (e.g. pension, scholarship etc.), capital earnings and total earnings are on the top row, while the vertical part of the matrix focus on the income quintiles.

In order to measure relative inequality and its dimensions, tendencies in absolute inequality is going to be measured along the following aspects (D 5.1 - D 5.3):

1. Intra-state inequality; in a descriptive way, explaining how inequality differs within states in in a given period (e.g.: urban vs. rural);

2. Intra-state inequality; in a descriptive way, explaining how tendencies in inequality has changed within the state over a certain time period (tendencies in inequality over time);

3. Inter-states inequality; in a descriptive way, explaining how tendencies in inequalities between states have changed over time.

---

6 John was the community manager at the WELL, the first-ever online service to define itself as a community. He started working in the mid-1980s, predating the Internet itself. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_WELL](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_WELL)
Thereafter, the task is to identify what forms of relative inequality create the best context for the rise of populism (D 5.5 – D 5.7).

This project incorporates Sen’s capability approach and perception as a way of defining economic insecurity. As it has been discussed earlier, the capabilities of achieving certain goals contributing to the well-being of individuals are highly dependent on perceptions. In order to measure ‘economic insecurity’ and its highly subjective nature, we apply three different methods (D 5.7). The first measure aims at capturing the ‘economic opportunity’ aspects of insecurity, as proposed by Guiso et al. [2017]. This measure first incorporates whether the voter has been unemployed at some time in the past five years, forcing search for a new job; second, as a measure of financial distress, whether the voter is experiencing income difficulties, and an indicator of exposure to globalisation.

Second, in order to broaden our understanding, some elements of economic insecurity are measured by the framework proposed by Allardt [1993] and based on the trinity of ‘Having, Being and Loving’. Having covers economic resources, employment, working conditions health and education; Loving refers to attachment to local community, whilst Being is about political and leisure-time activities and meaningful work. Thus, it is necessary to focus not only on measurable indicators of inequality, but also on perceptions and anxiety, which are routinely whipped up by populists to gain support. Third, discourse analysis is carried out based on what various media platforms, politicians and scholars (via channels available for the public) think and communicate about the ‘inequality - economic insecurity - populism nexus’ (D 5.7).

**Methodology in political analysis**

Populism is viewed primarily as an ideological phenomenon which, while it can have multiple political colorations, is most consequential when it takes nativist, nationalist and socially illiberal forms. As is common with the study of the emergence and consolidation of new (types of) party, causal patterns are understood in terms of a demand side and a supply side factors [see, for example Mudde 2007, van Kessel 2013].

Demand side factors are typically measured and analysed quantitatively using individual-level survey data to ascertain to what extent (certain categories of) voters hold populist beliefs; what factors or issues drive them to vote for or support populist parties; what logics motivate their electoral choice (for example, self-interested ‘pocketbook’ calculations versus sociotropic assessments); how they perceive democracy and democratic institutions, including established parties and party systems [see T 4.3].

Although quantitative approaches and formal coding of ideological statements are sometimes used in supply-side analysis of populist ideologies, our research [for example, in WP 4] takes a more qualitative approach, focusing on programmatic outlooks, ideological discourses and speech acts. For finer grain analysis of the emergence and metamorphosis of populist appeals, theoretically grounded approaches such as critical discourse analysis drawing on Laclau’s [2005] and Wodak’s [2013] treatments of populism are deployed, for example in T 4.5. The materials analysed range from party programmes to interview with individual to aspects of popular culture, which can be seen as expressing not only populist discourses, but some of the performative aspects of populism as a political style [Moffitt 2016].

The integration of supply and demand perspectives is achieved through case-based comparative methods supplemented by process tracing and, for more complex ‘medium N’ sets of cases and causes, using formalised, computer-based ‘configurational comparative’ methods such as Fuzzy Set Qualitative Comparative Analysis (fsQCA). fsQCA can be used to study the ways in which supply and demand factors combine both to undermine conventional programmatic parties and drive the success of anti-establishment outsiders [Veugelers and Magnan 2005, van Kessel 2015].

**Methodology in social-cultural analysis**

While our project adopts the ideational approach to populism, we enrich it with insights from Moffitt and Tormey’s political style approach. In a nutshell, while the ideational approach concentrates on the content of populist discourse, the political style approach urges us to pay equal attention to its form. For example, in WP 3 we want to study populist aesthetics that has something to do with its emotional appeal. Moffitt and Tormey write:

> In this light, we define the concept of political style as the repertoires of performance that are used to create political relations. There are a wide range of political styles within the contemporary political landscape,
including populist, technocratic, authoritarian and post-representative styles, all of which have their own specific performative repertoires and tropes that create and affect political relations. [2014:387].

But why are some styles effective at certain places and points in time while they may be disastrously ineffective at other locations and times? In order to answer this question we need to study both the cultural “demand” and the supply of discourses, symbolic displays and performances. Populist rallies or demonstrations are staged and thus can be seen as a specific form of political theatre.

Theatralisation, or – more broadly – symbolisation of politics is one of the key features of the populist political style. We study the impact of that ‘theatre’ on public opinion and vice versa. It has been noted that: ‘populism gets its impetus from the perception of crisis, breakdown or threat’ [Taggart in Moffit and Tormey 2014:393]. There is no doubt, however, that staging threat- and anxiety-inducing performances or displaying threatening images can manufacture this perception. Therefore, the study of the supply side of populist politics cannot be limited to resources, organizations and strategic manoeuvres; the performative dimension of ‘populist supply’ needs to be an integral part of any comprehensive analysis. We analyse the rhetorical, visual or performative tools, guided, at least initially, by the idea that the populist style relies on binary simplifications and generates of exacerbates the polarization of (political) culture. To accomplish this we study populist discourses and imageries and employ the whole gamut of methods of content and discourse analysis, ranging from basic identification of discursive patterns to more daring interpretations of critical discourse analysis (see, for example, T 3.3 or T 3.6). For models we will follow consult, for example, [Wodak et al. 2013] for critical discourse analysis and [Gimenes and Schwartz 2016] for visual discourse analysis.

On the demand side, we also study short- and long term trends in cultures and subcultures, focusing particularly on the fluctuating patterns of dormancy and saliency of ‘traditional’ motifs (described in the section on neo-traditionalism in Project’s key definitions). The iterative interactions between these changing patterns (demand) and populist performances (supply) are of particular interest to this project. By far the most important source of knowledge about the evolving patterns of demand for populist solutions is the rich material generated by massive online ethnography whose results are analysed with the help of the novel method of semantic social network analysis (see WP 2 and sections 1.3b and 1.4.8). We will also rely on surveys, though our work will be largely based on the secondary analysis of the rich survey material available in the region. We also plan case studies and at least short ethnographic fieldworks.

1.4 Ambition

1.4.1 State of the art on politics and populism

On the political supply side, the key issues are the relative demobilization of the ‘old’ parties, the emergence of new political formations, the far-reaching redefinition of party systems and the ‘drift’ to the more radical right by many centre-right parties [Mudde 2016a]. It is pointed out that the ‘traditional’ ideological division of left and right has been gradually replaced by other divisions, for example the one reflected in the GAL/TAN scale that ‘measures party positions on the socio-cultural conflict dimension between a left “Green-Alternative-Libertarian” and a right “Traditionalist-Authoritarian-Nationalist” pole’ [Pytlas and Kossack 2016]. Important work has been done on the differential explanations of the rise of radical as opposed to centrist populist parties [Stanley 2017].

While studying the political demand side scholars look at the main features of the ‘traditional’ political setup (for example, the strength of the state and its mode of interaction with civil society [Minkenberg 2015]), electoral systems (for example, single member district versus proportional representation), the type of the party system, and the general state of the rule of law guaranteeing freedom of the political competition. The ‘decay’ of ‘traditional’ parties and party systems is examined, against the background of real or perceived corruption, unresponsiveness (democratic deficit, weak horizontal accountability) or ineptness of governments that generate anger and disappointment.

Fewer studies focus on various forms of counter-mobilization by anti-populist forces, for example women’s organisations fighting against neo-traditionalist limitations on the freedoms that many of them have begun taking for granted. But some researchers observe that in response to the rising demand for new political solutions, some old and new political actors started mobilizing and trying new solutions (on the right), while others demobilized (often on the left and centre),
contributing the redefinition of the political map. This process is increasingly well documented at the level of civil society, where the right achieved spectacular successes in the recent years [Ekiert, Kubik, Wenzel 2017, Ślarzyński 2017, Greskovits 2017]. What needs to be better understood is the relative demobilization and electoral decline of mainstream parties of the left and centre-left. This seems to be partly rooted in the origins of these parties as technocratic, market-friendly successors to the reformist wing of communist parties [Grzymala-Busse 2017]; partly in their relative lack of resilience when hit by corruption scandals [Grzymala-Busse 2018 forthcoming]; and, partly in cross-cutting cultural cleavages that have disrupted and cut across the traditional electoral coalitions of the left across Europe [Rovny 2018]. However, the precise linkages and processes leading to decline and demobilisation remain to be fully researched. Other left parties and politicians have themselves turned to forms of populism [Anderson 2016], which echo the left-wing social populism commonly found in Latin America, but blends elements of national-populism most commonly found on the right or in political practices of former ruling parties in South-Eastern Europe. Importantly, we have already learned that the patterns of mobilisation, demobilisation and remobilisation should be studied not just as political phenomena, but also as socio-cultural ones, pitting against each other cosmopolitan liberals and the adherents of a populist outlook whose dominant sentiments include anti-establishment élan, authoritarianism and nativism [Inglehart and Norris 2016:6].

1.4.2 Own contribution on politics and populism

The study of populism has drawn heavily on politological approaches to the comparative study of parties. Our work is designed to build upon the insights developed by comparative political science, adding a more multidisciplinary perspective and stressing the importance of economic and political-cultural factors both to the development of populist parties and the decline of their mainstream rivals. Most importantly, we emphasise the perspectives of ordinary citizens and aim to reconstruct culturally embedded reasons for their adoption or rejection of populist solutions.

In our work we incorporate central insights into populism developed by party specialists: the notion of populism as a ‘thin ideology’ hostile to elites, minorities and institutional checks-and-balances, which can take on many ideological colourations [Mudde 2007 Stanley 2008, Minkenber 2015]; the explanation of (party system) change as the interaction of political ‘supply’ and social/cultural ‘demand’ [Kitschelt 2007; van Kessel 2013; Mudde 2014]; models of populist party formation and organisation [McDonnell 2013; Heinisch & Mazzoleni 2016] and the conditions under which populist parties are stable or unstable [Bolleyer 2013]. However, we build upon these insights in several ways. Our work highlights that the growth of populism cannot be reduced to shifts in electoral behaviour which drive the rise new outsider parties, which then pressurise the political mainstream. We study the emergence of alternative movements, organized by the people who are dissatisfied with the status quo politics, who want to practice politics in alternative ways, and articulate political positions that are beginning to coalesce into a ‘parallel’ political reality that is neither ‘traditional’ nor populist. Most importantly, we intend to test the proposition that populist parties have risen on the back of the growth, remobilisation and/or radicalisation of distinct socio-cultural milieus or subcultures, a point which with a few notable exceptions [e.g. Art 2011, Greskovits 2017], has been largely overlooked in the political science literature on populist parties. This also enables us to deal with the emergence of illiberal populist ideologies and identities in more complex terms than simply applying Mudde’s [2007] classic three-part typology to identify radical right populism. We thus additionally focus on the process through which parties’ basic populist ideology is ‘thickened’ by the admixture of ‘neo-traditional’ discourses of social conservatism and conservative nationalism. We track this by examining populist parties’ links to civil society and the development of new cultural practices at the grassroots and in social media, moving away from an understanding of parties merely as formal organisational systems. Such a culturally-informed perspective, we believe, may hold one of the key to explaining why strong populist parties consolidated so quickly in states such as Poland where they had once seemed far from power.

Our emphasis on identity and its political-cultural construction also sensitizes to the fact that populism does not only emerge through the ascendency of newly arrived challenger parties, but also through the populist transformation and/or realignment of existing parties: governing populist parties in Poland and Hungary are well-established political players, once considered part of the mainstream European centre-right, not political newcomers. The election of Donald
Trump as in 2016 shows that the capture of mainstream parties by populists is not necessarily confined to Central and Eastern Europe. Finally, our broad perspective of the populist life cycle, which draws on the concept of waves of mobilisation in social movement studies, contributes a further innovative element to the study of party-based populism, building on the limited existing literature on party lifespan [Pedersen 1982; Herkman 2017].

1.4.3 State of the art on culture and populism

The social and cultural mechanisms seen as responsible for the rising popularity of populist solutions, are studied from a variety of perspectives. There are influential case studies, often autobiographical [see for example, Vance 2016 and Hochschild 2016], and large-n panoramas, for example based on the data collected in the World Values Survey [Inglehart and Norris 2016]. What these studies have in common is the idea that economic explanations alone are insufficient; something is going on in the social situations of the people who eventually find the populist promise compelling. It often is the loss of subjective social status, the lack of social mobility, employment instability (the phenomenon of precariat), or the growing sense of existential insecurity caused by the changing set of norms and expectations. Most researchers agree, however, that the phenomenon results from a complex interaction of economic and cultural factors [Gidron and Hall 2017]. The power of this interactive effect, resulting, for example, in the growing insecurity among men, seems to be particularly pronounced in the area of gender relations where it has been shown that ‘Economic and cultural developments intertwine most deeply … (and) combine to increase the subjective social status of women relative to men’ [Gidron and Hall 2017: S65]. The emergence of new social norms legitimizing acceptance of the LGBT+ people and their lifestyles has also engendered a strong cultural reaction that constitutes a crucial part of neo-traditionalism in which anti-LGBT+ sentiments are often packaged in nationalistic idioms.

In any serious study of the cultural context of the recent rise of (right-wing) populism researchers need to focus both on the long durée of CEE countries’ trajectories and the continuities as well as raptures in their cultures, but also on the more recent experiences of both the communist period and the post-communist transformations. Quite a few researchers argue that (proto)populist ideas and sensitivities, even if not fully articulated, lay dormant in at least some socio-cultural niches of the society. For example Taggart and Rovira Kaltwasser write:

Why is it that people adhere to the populist ideology? This is a question that so far has received little attention, in part because many scholars and practitioners are inclined to assume that populism is a top-down phenomenon. However, recent research has shown that the populist set of ideas is relatively widespread in society and, under certain circumstances, can be activated to mobilize voters who are angry about the current state of affairs (emphasis added) [2016:360].

1.4.4 Own contribution on culture and populism

Our project -- with the cutting-edge ethnographic methodology at its heart -- is designed to capture the mechanisms of activation of those dormant neo-traditional cultural themes. The explanation of their emergence will come from the project’s economists, sociologists and anthropologists; the provision of new scenarios for remedial actions will come from the whole team, working together in the final phases of the project with the group responsible for WP 6.

The originality of our approach resides in a combination of the unique data generated by WP 2 with qualitative and quantitative studies conducted in WP 3. We contribute to the study of both the demand and supply sides of the cultural dimension of the rise of populism. From the point of view of demand, the relative success of populist framing and the growing acceptance of the populist style have something to do with the prior existence and eventual re-mobilisation of neo-traditionalism, a cultural formation that will be carefully theorized and empirically diagnosed in our work.7

In our work on the supply side we emphasize that the rise of populism is as much a political-economic phenomenon as a cultural one. At least since the mid-2000s we observe in the CEE region not just the rearrangement of the political arenas, but also considerable remapping of cultural fields. Populist cultural-political entrepreneurs create new organizations, set up new media outlets, and promote their visions with growing effectiveness. We study the formation

7 For an in-depth analysis of illiberal/populist discourses and the conditions of their viability see Wodak et al 2013.
of populist narratives in various media as well as visual displays and public performances via which these narratives are disseminated. Right-wing populists often argue that post-communist transformations have been botched, because ex-communists and particularly groups of former communist secret service operatives have retained too much power, at least behind the scenes. They promise to complete the revolution. In this sense communism and its legacies are kept alive in the populist discourse and imagery. On the other hand, other populists, for example in Slovakia and the Czech Republic, promise to end what they diagnose as the chaos of the post-1989 transformation process itself.

One of the populism’s two chief enemies (another one being the ‘aliens’) is the elites [Brubaker 2017a: 1192]. Blamed for many if not all shortcomings of the new system and the unwanted outcomes of the political and economic changes, the elites have been the target of occasional criticism before the rise of right-wing populism. The project will investigate to what degree the elite behaviour after 1989 warrants such interpretations and to what degree they are a 'manufactured' element in the repertoire of partisan framing.

1.4.5 State of the art on economy and populism

According to the scholarly literature, the rise of populism is predominantly socially- and culturally-driven phenomenon [Inglehart and Norris 2016]. Yet, the economic roots of populism cannot be neglected, either. POPREBEL has a strong preference for the first narrative; but it does not intend to downplay the importance of economic factors, either.

According to standard trade theory, globalisation is expected to narrow income disparities within developing countries [Stolper and Samuelson 1941]. Contrary to theoretical expectations, a number of empirical studies found that globalisation is associated with the expansion of income inequality [e.g. Lee 2005; Rudra 2008]. Furthermore, inequality as a consequence of globalisation, can be an ideal context within which certain authoritarian political forces can thrive [e.g. Huber et al. 2006; Lee 2005]. Guiso et al. [2017] argued that economic insecurity – including exposure to competition from imports and immigrants – is a driving force for the rise of populist parties.8

Since the eruption of the global financial crisis and in light of the prolonged economic recovery afterwards, a rising distrust towards markets along with increased reliance on state interventionism can be observed worldwide. Emerging countries (Brazil, Argentina our India) turned towards state capitalism, a form of market economy that has a preference for public property and active state interventionism [Kurlantzick 2016]. Dustmann et al. [2017] pointed out that there was a high correlation between populist vote and the poorer economic conditions of the Euro-area countries. In principle, the welfare states of European nations were supposed to moderate the adverse effects of globalisation. However, globalisation largely constrained the room for manoeuvring of EU governments. Anti-EU, euro-sceptic, highly populist forces have gained momentum in Europe.

The situation of CEE countries has been even more contradictory. Economic transformations of post-communist economies were driven by the Washington Consensus. After being introduced to private property and exposure to market forces, CEE economies experienced a painful transformational recession [Kornai 1994]; the rise of their living standards did not happen overnight. Moreover, international financial institutions along with the European Union conditioned both their technical and financial support on the unwavering commitment of CEE to their prescriptions.

1.4.6 Own contribution on economy and populism

The relationship between the economic performance of a given country and the emergence of demand for populist parties will be central for the work of WP 5. We will test the hypothesis that inequality is associated with the rise of welfare/leftist populism (as in Latin America and Southern Europe), whereas insecurity is more pronounced in countries where populism takes the right-wing turn (CEE). In other words, we will examine the validity of the idea that insecurity-driven fears and frustrations have led to the growing support for security populism that tends to be

8 Becker et al. [2016], focusing on the case of the UK, argued that austerity and immigration played a significant role in Brexit. Others found a much more direct impact of globalisation on the increasing support for Brexit. Authors showed that individuals highly affected by the import shock, were more likely to vote for Leave.
right-wing. We also try to clarify (1) how governments make use of people’s fears of (economic) insecurity and (2) what (economic) policy regime is established if populists make it into the government.

Economic populism in CEE is, however, not without redistribution – but its object is wealth rather than income. We aim to demonstrate that incumbents have embarked on both wide-scale privatisation and re-nationalisation programmes (from public utilities to the banking sector) in order to actively support an elite change in the region on a massive scale. These new national capitalists are the almost exclusive beneficiary of public procurement projects financed mostly by EU funds. Rent-seeking activity and corruption are natural side-effects of these politically motivated acts.

In the context of CEE, we argue that the backlash against free market economy and globalisation was not triggered simply by growing (vertical) inequalities, but rather by growing uncertainty and insecurity. The work in WP 5 will test the proposition that the perception of security, more precisely the perception of economic security, is the main cause of the rise of populism in CEE. What populists offer is an escape into the past, i.e., into the feudal past of the region. In brief, we hypothesise that in CEE people are increasingly preoccupied with stability rather than equality.

The literature is unanimous that globalisation leads to an ever increasing gap between the top and the ‘left behind” across countries and individuals within countries. This tension creates a perfect context for radical views can thrive.

We claim that the economic regimes of the region should not be assessed by the usual binary dialect of democracy and dictatorship, but in relation to feudalism, which was dominant in the region until the end of the 19th century [Bottoni 2017]. The most recent right-wing or national economic populism does not promise the delivery of the living standard of the most developed Western countries; instead, it promises socio-economic security. In turn, we argue that a special form of economic populism has emerged in CEE, one that can be directly linked to neo-feudal capitalism. The project will demonstrate that neo-feudalism in the subsystem of economy is, in fact, the twin-pair of neo-traditionalism in culture and politics, the main focus of POPREBEL, in CEE.

1.4.7 State of the art on ethnographic methodologies for large-scale studies

Ethnographers study individuals as community members: how people with their own unique worldviews and life experience live together and act in social groups. Ethnography is a qualitative research technique aimed at discovering how a certain group of humans perceives a set of issues. Its unique value lies in that its findings encode the culture and worldview of the group being studied. Social and cultural meanings that arise organically from human interactions are the main objects of research rather than pre-conceived, researcher-imposed analytical categories. Ethnographic coding, or simply 'coding', is the act of associating keywords to excerpts of text in the transcripts of the interview with key informants, or other text that can be ascribed directly to key informants.

Traditional ethnography is oriented towards one or a few physical sites, involving a small amount of participants and a few researchers at a time [Geertz 1973, Abu-Lughod 1991]. As ethnographic methodologies have been applied to the parts of everyday life that unfold online, they are no longer limited in terms of site, but can still only encompass a limited amount of information from a small number of participants, as the manual coding and qualitative analysis of such information is time-consuming and costly [Emerson 2013, Goffman 1989].

Conventionally, the in-depth qualitative richness of ethnographic analysis on the micro level of social interaction has been seen as irreconcilable with macro level statistics and quantitative methods. As a consequence, ethnography is commonly not understood to scale well. A series of recent experiments with computationally intensive analysis of large corpora of social data, however, demonstrated the potential of computationally enriching the ethnographic toolbox [Munk et al. 2016]. This enrichment can take several forms, for example as network analysis of large datasets related to social interactions that suggest hypotheses or questions for further ethnographic exploration in the field [Munk & Jensen 2015, Munk & Ellern 2015], or as ethnographic facilitation of data analysis with informants [Munk et al. 2017].

A recent contribution proposes a data model to encode ethnographic materials that is amenable to representation as semantic social networks [Cottica et al. 2017]. This move allows to deploy methods from network mathematics to process contributions from key informants in network form. For example, it becomes possible to compute quantitative measures of the strength of the connection between ethnographic codes.
1.4.8 Own contribution on ethnographic methodologies for large-scale studies

We build on the semantic social networks approach in order to extend the reach of ethnography as a discipline. Specifically, we mean to field-test four extensions to the method proposed in Cottica et al. [2017]:

1. Multilingualism
2. Open coding standards
3. Multimedia coding
4. Computational methods.

**Multilingualism.** POPREBEL’s raw ethnographic data (mostly contributions written on the POPREBEL forum) span across four languages: Polish, Czech, Serbian and English. For consistent analysis, the social semantic network must keep track of the fact that ‘bezrobocie’ is the roughly same thing as ‘nezaměstnanost’, which is the same thing as 'unemployment'. At the same time, it should preserve information about the language that the original contribution was made in, as the connections taken for granted in one language might well vary across different languages. We address this problem by an innovation in the data model of semantic social networks: the introduction of hierarchies of ethnographic codes. This means arranging codes in a hierarchy, where the parent node encodes the semantics (in our example, unemployment) and the children nodes encode the language-specific formulation of the semantics.

The network can then be induced at the level of parent node, allowing to map the entire conversation across all languages, or at the level of the children nodes, allowing to map the conversation in each language as its own separate network.

**Open coding standards.** Ethnographic coding in POPREBEL is the responsibility of a team of ethnographers operating across the project’s four languages. They must seek maximum consistency across their works, making sure that they really mean the same thing by 'bezrobocie' and 'unemployment', and that all contributions by informants are coded with the same code when the informants point to the same concept. For example, one informant might talk about unemployment, and another about lack of jobs. If they mean the same thing, the same code should be used for both contributions. We address this problem by documenting our ontology of codes, in the same sense that open source software developers document their code. This is done through an evolving wiki (D 2.4, D 2.6) where codes are defined and translated. This ensures maximum accountability of the coding process.

**Multimedia coding.** The populist rebellion uses non-textual expressive means like pictures, videos and animated GIFs. In order to incorporate them into our work, we need software to annotate and code multimedia object as well as text (D 2.1). This method is known, but it has not been attempted in the context of semantic social network analysis.

**Computational methods.** Semantic social networks induced by studies at the scale of POPREBEL tend to be very large and unwieldy (thousands of codes, tens of thousands of connections between them). To get a 'big picture' of the conversation that is legible by human researchers, the network needs to be reduced, discarding 'weak' connections and keeping 'strong' ones. So far, the strength of a connection between two codes has been measured by simply counting the number of times the two codes occur together on the same informant contribution. We mean to test other reduction methods and compare them with this one. Two examples of alternative reduction methods: Simmelian backbone [Nick et al. 2013] and count after degree normalization [Giatsidis et al. 2011] (T 2.4).
2. Impact

2.1 Expected impacts

GOVERNANCE-03-2018 ‘Addressing populism and boosting civic and democratic engagement’ calls for research that analyses the phenomenon of populism and its consequences for European democracies and the European project, develops innovative ways of understanding and addressing the causes of populism, and identifies strategies for strengthening democratic values and practices. POPREBEL directly addresses this call through its key objectives:

1. to build a new, interdisciplinary model to describe, interpret and explain the rise of populism in the CEE region;
2. to use the model to assess the replicability of populism’s trajectory in Europe beyond CEE;
3. to develop and apply new tools and methodologies for ethnographic analysis to support large-scale, multilingual and multimedia data, combined in our analysis with the data sources generated by more traditional methods.

The findings generated by POPREBEL will have academic, policy and socio-political impact.

In terms of academic impact, POPREBEL will produce a wealth of theoretical insights, qualitative and quantitative empirical data as well as a range of publications, web material and public events, thereby reframing debates and producing a step-change in our understanding of the causes and consequences of populism as well as advancing new interdisciplinary methods and approaches to study populism and theories to explain it.

In terms of policy impact, POPREBEL’s new, interdisciplinary theoretical models will allow activists and policy-makers to map the most likely future trajectories of populist politics in the CEE region and thereby allow them to make timely and targeted interventions.

In terms of socio-political impact, POPREBEL recognises that populists succeed by taking seriously the frustration and sense of loss and disorientation felt by those ‘left behind’ and will thus identify the elements of identity narratives that appeal to potential or actual supporters of populist parties but can be reframed by anti-populists to be compatible with democratic values and practices.

More specifically we will engage with four groups of stakeholders:

1. General Public. We open a channel for ordinary Europeans to be “key informants”, discharging rich personal lived experience into POPREBEL’s WP2. Since we have the capacity to treat these experiences as ethnographic material, we can and will credibly promise to give them a real voice in the POPREBEL sensemaking exercise.

2. Civil Society Activists. In its drive to map experiences (rather than only opinions), POPREBEL’s WP2 offers civil society activists a space to compare notes. Which activism techniques are being tried? What works? What backfires? What are the obstacles and opportunities?

3. Policy and law makers. Our engagement seminars within the foresight scenarios work package will include special sessions with politicians and policy-makers. These will not only present the findings of our foresight activity, but establish a dialogue in relation to where populist politics is headed in Central and Eastern Europe.

4. Academic community. It goes without saying that an important outlet for this project will be interaction with the academic community through conference presentations, working papers and final scholarly publications. In addition, however, we will engage this stakeholder through direct participation via, for example, an outreach seminar during the construction of the foresight scenarios planned within WP6. A special session will be scheduled where academics will be able to provide their feedback and input on the foresight tools to be developed for the entire research programme.

---

9 Many students of populism have called for time-sensitive and better targeted counter-measures. See, for example, Downs [2012], Rummens and Ants [2010], Rovira Kaltwasser and Taggart [2016].
Increased capacity for respectful listening and narrative construction (objectives 1 and 2)

The POPREBEL online conversation styles itself as a space for respectful listening. Tight community management means that online interaction is prevented from degenerating into online brawls. This is necessary for the voice of true experience to be heard; and that voice, in turn, is necessary to fully understand, even empathize with, the lived experience of informants. This is what ethnography is good at. The ultimate impact of spaces for respectful listening and carefully applied ethnographic methods is, of course, an enhanced capacity for informed, sophisticated narrative construction. The current narratives about supporters of populism by its opponents are oversimplified, and often dehumanising ('rednecks', 'obscurantists', 'irrational', 'stupid'). This is not helping understanding the phenomenon. Ethnographic data, rich in lived experience, can help build better ones.

A greater capacity for respectful listening and sophisticated narrative constructions impacts both science and society. They initially happen in POPREBEL. But, once built, the capacity stays with us as a society. Since the ethnography in the project happens in an open conversation, hundreds of people are part of it; additionally, narratives constructed in POPREBEL’s are duly disseminated. These participants, the ‘children of POPREBEL’, can then take community management techniques and narratives with them, onto societal dialogue at large and political activism.

1. Indicators and targets for respectful listening: 5 flame wars or fewer over a conversation of about 3-4,000 posts, squelched within 48 hours.
2. Indicators and targets for improved narrative construction: 10 stories on ‘the making of a populism supporter’ that opponents of populism can identify with (‘that could have been me’).

An additional source of impact: extending the reach of ethnography as research technique (objective 3)

Semantic social network analysis (SSNA) is now at the prototyping stage\(^{10}\), but it already has proven to be able to deal with hundreds of informants. We aim to extend its reach into multilingual and multimedia corpora. We will achieve this by (a) developing open standards for ethnographic coding; (b) developing new methods for filtering large quantities of ethnographic data, based on applications of network science; and (c) developing support for SSNA both within a single language and across all POPREBEL languages. Please find a detailed methodological overview in section 1.3.b.

Large-scale ethnography is, in a very real sense, collective intelligence [Cottica 2017]. And extending the reach of collective intelligence is essential at this time. The rise of populism in Europe is a ‘wicked problem’ humankind is currently struggling with. There are others: climate change, mounting inequalities, feral finance. Not only no solution seems in sight for them, they are so blurry at the edges that we are unable even to produce an exhaustive list of the relevant agents. Additionally, they interlock with each other and with other large systems, including political and religious beliefs, so that they induce controversy and division.

Recruiting collective intelligence into the effort to tackle these problems offers two benefits. First, it increases the sheer amount of brain power deployed, as well as its diversity. Second, it offers everyone a way to contribute. Inclusivity and openness breed societal trust, and this in itself makes participatory solutions more sustainable.

We evaluate techniques to tap collective intelligence along three dimensions.

1. **Robustness to cognitive biases**, particularly framing biases. The same people give different answers to the same questions when it is framed differently. For example, when estimating the value of something, asking the question in terms of loss will result in a higher estimation than asking it in terms of gain [Tversky and Kahneman 1985]. Biases must be compensated for to obtain dependable results.
2. **Robustness to poor or incomplete problem definition.** This is critical for attacking ‘wicked problems’ as discussed above, as well as the specific issue of the understanding European populism that we tackle directly in POPREBEL. Techniques should allow the exploration of a complex problem as well as a frontal assault to it.\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) In the course of the OpenCare project. See 1.3.4, Connected research/Innovation projects.

\(^{11}\) There is growing recognition that humans are good at solving problems without having defined them first [Von Hippel and Von Krogh 2015, Stock et al. 2017]. While we are not aware of attempts to port this ability to a collective dimension, it is plausible (and obviously useful) that these experiences should inform collectively intelligent debate.
3. **Scalability.** Scalable techniques can process more brainpower and be more participatory and inclusive.

### 2.2 Measures to maximise impact

#### a) Dissemination and exploitation of results and methodology

**Dissemination and exploitation of the research results**

One of the central concerns of POPREBEL is to have an impact on research, policy-making, activism and public debate, not only during the project but also beyond its completion. Diffusing and disseminating the work and the findings of POPREBEL to a range of target audiences is thus an essential part of the overall objectives.

One of our key target groups will be civil society activists working through a range of channels to promote support for democracy and respect for equality. POPREBEL dedicates three specific outputs to civil society activists. We target, however, the general public as well as ‘professional’ activists, as future activists will come from the ranks of the general public. These outputs include:

1. A catalogue and evaluation of policies that worked and did not work in preventing or defusing populist dynamics (D 5.7).
2. A catalogue and evaluation of civic and political tactics and forms of activism that worked and did not work in preventing or defusing populist dynamics (T 4.1; D 4.5).
3. A final impact conference, targeting not only academics, but also – and especially – activists, politicians, journalists. Comparing notes, learning from each other, with POPREBEL functioning as a way to find and systematize the existing experiences. This is meant to boost the immune system of Europe’s democracy by giving extra tools to the people in its frontline (T 7.5, MS14).

A second target group consists of policy- and law-makers – in all branches of government – at the local, national, European and international levels. Policy briefs and papers as well as the research-to-policy seminars and the research roadshow will help us to engage policy-makers in our work.

A third target group is academics. This project will generate a wealth of theoretical insights, qualitative and quantitative empirical data as well as a range of publications, web material and public events, thereby producing a step-change in the academic study of populism. For the academic audience, our publications and participation in international conferences will provide the necessary basis for academic discussion and exchange.

The fourth target group is the general public. All of our research outputs will be freely available and disseminated as widely as possible so as to generate public debate.

Given the strong emphasis on dissemination and interactive media, POPREBEL will incorporate the feedback we receive from academics, policy-makers, activists and the public into our work and use this input to formulate an agenda for follow-up research. Before POPREBEL is concluded, all consortium partners will identify and frame research questions that emerge from the project and the feedback from stakeholders not answered during the duration of the project itself. By disseminating our findings through our networks and being part of an on-going exchange in the stakeholder community, we will ensure a sustainable and vivid discussion of our key findings that will not stop with the formal expiration of the project.

In order to achieve this, we will benefit from the existing platforms and distribution channels that our consortium partners bring into this project. At UCL SSEES, by having direct access to a range of different networks with an outreach that is worldwide, we have a global audience of end-users and researchers working on populism and related questions. They will help disseminate our findings and engage in discussions on our work completed to date and on the future directions of research.

We will also benefit from the network of partners from our parallel International Training Network on ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE),
which span the economic (EBRD), political (Transparency International, Foundation Institute for Strategic Studies), civil society (Amnesty International, Minority Rights Group Europe, International Organisation for Migration, Prague Civil Society Centre, Integration and Migration Foundation) and cultural and historical (Jewish Historical Museum, British Library) sectors.

**Dissemination and exploitation of the research methodology**

POPREBEL aims to have an impact on the way social research is done in general, not just on populism. This impact rests mostly on an enhanced robustness of semantic social network analysis as a research technique to tap into collective intelligence. This method is still in its infancy; POPREBEL contributes to its development by building experience on how to deploy it and incorporate its results in interdisciplinary research, and by extending it in several directions (see section 1.3 for details). EDGERYDERS, a SME which operates in the field of expert advice based on collective intelligence, is already marketing SSNA as its flagship methodology. It is in its best interest to make its profile as high as possible. Therefore, we engage media, commentators and pundits to raise awareness of POPREBEL and, through it, of the properties of SSNA. Populism is a top-of-mind issue at the moment. We expect good results from this dissemination effort, which also results in dissemination of the methodology.

EDGERYDERS’ client base already includes large, global players like the United Nations Development Program, the World Bank Group, UNESCO and several European cities: EDGERYDERS is in close contact with all of them, promoting SSNA as part of their array of methods to gather collective intelligence. Any such adoption is likely to influence other organisations to do the same. All adoptions, of course, increases the impact of POPREBEL. The World Bank Group has already commissioned EDGERYDERS a study on social innovation in the Arab states based on the SSNA methodology.

**b) Communication activities**

Our communication and dissemination strategy outlined here is only the starting point and serves as a preliminary blueprint that will guide us as we seek to reach the maximum possible outreach to academic, policy-making, civil society and public circles within the EU and beyond. The detailed dissemination plan will be thoroughly discussed at the kick-off meeting and will be subject to further refinement at each consortium meeting. The overall objective of the strategy is to ensure that the research activities and findings of the participating researchers enjoy maximum visibility, multimedia versatility as well as use and engagement by a range of relevant audiences and stakeholders. Our guiding principles and the rationale for the dissemination strategy are the following:

1. Stakeholders will not only be treated as dissemination targets but will also engage early on in the design and content of the research in order to achieve maximum policy relevance and use of the results.
2. Communication activities will draw on the networks of the beneficiaries – at the local, national, European and international levels as well as with reference to specific sectors – to ensure the most targeted and effective outreach to different stakeholder groups at the most appropriate level.
3. Multimedia and social media afford new opportunities to present, disseminate and engage in research. We are committed to taking full advantage of these opportunities in a strategic way, not by adding to information overload and embracing novelty for its own sake, but by carefully reviewing and selecting new tools and channels in view of the specific dissemination audience and purpose.

In order to disseminate the project results as broadly as possible both during the project and after its completion, the communication strategy of POPREBEL will include the following measures:

1. Provide a communication platform for the consortium that makes it easy for all partners to communicate with each other and to engage with policy-makers, targeted practitioners and other stakeholders. The website will be an interactive means of profiling, disseminating and discussing results and publications. The platform will host the following:
   a. Working papers, thought pieces, open-access academic articles and policy papers
   b. Video clips (in the form of bite-size vignettes) of researchers explaining their findings
   c. Interactive blog posts, written by the POPREBEL researchers
d. Links to the project Facebook site and Twitter account  

e. General information in multiple languages on different aspect of populism, linking to the websites of the organisations of our academic beneficiaries and partner organisations.

2. Organise a research roadshow, whereby groups of POPREBEL researchers will visit specific CEE cities and organise a series of events aimed at different target audiences, i.e. workshops for anti-populism activists, advisory meetings with local politicians, seminars with academics and students, etc.

3. Publish work highlighting the synergies between the various projects by means of at least 1 edited book and 1 special journal issue in addition to numerous individual articles and research reports, which will be available via open access (gold model). This includes policy briefs and papers on different WP topics, highlighting the objectives of the research, the scientific approach and methodology with the new knowledge produced within the programme and identifying key messages for POPREBEL’s target groups. In addition to being uploaded to the project’s website, all policy briefs and publications will be disseminated via other platforms available to our consortium, while all researchers will send publications to their respective networks.

4. Use multimedia and data visualisation tools as well as social network tools – including Facebook, Twitter and video clips – to make research findings accessible in the most engaging ways for activists and the broader public and ensure that lessons learned are widely debated and circulated. We will use a selected set of research outputs that are conducive to multimedia representation and appeal to a broader audience and produce in conjunction with the authors engaging data visualisations, audio-visual packages and interactive multimedia representations tailored to specific target audiences (all available on the POPREBEL website). This set of visually engaging and multimedia-enhanced materials will document key research findings, including a podcast author interview series and online data platform that allows users to interactively visualise and explore some of the datasets and case studies generated.

5. Convene panels and roundtables at academic conferences (e.g. BASEES and ASEEES). In addition, individual researchers will promote their findings of the POPREBEL project at national and international workshops and conferences. At the end of the project, we will hold an academic conference at one of the partner universities.

6. Convene a series of research-to-policy workshops to facilitate essential face-to-face communication and discussion of results between academics and policy makers and lay the foundation for policy impact. These workshops will be organised in cooperation with our partner organisations. All the workshops and stakeholder conference will allow for the exchange of information and discussion between researchers, civil society activists, political and economic actors and members of the public.

7. Organise a final impact conference, to socialize knowledge about how different public policies and political tactics can boost the immune system of European democracy (T 7.5, MS14)

8. Publish op-eds, articles in national and international print media and relevant blogs, such as the Freedom House Blog. It is the intention of the project to encourage the publication of short articles, commentaries or essays in national and international print and online media during the lifecycle of the project. Both academic and non-academic partners will make use of their existing connections to newspapers for that purpose.

9. Influence the current academic debate on populism in order to make it more responsive to policymakers and practitioners’ needs and inform evidence-based programmes with measurable impact by exploiting the channels provided by our partner organisations, which have links with national and EU legislative bodies.

From an internal consortium perspective, POPREBEL will contribute to stronger links and exchange between the participating partners and different academic disciplines. At the same time, the consortium comprises institutions from old and new EU member states and accession states, manifesting the continuous need to foster the cooperation of research institutions across Europe, thus contributing to the progress of the European Research Area.
3.2 Management structure and procedures

The task at hand requires effective project management to deliver high quality results. The project management approach chosen guarantees transparency and commitment to all engaged partners and thus facilitates an unobstructed and successful project evolution. The management structure of POPREBEL builds on the management structure of the pre-existing consortia of the IMESS programme (International Master’s in Economy, State and Society, which has been in operation since 2006 and received Erasmus Mundus funding for the first five intakes of students) and of the FATIGUE programme (Marie Curie-Skłodowska International Training Network on Populism), on which all academic partners are already represented.

Our management structure will be organised following the standard Desca model. The structure and decision making rules will be laid down in the Consortium Agreement. POPREBEL will be professionally managed by a UCL’s European Research and Innovation Office (ERIO).

The General Assembly (GA) is the highest level of management and the board for strategic direction of the project. It consists of one representative per partner in the consortium. The GA is the only body within the project that decides on contractual issues, including the budget, timescales, deliverables and reallocation of effort. Decisions are taken by a majority vote, with each member of the GA having one vote. The GA will meet face-to-face every year and more frequently by Skype, if required. The day-to-day management of POPREBEL is delegated by the GA to the Supervisory Board (SB).

The SB will ensure efficient daily management of POPREBEL, timely delivery of the project’s deliverables and realisation of its overall research objectives and milestones. It will also ensure the operation of the communication lines inside and outside the project’s remit. The SB consists of the Principal Investigator and the Work Package Leaders and is chaired by the Principal Investigator. The SB is responsible for quality assurance of all deliverables of the project and will implement all required procedures. Members will attend each of the six-monthly consortium meetings as well as the seminars, academic conference and research-to-policy workshop. As the membership of the POPREBEL and the FATIGUE projects overlap, SB meetings will be coordinated to maximise efficiencies. POPREBEL will have an Advisory Board (AB), comprising world-leading experts in the field.

The Principal Investigator (Prof. Jan Kubik, UCL) will ensure that the project plan is executed in fulfilment of the contract with the European Commission. The Principal Investigator will coordinate research and innovation activities, monitor progress, coordinate reporting to the European Commission and act as a link between the POPREBEL project and other related projects, initiatives and commercial bodies. When necessary, the Principal Investigator will be supported by the Co-Investigator (Dr. Richard Mole, UCL) in the performance of his tasks. All decisions that are made by the SB will be executed by the Principal Investigator, who can in turn delegate this to the appropriate Work Package Leader.

The Project Manager (appointed by ERIO) will interface with the European Commission and assist the Principal Investigator in all administrative, legal and financial matters to ensure that the project programme, milestones and timescales are carried out efficiently. The Project Manager will control the quality assurance procedures, identify bottlenecks and control the risks in implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that all Intellectual Property Rights used or generated by the project are managed in accordance with the Consortium Agreement during the contract preparation phase and the legal requirements of the partners. The Project Manager is responsible for all contractual financial reporting.

3.2.1 Management processes

Collaborative management approach

The approach to managing POPREBEL rests on an extended effort to make sure each partner is comfortable both with the project as a whole and with their role in it. This was achieved by a wiki-based – thus decentralized, collaborative and
transparent – approach to proposal writing and budgeting. No one is taking responsibility for activities (s)he is not confident (s)he can carry out in an excellent way, and that (s)he has not co-designed (her)himself. Careful time- and dependencies planning has been carried out. Partners are committed to full within-consortium transparency and tidiness of process, based on wikis, fora and issue tracker technology.

**Reporting as accountability to the research community as a whole**

Rather than engaging in box-ticking, we treat reporting as an opportunity to be accountable not only to the European Commission as a funder, but to the broader POPREBEL and TRANSFORMATIONS communities. To do this, we commit to an extra effort for short, appealing reports that can be re-used for dissemination, for example in forms like blog posts or slidecasts.

**Frequency of management meetings**

The first instance where the Consortium members come together is at the POPREBEL kick-off meeting. Thereafter, the members of the GA and the SB will meet in person, at the annual project meetings, where the GA will be updated on the progress of the project by the SB. Academic partners will also organise an academic conference and research-to-policy workshop. Conferences not organised by the consortium will be attended by partners where there is scope to promote the results of the project. Extraordinary meetings may be called as required (preferably as Skype conferences) and as specified in the CA. The details of the organisation of the meetings and the timing will be specified in the CA which will be in place before the project start date.

**Compiling and submitting reports: partners responsible for reporting financial, legal & scientific tasks**

WP leaders will be responsible for collecting the scientific reports concerning their WP. The WP leaders will report to the Principal Investigator according to a specific timeline, using standard templates. These communications are to update the Principal Investigator on WP progress and to signal any potential threat to meeting objectives as well as to raise any financial issues from the point of view of WP objectives and deliverables. WP leaders also report at SB meetings on their domain of responsibility.

Progress of the project in terms of achieving objectives and resource consumption at participant level is also monitored by interim reports delivered to the SB by all participants using a standard template. This will then be submitted to the Principal Investigator.

Reports required by the contract, are drafted by the WP leaders and the Principal Investigator, using inputs from the participants and all appropriate levels of management. Electronic mail is the normal means of communication, also for the exchange of documents. Rules and procedures for the formats of documents will assure easy exchange and efficient handling. In addition, telephone conferences will be arranged as needed.

As part of the ongoing monitoring and reporting process, the achievement of the below KPIs will also be assessed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPREBEL: key performance indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>KPI type</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process and outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Decision-making processes and conflict resolution**

Agreement will usually be reached first by informal contact, followed by official confirmation via e-mail, letter or by agreed written minutes. For important issues, the agreement may take the form of a short report that needs to be signed by those responsible for decision-making. Non-technical factors, such as resource allocation and contractual terms, will also need to be agreed and documented in writing.

Technical issues/conflicts within given contractual commitments that do not involve a change of contract, a change of budget or a change of resources/overall focus will be discussed/solved at the WP level first. The Principal Investigator will be informed in case conflict affects the work plan and expected results, or if no solution is reached. In the latter case, the Principal Investigator will make every effort to mediate, if necessary involving other members of the SB. In case the SB cannot solve the conflict, the issue is referred to the GA. The GA will attempt to reach a unanimous decision in all cases. Should consensus not be achieved, decisions will be reached by simple majority vote, each delegate having one vote. Should a conflict not be resolved by this mechanism, the Principal Investigator will formally consult the EC PO to make a concerted decision on the matter. The details and the timing of the conflict resolution and decision-making procedure will be specified in the CA, which will be in place before the project start date.

**3.2.2 Management of resources**

In the CA the conditions on payment procedures, in case it should become necessary, are laid out. As a basic rule all partners receive an initial advance payment aligned with their assigned work and the budget that goes with it for the first year. During the following periods the Principal Investigator will transfer payments following approval of all deliverables by the EC. Should any factor (irrespective of whether it is an objective cause or caused by the contractor) emerge, which can be expected to lead to a delay, or which actually causes a delay, the contractor has to inform both the WP leader and the Principal Investigator without any delay. All parties concerned are obliged to attempt to find a solution taking into account the contractual obligations vis-à-vis the European Commission.
If it is reasonable to expect that the contractor cannot perform in time or, if after a reminder, a new deadline has not been met, the Principal Investigator, in coordination with the WP leader, is authorised to shift the (remaining) work and the funding that goes with it to another contractor who can assure the required competencies and who offers to complete the work. The same applies mutatis mutandis if the work delivered by a contractor does not meet the quality level and criteria as described in the proposal. Conflict resolution will follow the path described above. This procedure ensures a high degree of security and flexibility and will help to assure that work will be delivered according to plan even if a partner may fail for any reason within or beyond his authority to perform the assigned work.

3.2.3 Innovation Management

POPREBEL is expected to produce a number of innovations. Some will be technological (such as the advancement and unprecedented application of cutting edge software applications in WP2); others will be methodological and incremental (practices for eliciting more informative contributions from citizens, interdisciplinary researchers working with shared datasets, more effective ways to reduce large semantic social graphs, expert humanities scholars working in collaboration with engaged citizens inclined across the populist spectrum etc.).

Our management approach to them is as follows:

1. Triage. Determine if the innovation at hand is likely to be useful outside of the project, or in unforeseen areas of the project’s scope. The interdisciplinarity and community management across the consortium through the shared datasets of WP2 will be central in detecting and discussing innovations with potential impact.
2. Prototype. If 1 checks out, develop an applicable methodology of it in one of the case studies that can be shown with pride to third parties.
3. Pitch. Approach potentially interested third parties with the methodology. These will be identified with the help of the communications and dissemination and stakeholder engagement strategies - such as policy makers, other academic departments working in grassroots responses to populism, community groups - as well as via existing partners and networks of the consortium.
4. Develop. If a third party is interested, this is treated as an opportunity. The development of the innovation or feature is re-prioritised. Its deployment outside the project integrated with that within, so as to exploit that opportunity while being respectful of the POPREBEL process.

The innovation management process is addressed in WP2 and WP8 specifically but spans the project as a whole. It will be led by EDGERYDERS, in collaboration with all consortium partners, who will detect innovation arising from their respective scientific fields and ensure the first step (triage). Other steps (prototyping, pitching and developing) will then be dealt mainly by will be dealt mainly by EDGERYDERS, the partner most naturally prepared to bring the innovation to various stakeholders and markets.

3.2.4 Intellectual Property Rights

The POPREBEL consortium is committed to ensuring that all of our outputs are made open access and our data is made available for other researchers to use, and to encouraging the successful exploitation of intellectual property (IP) and maximising the value of IP for the benefit of those involved in its creation. Prior to the launch of POPREBEL, each partner will identify the background it is bringing to the programme (e.g. social scientific knowledge, methods and data) and how this will be used, both individually and jointly, for generating and exploiting results. The principles for the use of partners’ background as well as the conditions under which partners can/cannot disclose information will be set out in a separate Memorandum of Understanding. Special attention will be paid to ensuring that any third parties’ rights to the background are not infringed in the generation and exploitation of project results. Any potentially valuable IP produced by POPREBEL researchers will be recognised, protected and exploited in line with national and EU legislation (especially, 2008/416/EC) and we will encourage researchers to make full use of the European IPR Helpdesk (www.iprhelpdesk.eu) as well as the legal services of their home institutions. At UCL, for example, IP generated will be developed in cooperation with UCL Business (the university’s internal IP specialists) and governed by the university’s IP Policy. A UCL Business representative will act as IP rights manager for the project, while ultimate responsibility for the management of IP lies with the POPREBEL Supervisory Board.
3.3 Consortium as a whole

The POPREBEL consortium comprises academic partners from Western Europe, Central Europe, South-Eastern Europe and the Baltic and, as such, includes ‘old’ and ‘new’ EU member states and an EU candidate country. These partners form an interdisciplinary team of highly qualified and experienced scholars and researchers in the fields of political science, sociology, cultural studies, history, economics and anthropology. An SME, EDGERYDERS, brings to the table world class expertise on engagement, online community convening and management, and ethnography-based semantic social network analysis. Such a project team is ideally suited to carry out a project like POPREBEL, the research interests and theoretical foundations of which lie at the intersections of socio-political sciences and the humanities, and whose ambition is to have a powerful practical impact.

Due to the mixed qualitative and quantitative nature of the project, partners are drawn from those who have been engaged in both research methodologies, so as to ensure the highest quality of research from the team. The consortium also benefits from a wealth of experience in collaborative research projects and a combination of academic work with experience in policy-oriented research. Importantly, many of the researchers have experience of interdisciplinary collaboration and have the competence to communicate across disciplines. Given the scope and aims of POPREBEL, no single researcher has the capacity to cover all the areas which are essential for meeting the ambitious aims of the project. Therefore, a strong effort is made to ensure optimal use of the various competences and enable a quantitative and qualitative understanding of the factors that promote or hinder the development of populism. The division of the work among the partners reflects their geographical and thematic expertise in the areas covered by the project.

The non-academic partners in the parallel FATIGUE programme also map onto these disciplinary and subject areas: economic (EBRD), political (Transparency International, Foundation Institute for Strategic Studies), social (Minority Rights Group, Amnesty International, Foundation for Migration, Halina Nieć Legal Aid Center) and cultural and historical (Jewish Historical Museum, British Library).

The academic partners have been working together since 2006 on the Erasmus Mundus IMESS programme and have many years’ experience of developing joint teaching, supervision and academic procedures. All of the academic partners are also involved in the FATIGUE ITN programme. UCL will apply its experience of managing the IMESS and FATIGUE consortia to the management of the POPREBEL project. We will make full use of the experience of the various non-academic partners in the fields of policy development, public and stakeholder engagement and research dissemination for the aims and objectives of the POPREBEL programme.

3.4 Resources to be committed

POPREBEL is bringing together leading researchers from seven organisations with the common goal of achieving an integrated, qualitative and quantitative understanding of populism. The effort required to complete POPREBEL and disseminate its findings will encompass 563.85 person months.

Table 3.4.1: Summary of staff effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>WP1</th>
<th>WP2</th>
<th>WP3</th>
<th>WP4</th>
<th>WP5</th>
<th>WP6</th>
<th>WP7</th>
<th>WP8</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>44.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNI</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>24.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>112.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project is planned for a period of three years, which is required to accomplish the research goals. Meeting the high quality standards that the project is setting will require investing significant amounts of person months. The requested financing of 563.85 person months will be fully dedicated to the execution of the work plan presented here.

Other direct costs account for 27.98% of the budget, which largely includes dissemination activities to ensure that the research activities and findings of the consortium enjoy maximum visibility, multimedia versatility as well as use and engagement by a range of relevant audiences. These resources will be used for the involvement of project partners in the organisation of workshops and conferences as outlined in WP6 and are therefore essential for the dissemination of project results, spreading best practice and knowledge both within and outside of the project. Significant activities in this regard are the series of targeted research-to-policy workshops and a research road show.

This project mobilises resources for partners based both in ‘old’ EU member states, ‘new’ EU member states and EU candidate countries. An effort has been made to include young researchers, particularly females, and train them.

While every effort has been taken to ensure an even distribution of costs across the consortium, this has been made difficult for a number of reasons. First, personnel costs in ‘old’ EU member states are higher than in ‘new’ member states and candidate countries. Second, as the coordinating institution, UCL has had to budget for items which are of benefit to the whole consortium (e.g. dissemination costs), which increases the relative share of funding going to the UK.

POPREBEL is created by a Consortium that has already worked together for about ten years on other programmes and is collaborating on another EU funded project, FATIGUE (Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism. GAP-FATIGUE-765224-H2020-ITN-2017, Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA). Since several colleagues are engaged in both projects, we will rely on the existing synergies to run them in close collaboration with each other. This will have two major benefits. First, the ESRs (young scholars trained in FATIGUE) will have many opportunities to interact with and learn from more senior scholars and experienced researchers involved in POPREBEL. As a result an organic, interactive intellectual environment facilitating mutual learning will be created. Second, we intend to organise several POPREBEL and FATIGUE events and workshops together and this will allow us to distribute their costs, for example for accommodation, between the two projects, generating overall savings. The meetings of the POPREBEL Supervisory Board (SB) and General Assembly (GA) will be scheduled immediately after the corresponding meetings of the FATIGUE project. The general rule that we will follow in sharing such costs is simple: the expenses related to participation of FATIGUE ESRs and their training will be charged to the FATIGUE budget, while the POPREBEL budget will provide funds for all activities and costs related to research. None of the FATIGUE MSCA Fellows will participate in POPREBEL research activities nor will they claim any costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>FATIGUE Event</th>
<th>POPREBEL Event</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Methods Workshop + SB meeting</td>
<td>SB meeting</td>
<td>50% FATIGUE 50% POPREBEL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The cost of the joint FATIGUE and POPREBEL website will be split 30% FATIGUE 70% POPREBEL.

### Table 3.4.2: ‘Other direct cost’ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCL</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>86,375</td>
<td>4 Project workshops/meetings – 3 days – 4 people (€ 25,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Project workshops/meetings – 3 days – 3 people (€ 9,375.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Conferences (EU) – 3 days – 3 people (€ 9,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Conferences (international) – 3 days – 3 people (€ 15,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Fieldwork (Czech Republic) – 14 days – 1 person (€ 9,125.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Fieldwork (Slovakia) – 14 days – 1 person (€ 9,125.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 Travels to project meetings / EC reviews for 1 ERIO Project Manager (€ 3,750.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Project meetings – 1.5 days - 2 Advisory Board members (from EU) (€ 3,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Project meetings – 1.5 days - 1 Advisory Board member (from outside EU) (€ 2,400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td>98,330</td>
<td>Organisation of seminars and workshops (€ 25,000.00), Organisation of research-to-policy workshop (€ 5,000.00), Organisation of project meetings (€ 10,000.00), POPREBEL impact conference (€ 15,000.00), Website (€ 20,000.00), Promotional materials (€ 11,500.00), Publication (€ 8,000.00), Audit (€ 3,830.00).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184,705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CUNI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Project workshops/meetings – 3 days – 2 people (€ 4,800.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Project workshops/meetings – 3 days – 1 person (€ 4,800.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Conference (international) – 3 days – 1 person (€ 2,500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Conferences (international) – 3 days - 1 person (€ 2,500.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other goods and services | 4,000 | Conference fees (€1,000.00)  
| | |  
| | | Open Access fees (€ 3,000.00)  
| **Total** | 18,600 |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>UJ</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost (€)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Travel** | 154,490 | 6 Project workshops/meetings – 3 days – 6 people (€ 36,000.00)  
| | | 2 Conferences (EU) – 3 days – 6 people (€ 12,000.00)  
| | | 2 Conferences (international) – 3 days – 4 people (€ 20,000.00)  
| | | 2 Project workshops and 2 conferences (EU) – for Research Assistants – 3 days – 4 people (€ 24,000.00)  
| | | Cost of field trips for researchers (conducting interviews in Poland & other EU countries) (€ 62,490.00)  
| **Other goods and services** | 63,360 | Cost of editing and proofreading of articles (€ 21,500.00)  
| | | Open Access fees (€ 10,000.00)  
| | | Cost of transcription and translations of interviews (€ 22,000.00)  
| | | Audit (€ 4,000.00)  
| | | Funds for local dissemination (€ 2,000.00)  
| | | Research Software (MaxQDA/QDAMinor) (€ 2,500.00)  
| | | Funds for research software training (€ 1,360.00)  
| **Total** | 217,850 |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CUB</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost (€)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Travel** | 125,130 | 5 Project Workshops/meetings – 3 days – 4 people (€ 19,020.00)  
| | | 1 Project Workshop/meeting – 3 days – 6 people (€ 5,706.00)  
| | | 2 Conferences (EU) – 3 days – 6 people (€ 18,276.00)  
| | | 2 Conferences (international) – 4 days – 6 people (€ 38,128.00)  
| | | 4 Study trips – 30 days – 1 person (€ 44,000.00)  
| **Other goods and services** | 65,000 | Cost of editing and the proofreading of manuscripts (€ 12,000.00)  
| | | Cost of conducting surveys (€ 23,000.00)  
| | | Cost of buying access to databases (e.g. the Hungarian Statistical Office) (€ 16,000.00)  
| | | Audit costs (€ 4,000.00)  
| | | Reaching out to the local and Corvinus University Community (€ 10,000.00)  
| **Total** | 190,130 |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>UTARTU</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cost (€)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Justification</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Travel** | 28,180 | 4 Project Workshops/meetings – 6 days – 2 people (€ 8,760.00)  
| | | 1 Conference (EU) – 4 days - 2 people (€ 1,580.00)  
| | | 1 Conference (EU) – 4 days - 8 people (€ 6,320.00)  
| | | 4 Conferences (International) – 4 days - 2 people (€ 11,520.00)  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other goods and services</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          | 2,739    | Transcription services (€ 2,000.00)  
|                          |          | Organisation of seminars (€ 739.00)  
| Total                    | 30,919   |               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UBFF</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Travel                   | 32,800   | 3 Project Workshops/meetings – 3 days – 3 people (€ 9,000.00)  
|                          |          | 1 Project Workshop/meeting – 3 days – 4 people (€ 4,000.00)  
|                          |          | 4 Fieldwork (Croatia, BIH, Macedonia, Montenegro) – 5 days – 1 person (€ 5,800.00)  
|                          |          | 2 Conferences (Western Balkans) – 2 days – 2 people (€2,000.00)  
|                          |          | 8 Conferences (EU) – 3 days - 1 person (€ 9,200.00)  
|                          |          | 2 Conferences (International) – 4 days - 1 person (€ 2,800.00)  
| Other goods and services | 7,391    | SPSS software (2,391)           
|                          |          | Open Access fees (5,000)       
| Total                    | 40,191   |                                   |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDGERYS</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Travel                   | 75,000   | 6 Project Workshops/meetings – 3 days – 4 people (€ 18,000.00)  
|                          |          | Outreach and onboarding meetings x 12 – 36 days – 3 people (€ 18,000.00)  
|                          |          | Outreach and onboarding workshops x 12 – 36 days – 4 people (€ 28,500.00)  
|                          |          | Community management training – 3 days – 2 people (€ 1,500.00)  
|                          |          | Ethnographic ontology coding training – 3 days – 6 people (€ 4,500.00)  
|                          |          | Ethnographic ontology coding meetings x 6 – 6 days – 1 person (€ 4,500.00)  
| Other goods and services | 81,400   | Outreach and onboarding workshops –event costs x 12 – (€ 36,000.00)  
|                          |          | Community journalism program - 40 guest posts at € 250 – (€ 10,000.00)  
|                          |          | Impact conference – event costs (€ 30,400.00)  
|                          |          | Audit costs (€ 5,000.00)            
| Total                    | 156,400  |                                  |
4. Members of the consortium

4.1. Participants (applicants)

Partner 1: University College London (UCL)

Partner Description
UCL is consistently placed in the **global top 20** across a wide range of university rankings (currently 7th in QS World University Rankings 2018). Furthermore, the Thomson Scientific Citation Index shows that UCL is the second-most highly cited European university and 12th in the world.

UCL’s total research grant spend was £452m in 2016-17. UCL retained and strengthened its position as the top performing university in Europe in the first three years of Horizon 2020, having been awarded funding in excess of €52.5m in 2016-17. In total 85 projects were funded in 2016-2017, bringing the number of H2020 projects funded since the programme was launched to 352, with a total value of over €212m. UCL researchers were awarded 21 European Research Council Grants and 34 Marie Curie International Fellowships. In line with its position as a European research powerhouse, UCL has expanded its European Research and Innovation Office as a dedicated central support and project assurance service for all Horizon 2020 projects in which it participates. This service includes a specialist European Project Management section employing five full-time members of staff.

The **UCL School of Slavonic and East European Studies** (UCL SSEES) is one of the world's leading specialist institutions, and the largest national centre in the UK, for the study of Central, Eastern and South-East Europe and Russia: more than 60 academic staff work at UCL SSEES, teaching and conducting research in the history, economics, politics, sociology, anthropology, culture, literature and languages of the countries of the region. SSEES has five interdisciplinary research centres and leads the inter-university Centre for East European Language Based Area Studies. SSEES has some 200 graduate students on MA degrees or undertaking PhD research, with a range of studentship opportunities. SSEES has an unrivalled range of BA degrees with over 500 students.

Personnel Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title &amp; Full Name:</th>
<th>Prof. Jan Kubik (Male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position in Organisation:</td>
<td>Professor of Slavonic and East European Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Profile
I am Professor of Slavonic and East European Studies at University College London (UCL) and Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University. At UCL I work at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies (SSEES) and have a function of the Scientist-in-Charge in a large international project Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism. FATIGUE. Between 2015 and 2017 I was SSEES Director and Pro-Vice Provost for Europe at UCL. Before moving to London, I served in several major functions at Rutgers, including Chairmanship of the Department of Political Science.

I have, therefore, extensive experience in running larger institutions and coordinating – organisationally and intellectually – the work of large collectives and research teams. Several of my own research projects listed below have been collaborative and have produced very well reviewed results.

I study the interplay between power (politics) and culture, protest politics and social movements, post-communist transformations and the rise of populism. I also write about qualitative methods in the social sciences. My first
and one of the most recent books, *The Power of Symbols against the Symbols of Power* (Penn State Press) and *Anthropology and Political Science* (Berghahn, with Myron Aronoff) are the best exemplifications of my approach. In another recent project, co-organized with Amy Linch and sponsored by the Social Science Research Council in New York, I led a team of top experts who took a critical look at the field of post-communist studies: *Postcommunism from Within: Social Justice, Mobilization, and Hegemony* (NYU Press). I study politics and culture comparatively, but the principal source of my observations and data are Poland and East Central Europe.

My work on the relationship between culture and politics finds the most recent expression in another collaborative research project: *Twenty Years After Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration* (Oxford University Press). Michael Bernhard (University of Florida) and I developed an original analytical frame, proposed a theory of the politics of memory, and led a team of exceptional scholars to investigate the politics of commemorations in 17 post-communist countries. We studied the way 1989 is collectively remembered, how this remembering is politicized, and how it influences the course of democratic consolidation. Our theory has been now referred to and tested by a number of scholars.

During the last few years I have returned to my earlier interest in the philosophy and methodology of the social sciences (particularly interpretive and ethnographic approaches and cross-disciplinarity) and contributed to this area through teaching, writing, and participation in conferences and workshops. My synthesizing work has been very well received and I have been recently invited to contribute to several major handbooks (see my bibliography below).

At the moment I am completing a large empirical project entitled “Strategies of collective protest in democratizing societies.” It has been conceived, planned, and organized mostly by Grzegorz Ekiert (Harvard) and myself. The main product of its first stage was: *Rebellious Civil Society. Popular Protest and Democratic Consolidation in Poland, 1989-1993* (University of Michigan Press). The book has been broadly reviewed and won two awards: (1) The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies/Oribis Polish Book Prize, awarded to the best English language book in any discipline (2000) and (2) the Bronislaw Malinowski Social Sciences Award, awarded by Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences of America (2001). Using our own, unique database, we are writing a book on Poland: *From Communism to Authoritarianism via Democracy: Puzzles of Poland’s Political Transformations*. We are also working with several colleagues, on the project’s second and final phase entitled: *The Logic of Civil Society: Contentious Politics in New Democracies: Poland, Hungary, South Korea and Taiwan, 1987-2011*.

I received M.A. (sociology and philosophy) from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland and Ph.D. (anthropology, with distinction) from Columbia University in New York City.

**Role in the project:** I am the project’s Principal Investigator and a contributor to Work Package 2 (Participatory Online Conversation) as a community manager and ethnographer in Polish. I will be responsible for all aspects of the project and will concentrate, in particular, on the delivery of innovative policy recommendations for all types of actors interested in combating the rise of populism that threatens the stability of Europe and the world.

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**


---

**Title & Full Name:** Dr Richard Mole (Male)

**Position in Organisation:** Senior Lecturer in Political Sociology, Deputy Director, Head of Research

**Profile**

I am Senior Lecturer in Political Sociology, Deputy Director and Head of Research at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies at UCL, having arrived in 2003 as an Andrew Mellon Post-Doctoral Fellow. I have MPhil and PhD degrees in International Relations from the University of Cambridge and the London School of Economics, respectively. I am an experienced qualitative researcher with extensive survey design, interviewing and discourse analysis skills and advanced knowledge of German and Polish. My research focuses on the relationship between identity and power, with particular reference to sexuality, nationalism and migration. In 2010 I completed a two-year project on the ‘Sexual Attitudes and Lifestyles of London's East Europeans’ in collaboration with the UCL Centre for Sexual Health and HIV Research, funded by the UK Medical Research Council. In 2011 I was awarded an Alexander von Humboldt Fellowship for Experienced Researchers and was a Senior Research Fellow at Humboldt University in Berlin in 2011-12, where I conducted research on the lives of LGBT migrants. In 2013 I curated the UCL-European Parliament Sakharov Debate on ‘LGBT Rights as Human Rights’ and organised international conferences on ‘Soviet and Post-Soviet Sexualities’ (2015) and ‘Queer Migration and Asylum in Europe’ (2017). I am the Principal Investigator of a Marie Curie-Skłodowska International Training Network on ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE), which received funding of €3.5 million from the European Commission.

I have published widely on issues of sexuality and nationalism in high impact peer-reviewed journals (_Slavic Review, East European Politics and Societies, European Journal of Social Psychology, Nations and Nationalism, Ethnicity and Health, Sexually Transmitted Infections_), in the media (BBC, Bloomberg, Radio Liberty, Russia Today, Correio Braziliense, The Conversation, The Economist) and in blogs. I am committed to knowledge exchange, having discussed LGBT rights in Russia and Eastern Europe on panels organised by Amnesty International, European Parliament Representative Office and the Westminster-Russia Forum. I have briefed UK ambassadors to Latvia and Lithuania on domestic and foreign policy, have advised Baroness Suttie of the UK House of Lords on Russian and East European politics and provide expert reports on asylum and human rights cases for lawyers in the UK and US.

**Role in the project:** I will act as Co-Investigator, one of the co-ordinators for Work Package 3 (Culture) and as a researcher on task 3.5 (Homophobia and populist politics in Poland, Czech Republic and Germany). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Edited volume on populism and sexuality
2. Article on populism and homosexuality in Eastern Europe

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**
I will also act as researcher on WP4 for the set of task examining the rise of an illiberal populist left in Central Europe and the responses of social democratic parties to populist challengers. The resulting deliverable (D4.2) will comprise sub-reports on:

- Illiberal populist trends on the social democratic left in Czech Republic and Slovakia.
- Social democrats’ responses to right-wing populists and populist technocratic in Czech Republic and Slovakia.
- Populism and comparative success of social democratic parties in Central Europe.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Partner 2: Univerzita Karlova v Praze / Charles University (CUNI)**

**Partner description**
The Institute of International Studies (IMS) is an organisational part of the Faculty of Social Sciences at Charles University in Prague. The Institute offers Bachelor’s, Master’s and Doctoral degree programmes in Area Studies and Modern and Contemporary History. The Institute’s research concentrates on memory studies, transformations in the 20th century, the role of violence in inter-ethnic relations and nationalist movements, and bilateral and multilateral relations with respect to four primary regions: the former Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe, German-speaking countries, Western Europe and North America.

**Personnel Involved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title &amp; Full Name: Dr Maria-Alina Asavei (Female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position in Organisation: Lecturer in Cultural and Memory Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile**
I am a Lecturer in Cultural and Memory Studies at Russian and East European Department (Institute of International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University in Prague) and independent curator of contemporary art. I curated several international exhibitions of contemporary art and material culture in collaboration with artists and cultural activists of Romani ancestry (in Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and France). These contemporary art exhibitions tackled the rampant growth of Romaphobia in Europe and beyond. In 2011 I was awarded an honorary research fellowship at City University of New York (CUNY) and in 2014 at the American Research Centre in Sofia (ARCS) to conduct research on collective art production, art and politics during modern dictatorships and applied arts/material culture. My research interests revolve around critical political theory, cultural studies, aesthetics, ethnography, memory studies and forms of artistic engagement during and after totalitarian regimes. In 2015-2017 I was awarded a Post-doc fellowship at Charles University research centre of Collective Memory to conduct research on *Critical Cultures of Remembrance in Eastern Europe*. From 2017 I am a co-investigator in the research project “Beyond Hegemonic Narratives and Myths:

**Role in the project:** I will act as a researcher for WP 3 (Culture) and as a supervisor of CUNI’s work on ethnographic coding. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Author of the report on visual manifestations of populism in art and popular culture (D 3.4)
2. Author of the report on strategies of resistance to populism (D 3.5)
3. Participation in international conferences, workshops, congresses (e.g. European Consortium for Political Research; ASEEES)
4. MA course on Popular Culture, Social and Cultural Memory and Populism in CEE.

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**

2. Maria-Alina Asavei (2017) “Call the Witness”: Romani Holocaust Related Art in Austria and Marika Schmiedt’s Will to Memory, Memory Studies, Vol.4

**Partner 3: Uniwersytet Jagielloński / Jagiellonian University (UJ)**

**Partner Description**

The Institute of European Studies is part of the Faculty of International and Political Studies at Jagiellonian University – the leading and oldest university in Poland. The Institute is known for its interdisciplinary approach, combining the perspectives of anthropology, economy, cultural studies, political science and international relations, history, law and sociology.

The Institute of European Studies participates in research networks and international consortia, notably it has been partner in the EU 6th Framework Programme “RECON. Reconstituting democracy in Europe”, coordinating the Work Package “Identity formation and Enlargement”. IES participated in ISCH COST Action IS1203 “In search of transcultural memory in Europe (ISTME)” network (2012-16). The Institute was also part of the Jean Monnet Network European Identity, Culture, Exchanges and Multilingualism (EUROMEC) (2014-2017) and from 2017 is partner in Jean Monnet Network ‘The European Union at the Crossroads of Global Order’ (EUCROSS) (2017-2020). IES has been hosting nationally funded projects, among others Democratic control and legitimisation in European foreign policy. The case study of EU Enlargement Policy and European Neighbourhood Policy (2012-2018) and Local Poland and the European integration - a decade of experience (2012-2014), financed by the Polish National Science Centre.
IES hosts a variety of BA, study abroad and international MA and PhD programmes. IES’s international programmes branch, Centre for European Studies (CES) hosts 2 PhD programmes under the Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Innovative Training Network: ‘Post-Crisis Legitimacy of the European Union’ (PLATO) (2016-2019), coordinated by ARENA Centre for European Studies in Oslo, and ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE) (2018-2021) coordinated by University College London.

### Key Personnel Involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Full Name:</th>
<th>Prof. Zdzislaw Mach (Male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in Organisation:</strong></td>
<td>Dean of the Faculty of International and Political Studies, Professor at the Institute of European Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile**

Zdzisław Mach is Professor in the field of sociology at the Jagiellonian University, Krakow, specializing in social anthropology and European studies. H-Index: 11. He currently serves as Dean of the Faculty of International and Political Studies. He obtained his MA in sociology in 1978 and his PhD in 1984. Between 1993-1999, he was the Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, between 1993 and 2012 he has been Director of the Institute of European Studies, and since 2012 he was the Rector's Proxy for International Relations at the Jagiellonian University. He is also professor at the School of Administration, Bielsko-Biała (Poland) and permanent visiting professor at the Centre for Social Studies, Warsaw. He has held visiting professorships and fellowships at many academic institutions at leading European and American universities. He has supervised several international research projects dealing with European integration, democracy and collective identity, transnationalisation of social movements in Europe in the 20th and 21st centuries, and attitudes toward European integration in Polish society. He has published and edited 16 books and numerous articles on collective identity in Central and Eastern Europe, the transformation of identity in Polish-German borderland and the role of memory of Holocaust in Polish and European collective identification. He is also Principal Investigator in two 2 PhD programmes under the Horizon 2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Innovative Training Network: ‘Post-Crisis Legitimacy of the European Union’ (PLATO) (2016-2019), coordinated by ARENA Centre for European Studies in Oslo, and ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE) (2018-2021) coordinated by University College London.

**Role in the project**

Scientist-In-Charge for the JU team of researchers in the project; co-leader of WP1; researcher in WP 1 (10% FT); researcher in WP3 (10% FT). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the conceptual report on neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism (state of the art and application to contemporary debates) (D1.1)
2. Report on neo-traditionalist turn in CEE (D1.3)
3. Co-author of the report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 (D3.1)
4. Co-author of the report on communicating and teaching Europe (D3.8)
5. Co-author of the report on returning migrants and their value systems (D3.12)

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title and Full Name:</th>
<th>Dr Agnieszka Sadecka (Female)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position in Organisation:</td>
<td>International programmes academic coordinator at the Centre for European Studies; Local project coordinator for the H2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Innovative Training Network: ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE) (2018-2021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile</td>
<td>I work as academic coordinator of international MA programmes at the Centre for European Studies of the Jagiellonian University, and as local project coordinator for the H2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions Innovative Training Network: ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE) (2018-2021). I teach courses related to European cultures, literatures and identities at BA and MA programmes run at the Faculty of International and Political Studies. Between 2012-2015, I was an Erasmus Mundus Fellow at the Joint Doctorate Programme &quot;Cultural Studies in Literary Interzones&quot;, coordinated by the University of Bergamo, Italy. My doctoral thesis, &quot;Exotic Others or Fellow Travellers? Representations of India in Polish Travel Writing in the Communist Era&quot;, was defended at Eberhard Karls Universitaet in Tuebingen, Germany and Jawaharlal Nehru University in New Delhi, India. My international experience includes studies and research in Bologna (Italy), Cluj-Napoca (Romania), Leuven (Belgium), St. Petersburg (Russia), as well as an internship at Europaeum in Oxford, UK. In 2007, I graduated in European Studies at the Jagiellonian University in Krakow, Poland, and worked there as a teacher, researcher and student adviser between 2007-2012.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Role in the project | I will be a co-leader of WP 3 (10%), and a researcher in WP T1.1 (15%) and WP T3.9 (25%). The deliverables will be as follows:  
1. Report on diagnosing post transformational dissatisfaction in culture  
2. Co-author of the report on religion, national myths and xenophobia (anti-migrant feeling) as elements of neo-traditionalism (D1.4)  
3. Co-author of the report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 (D3.1)  
4. Co-author of the report on visions of national unity (D3.13)  
5. Co-author of the report on the notions of Us and Them / Self and Other (D3.14) |
List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

5. Sadecka, A., “The Role of NGOs in the Formation of European Identity” with Olga Brzezińska, Beata Czajkowska, David Skully and Natasza Styczyńska, RECON Report by Arena Center of European Studies at Oslo University, Fall 2011

Title and Full Name: Dr Krzysztof Kowalski (Male)

Position in Organisation: Senior Lecturer, Department of European Heritage, Institute of European Studies

Profile

I hold an MA degree in ethnology from the Jagiellonian University in Kraków (1993), a PhD in history from the same university (2000) and a Master of Public Administration (2004, double degree programme) from the University of Economics in Kraków and Copenhagen Business School. I work and teach in the Department of European Heritage of the Institute of European Studies at the Jagiellonian University. My specialization is the theory of heritage and anthropology of Europe. During my academic career I have received many scholarships (including those from the Swiss government, 1995; Stefan Batory Foundation, 1997; French government, 2017). I had a postdoctoral position in the Centre for European Studies at Lund University (2015) and has frequently been a visiting professor at l’Institut d’Etudes Politiques in Strasbourg as well as in Lyon (2015).

Role in the project

Researcher in WP3, Task 3.6. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 (D3.1)

Author of the report on visions of Europe in the narratives of cultural institutions (D3.9)

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

2. Kowalski K., Törnquist-Plewa B. (eds 2016), Europeanization of Heritage and Memories in Poland and Sweden, Jagiellonian University Press, Kraków


### Title and Full Name: Dr Natasza Styczynska (Female)

#### Position in Organisation: Assistant Professor

**Profile**

Natasza Styczynska holds a PhD in Political Science from the Jagiellonian University and since 2007 she is teaching at Institute of European Studies. H-Index: 2 Her doctoral thesis tackled the issues of European discourse of Polish political parties and Euroscepticism. Her academic interests include transformation processes in Central and Eastern Europe and party politics, nationalism, populism and euroscepticism in the CEE region and the Balkans. She was involved in teaching and organising numerous workshops (in cooperation with UACES, Europaeum or Coimbra Group network) and summer schools (within Erasmus+ and CEEPUS programmes). She has been a visiting professor at academic institutions in UK, Spain, Hungary, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Montenegro, Azerbaijan, Austria and Mexico. She is a researcher in the project "Democratic control and legitimisation in European Foreign Policy. The case study of EU Enlargement Policy and European Neighbourhood Policy" funded by the National Research Centre, Poland and “Negotiating Brexit: national governments, EU institutions and the UK” funded by Economy and Social Research Council, UK. Natasza Styczyńska is coordinating Jean Monnet (ERASMUS+) Module entitled “Internal and external challenges to the European Union”.

**Role in the project**

I will act as a researcher in WP4 on task 4.4 (20% FT)

I will contribute the following deliverables:

1. Report on Euroscepticism and populism in Poland after 2003 (D4.4)
2. Contribution on populism and Euroscepticism in Poland forming part of a report on Comparative and theoretical perspectives on political populism (D4.7)

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**


**Title and Full Name:** Dr Joanna Orzechowska-Waclawska (Female)

**Position in Organisation:** Assistant Professor at the Institute of European Studies

**Profile**

Joanna Orzechowska-Wacławska, Assistant Professor at the Institute for European Studies, Jagiellonian University in Krakow (Ma in economics, PhD in sociology). H-index: 2. Her research interests lie at the intersection of economics and sociology. She has been mainly concerned with the influence of economic factors on the formation, development and the rebirth of national and nationalistic movements in Europe. Her current research focuses on the problem of Polish socio-economic transformation and its wide consequences on ideological portray of Polish nation, nationalism, national ideology and national interest. Lately, she has been studying the narrative discourses of Polish political leaders and the ways they present and contribute to the understanding of Polishness, Poland’s political role and place within Europe and the EU.

Joanna has broad international experience. She studied at Georgetown University in Washington, University of Navarra in Pamplona, Corvinus University in Budapest, and Charles University in Prague. During her PhD research she was a Marie Curie Fellow at the University of Deusto in Bilbao. In 2015 she was a guest lecturer at Universidad Complutense in Madrid. She has participated in various educational projects concerning EU integration, European identity and nationalism (including currently operating Jean Monnet Module). Since 2015 she has been involved in the actions of Poland’s Team Europe as an expert. Joanna has authored a number of scientific articles in the area of nationalism and national identity, and a book on the development of Basque national sentiment, which was the main topic of her PhD dissertation.

**Role in the project**

I will act as a researcher on task 3.9. I will also contribute to task WP 5.2. The deliverables will be as follows:

6. Co-author of the report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 (D3.1)
7. Author of the report: Polishness and Europeanness in populist discourses (D3.10)
8. Co-author of the report: Do inequality, perceptions and economic insecurity usher in political populism? (D5.5)
9. Co-author of the report: The Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering? (D5.6)

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**

Title and Full Name: Dr Łucja Piekarska-Duraj (Female)

Position in Organisation: Assistant Professor

Profile
I am an Assistant Professor at the Institute of European Studies, UNESCO Chair for Education about the Holocaust, where I conduct courses on cultural management, heritage interpretation and museum studies. I am a principal researcher in “Europeanization of realms of memory and the construction of common European heritage”, where I have developed a method of museum interpretation in relation to processes of Europeanisation. At the same time I am a scientific coordinator of “Spirituality of Wadowice” (the birthplace of John Paul II), where social researchers are trained to grasp the processes of religiousness.

For a decade I worked as a museum consultant and interpretive heritage trainer, combining it with research on cultural tourism (My PhD thesis was on “The construction of common heritage in case of European cultural routes”) and work with NGOs, where I promote democratic museology. I have published and lectured about the formation of public space in post-socialist Europe, as well as local memory construction.

I have co-authored a number of museum exhibitions and education/outreach projects, as well as a practical manual “A local museum in a global world”.

Role in the project
Researcher in WP1, T 1.1(10%); researcher in WP3, task 3.9 (40%). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the report on religion, national myths and xenophobia(anti-migrant feeling) as elements of neo-traditionalism (D1.4)
2. Co-author of the report: Glossary of basic concepts for Work Package 3 (D3.1)
3. Co-author of the report on visions of national unity (D3.13)
4. Co-author of the report on the notions of Us and Them / Self and Other (D3.14)

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements
2. Piekarska-Duraj, L., Facebook i facepalm. Kontekstualizacja dziedzictwa w regionalnym muzeum wirtualnym. [w:] A. Fiń, Ł. Kapralska (red.), Sieć pamięci. Cyfrowe postaci pamięci społecznej. , Zakład Wydawniczy NOMOS, Kraków, 2015; (Facebook and facepalm. The contextualization of heritage in a regional virtual museum. (in:) A.Fiń, Ł. Kapralska (eds.) The Memory Network. Digital forms of social memory, Kraków, 2015);
Partner 4: Budapesti Corvinus Egyetem / Corvinus University of Budapest (CUB)

Partner Description

Corvinus University of Budapest is one of the major centres of excellence within East-Central Europe, providing cutting-edge research and top quality education in the fields of economics, business studies, international relations, sociology and political sciences. The mission of the University is to combine research excellence with high quality teaching with a focus on a wide range of fields in social sciences, especially in the field of economics, including comparative economics, institutional economics, world economics, labour economics and international political economy. The university comprises three faculties, that of Business Administration, Economics and Social Sciences and International Relations, where the three faculties regularly work together in improving their programmes and as such have obtained accreditation from EPAS and EQUIS for some programmes. In terms of rankings it has been ranked in 2014 by Eduniversal the best business school in Hungary, the Financial Times (2015) ranked it at no.79 in Europe and it generally offers the most sought after economics and business programmes on both the BA and MA levels according to HVG and Figyelő (two Hungarian weekly’s). The University houses more than 14,000 students offers educational programmes in business administration, economics, social sciences, and these disciplines assure it a leading position in Hungarian higher education. There are 7 accredited doctoral schools operating at Corvinus University of Budapest, which have achieved high academic prestige. An important element of the research strategy is to be connected with international scientific life intensively.

An affiliate of Corvinus University (Rajk László College for Advanced Studies) is the provider of the John von Neumann award, which has been given to Kenneth Arrow, Daron Acemoglu, Philippe Aghion, Oliver Williamson among others, who have delivered lectures and seminars for the students of Corvinus University.

In terms of research Corvinus has been engaged in a number of EU financed research projects. For example:

- Jean Monnet Multilateral Research Group, CEE Banking sector stability after the reform of the European financial supervision, 2012-2014
- Assessment of EU economic policies, financed by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund, 2007-2010
- FP7: COCOPS, Coordinating for Cohesion in the Public Sector of the Future, 2011-2014
- FP7: ANTICORRP, Anticorruption policies revisited Global Trends and European Responses to the Challenge of Corruption; 2012-2017
- FP7: CRE8TV.EU, Creativity for Innovation & Growth in Europe, 2012-2016
- H2020: European Training Network Healthcare Performance Intelligence Professionals
- H2020: Enhancing Responsible Research and Innovation through Curricula in Higher Education

Key Personnel Involved

Title and Full Name: Prof. István Benczes (Male)

Position in Organisation: Professor in International and European Political Economy

Profile

I am Full Professor in International and European Political Economy at the Faculty of Social Sciences and International Relations, Corvinus University of Budapest. I earned my MSc in Economics from UCL and my MA in Finance from CUB. I have a PhD degree in Political Economy from Central European University. My research focuses mainly on European economic integration, with particular reference to fiscal policy, and on the
I am the Head of Institute of World Economy at CUB and I also act as the Programme Director of the International Relations Multidisciplinary Doctoral School at CUB – with 7 successful PhD defenses. I am also Programme Director of the double degree programme of International Maters’s in Economy, State and Society, a former Erasmus Mundus programme. I work as a Programme Director of another double degree programme, sponsored by the European Commission’s EU-IC1 ECP Programme (Creating Sustainable Innovative Competitive Advantages in International Business for EU-Australasia in the 21st Century). I act as scientist-in-charge for the H-2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie ITN entitled FATIGUE (Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism). I am elected member of the Committee of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. I work as an editor of Society and Economy and I am member of the scientific editorial board of Revista Finanzas y Política Económica, European Journal of Business Science and Technology and Politické vedy. I was highly commended award winner of Emerald Literati Network in 2012.

I extensively publish on issues of economic transformation and integration in high impact peer-reviewed academic journals (such as Journal of Common Markets Studies, Post-Communist Economies, Intereconomics, Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences). I am the author or co-author of 3 books and several book chapters (incl. SAGE Handbook on Globalisation).

Role in the project

I will act as scientist-in-charge on behalf of CUB and will be the work package leader of WP5 (Economy), focusing on the economic causes of the rise of populism in general and in CEE in particular. I will also act as a researcher on WP1 (neo-feudalism). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the report on the conceptualisation of economic populism (D5.1);
2. Co-author of the varieties of state capitalism and its relevance for understanding the rise of populism in CEE economies (D5.4);
3. Co-author of the report on the rise of economic populism and its impact in CEE (D5.7)

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


Title and Full Name: Dr István Kollai (Male)
Profile

I am assistant professor in economics at the Institute of World Economy of the Corvinus University of Budapest. During my work I act as a PhD supervisor for the H2020 Marie Skłodowska-Curie Innovative Training Network entitled FATIGUE (Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism). I have also worked as an external consultant for “Terra Recognita Foundation – for a Central European dialogue” and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Hungary. My research interests are in the field of socio-economic tendencies in Central and Eastern Europe, with a special focus on the Czech Republic and Slovakia, where I was employed as cultural diplomat for 5 years. My research and innovation project about trans-nationalisation of Central and Eastern European identities has received funding from the Slovak Academic and Information Agency, from the International Visegrad Fund and from the Central European Fund.

Role in the project

I will act as a researcher on conceptualizing neo-feudalism and investigating its functioning in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary. I will also study the market structures and regulatory frameworks of these countries. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Report on the conceptualisation of neo-feudalism (review of literature and development of concept - D1.1);
2. Report "economic checks and balances (D1.5);
3. Report on territorial disparities (D1.6) 4. Case studies on the Gorilla-case (the Slovak way towards neo-feudalism) and the Babis-case (the Czech way towards neo-feudalism) - D1.1.

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

4. Peripatos – educational audioguide with open editor platform for outdoor and interactive education. peripatos-app.com

Title and Full Name: Dr Judit Ricz (Female)

Position in Organisation: Assistant Professor

Profile

I am research fellow at the Institute of World Economics, Centre for Economic and Regional Studies of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (IWE CERS HAS) and assistant professor at Institute of World Economy at the Corvinus University Budapest (IWE CUB). I have conducted various (domestic and international) research projects (at IWE HAS), and I am teaching various courses (at IWE CUB) related to development economics,
international political economy and the Varieties of Capitalism approach (including developmental states). My research focuses on analysing different forms of state capitalism (mainly in Latin America and East Asia, and also beyond), including historical and current forms of economic populism with the aim to formulate policy relevant conclusions and lessons for other emerging and developing countries (incl. the CEE region). I am the author of one book, several peer reviewed articles and book chapters both in Hungarian and English, and participate regularly in domestic and international conferences.

Role in the project

I will act as a researcher on WP5, especially on State capitalism in a comparative perspective. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the report on the conceptualisation of economic populism (D5.1);
2. Co-author of the report on the varieties of state capitalism and its relevance for understanding the rise of populism in CEE economies (D5.4);
3. Co-author of the report on the rise of economic populism and its impact in CEE (D5.7).

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

Role in the project

Within this project, as a researcher I contribute to conceptualization and to the quantification of the terms used throughout WP5, whilst also contributing to the part in which the inequality – economic insecurity nexus is tested for the case of CEE. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the conceptualisation of economic populism (D5.1);
2. A publicly available database on economic inequality and insecurity (D5.2);
3. Report: From income inequality to economic insecurity and back (D5.3);
4. Co-author of the report on perceptions and economic insecurity (D5.5);
5. Co-author of the report on the Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering? (D5.6);
6. Co-author of the report on the rise of economic populism and its impact in CEE (D5.7).

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

Role in the project

I will act as academic administrator for the project on the side of CUB, maintaining an overview of the deadlines, deliverables, milestones and budget. I will also act as a researcher on conceptualising inequality and economic insecurity and investigating the causal relationship between inequality, insecurity and rise of populism. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the report on xenophobia (D1.4)
2. Co-author of the conceptualisation of economic populism (D5.1)
3. Create a publicly available database on economic inequality and insecurity (D5.2)
4. Co-author on the report of From income inequality to economic insecurity and back (D5.3)
5. Co-author of the report on perceptions and economic insecurity (D5.5)
6. Co-author of the report on the Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering? (D5.6)
7. Co-author of the report on the rise of economic populism and its impact in CEE (D5.7)

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


Title and Full Name: Dr Gábor Vigvári (Male)

Position in Organisation: Assistant Professor in International Economics

Profile

I am assistant professor in economics at the Institute of World Economy of the Corvinus University of Budapest. During my work I act as Programme Managing Director for the Hungarian Language part of the International Economy and Business (IEB) Masters Programme at the Corvinus University of Budapest. I was involved in multiple research projects concerning the evolution and transformation of developmental states; globalization and competitiveness; and political-economic issues of the European Union. In my research and teaching economic development; institutional quality; historical causes and effects of institutional differences;
globalization and its effect on sovereignty are discussed, that are essential to understand the emergence of populism not just in CEE but throughout the world economy. My ongoing research focuses on the international policy responses toward developmental states within the framework of the research programme “From developmental states to new protectionism: changing repertoire of state interventions to promote development in an unfolding new world order” financed by the Hungarian National Research, Development and Innovation Fund. I am the author of several journal articles (peer reviewed) and book chapters both in English and Hungarian, and spoke at many conferences. During my career I taught at several foreign and other Hungarian universities.

Role in the project

I will act as a researcher on subproject: From income inequality to economic insecurity and back: A narrative about the shifting tendencies of priorities as a cause of economic populism. The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Co-author of the conceptualisation of economic populism (D5.1)
2. Co-author of the report on From income inequality to economic insecurity and back (D5.3)
3. Co-author of the report on the Great Divide. Does the rise in insecurity lead to the phenomena of othering? (D5.6)
4. Co-author of the report on the rise of economic populism and its impact in CEE (D5.7)

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


Partner 5: University of Tartu (UTARTU)

Partner Description

Founded in 1632, the University of Tartu (UT) is Estonia’s leading centre of research and training. It preserves the culture of the Estonian people and spearheads the country's reputation in research and provision of higher education. UT belongs to the top 1.2% of world's best universities. It ranks 314th in the QS World University Rankings 2018, and within the 301–350 range in the Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2018. The UT is among the top three research institutions of the entire post-communist region, as evident from QS University Rankings: Emerging Europe and Central Asia 2018). The UT is among 1% of the world’s most cited research institutions in twelve fields of research (Thomson Reuters Web of Science).
The University offers 56 bachelor, 71 master and 32 doctoral study programmes. The total number of students is 13,000 (including over 1000 international students from 70 countries). The UT has more than 1300 doctoral students and accounts for more than a half of all Estonia's doctoral defenses. The academic structure of the University includes four faculties, including Arts and Humanities, Social Sciences, Medicine, and Science and Technology. The UT has 3,500 employees, including 1850 academic employees (194 professors). The University has 80 partner universities in 31 countries. UT scholars have produced over 34,000 research publications (including 7,500 in the ISI Web of Science). The University has a budget volume of 142.6 million euros (2017).

The **Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies** at the University of Tartu combines both top-level scholarly research and a dynamic, international learning environment at all three levels of higher education. It offers a Political Science BA programme at the Bachelor’s level (in Estonian), four MA programmes (International Relations and Regional Studies, Democracy and Governance, EU-Russia Studies, and European Studies) in English and Estonian, as well as a Political Science PhD programme (in English). Skytte Institute staff includes 56 employees (14 teaching staff, 8 researchers, 18 applied research analysts, 16 specialists and administrators). The faculty come from seven different countries of origin and have earned degrees in Estonia, Denmark, Germany, France, Russia, the UK, Canada and the United States. In 2016, 348 students were enrolled in the Institute’s degree programs (including 17 Ph.D. students). The Institute has built up considerable competences in both EU Studies and Eastern European Studies. Since 2011, the Institute has been a home to a **Centre for EU-Russia Studies** (CEURUS, [http://ceurus.ut.ee](http://ceurus.ut.ee)) which pools relevant competences from a range of UT faculties, including the Social Sciences, Economics and Law. The Institute has implemented a **Jean Monnet Network project** that focused on developing European Studies in the Caucasus (DESCNet, 2015-2018). Other ongoing, thematically relevant projects implemented by the Centre and the Institute include a **Horizon 2020 Twinning project** “Building Research Excellence in Russian and East European Studies at the Universities of Tartu, Uppsala and Kent” (2016-2019), a H2020 **MSCA Innovative Training Network project** FATIGUE: “Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe,” (2018-2021) and an Open Society Foundations Eurasia Program project “Hosting OSF Eurasia Program Fellows at the University of Tartu” (2018-2020).

### Key Personnel Involved

**Title & Full Name:** Prof Vello Pettai (Male)

**Position in Organisation:** Professor of Comparative Politics

**Profile**

Vello Pettai specializes in post-communist democratization, including elections, party system development and institutional change. Most relevant for this applicant, he was a member of the Scientific Committee of the European Science Foundation’s Forward Look on “Central and Eastern Europe beyond Transition: Convergence and Divergence in Europe”. In addition to being a co-editor of the final volume of that project, he was specifically responsible for organizing the foresight dimension of the project, which involved developing and testing scenarios of future social, political and economic development in CEE. (See publication reference below.) During 2015-2018, Vello Pettai has held a four-year Personal Research Grant from the Estonian Research Council for in-depth, regional study of the Varieties of Democracy database. He is also widely connected in the field having served for six years on the Executive Committee of the European Consortium for Political Research and for ten years on the High Council of the European University Institute.

**Role in the project:**

1. Responsible for Work Package 6, all tasks
List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


---

**Title and Full Name:** Dr Piret Ehin (female)

**Position in Organisation:** Senior Researcher in Comparative Politics, Director of the Centre for EU-Russia Studies and Vice Director for Research at the Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies

**Profile**

Dr Piret Ehin holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of Arizona (2002). Her main research interests include democracy, legitimacy and political support, European integration and Europeanization, and international relations in the Baltic Sea region. Her work has appeared in the *European Journal of Political Research, Journal of Common Market Studies, Cooperation and Conflict, Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* and the *Journal of Baltic Studies*. She has co-edited a book on Russian-Baltic relations in the context of European integration (Ashgate, 2009) and has extensively studied the ethnic cleavage in Estonian politics. She is the Estonian country collaborator for cross-national survey projects such as the European Election Studies (EES) and the Comparative Study of Electoral Systems (CSES). Since 2007, she has prepared numerous studies and briefing papers for the European Parliament on issues ranging from electoral politics in the EU to the European Neighbourhood and EU-Russia relations. Since 2016, she has served as the Coordinator of Horizon2020 Twinning project “Building Research Excellence in Russian and East European Studies at the Universities of Tartu, Uppsala and Kent.”

**Role in the project**

1. Responsible for T 4.3: Regime performance and support for populist parties in Central and Eastern Europe contributing to D4.5 and D4.7.

---

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**

Title & Full Name: Prof Andrey Makarychev (male)

Position in Organisation: Visiting Professor

Profile
Prof Andrey Makarychev has a PhD (doctor nauk) from Nizhniy Novgorod State University. His research interests include Russian foreign policy discourses, international security and regionalism in EU – Russia common neighborhood. He has worked for the Center for Security Studies & Conflict Research, ETH Zurich (2000-2001) and the Danish Institute for International Studies (DIIS), Copenhagen (2003-2004). He has been visiting fellow at several European and US Research Institutes, among them the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute; Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies (Washington, D.C.); George Mason University, Fairfax, and the JFK Institute for North American Studies, Free University of Berlin. His projects were supported a.o. by Central European University, Budapest; IREX; McArthur Foundation; OSI; NATO Democratic Institutions Fellowship Program. He has studied extensively the various aspects of Russian foreign policy and domestic politics, recently focusing on biopolitics and identity.

Role in the project:
1. Responsible for T 4.5: Populist imageries and popular geopolitics

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements
**Title and Full Name:** Dr Vasileios Petsinis (male)

**Position in Organisation:** Marie Curie Experienced Researcher

**Profile**
Dr Vasileios Petsinis holds a PhD from the University of Birmingham. His research interests include European politics and ethnopolitics with a regional focus on Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkans. He has worked as a researcher in several institutions in Sweden (Södertörns, Uppsala, Lund) but also in Copenhagen University and Herder University (Marburg). He has conducted research on ethnopolitics in Serbia, Romania and Slovakia and is now working on a H2020 Marie Curie Individual Fellowship project “Patterns and management of ethnic relations in the Western Balkans and the Baltic States”. Dr Vasileios Petsinis will start working on the project once his MSCA Fellowship ends after April 2019.

**Role in the project**
1. Responsible for T 3.7: The refugee crisis and the populist and radical right in the Baltic States

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**

**Partner 6: Univerzitet u Beogradu / Belgrade University (UB)**

**Partner Description**
The Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Belgrade, founded in 1838, is the oldest and most prominent institution of higher education in Serbia and among the oldest in South-Eastern Europe. Today it is a modern school in compliance with contemporary trends in European academic space and upholding a high standard of academic excellence. It employs 255 teaching staff and has approximately 6,000 undergraduate and postgraduate students enrolled at nine departments: Department of Philosophy, Department of Classics, Department of History, Department of Art History, Department of Archaeology, Department of Ethnology and Anthropology, Department of Sociology, Department of Psychology and Department of Pedagogy and Andragogy. There are 18 research institutes, specialised laboratories, collections and centres operating within the Faculty, such as the Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Centre for Contemporary History of the Balkans and Institute of Sociology and Social Research. The Faculty of Philosophy participates in various international projects (FP7 and other European Commission projects as well as projects funded by NSF, UNICEF, RRPP, US AID, etc.). In cooperation with a number of esteemed academic institutions from Serbia.
and the international academic community, the Faculty of Philosophy organises summer schools, winter workshops and many other activities. In terms of research, the Faculty of Philosophy at the University of Belgrade has been engaged in a number of financed research projects. For example:

1. UNICEF: Piloting the Draft of the new Preschool Curriculum Framework - Years of Ascent
3. UNICEF: Research on internet usage among children aged 4-8 and their carers (parents and teachers) - competencies for greater child on line safety
4. UNICEF: Research on Adverse Childhood Experience in Serbia
5. HELVETAS Swiss Intercoperation SRB: Accession of Serbia to the mechanism of the European Social Survey – ESS Round 9
6. FP7 / EU BEAN: Bridging the European and Anatolian Neolithic
7. FP7 / EU INT.RE.COOP: International Research Exchange on Cooperative
8. FP7 / EU CONPRA: Contributing the Preventive Archaeology: Innovativeness, Development and Presentation
9. UNICEF: Violence Among and Against Children in the Schools

Personnel Involved

Title & Full Name: Dr Haris Dajč (Male)

Position in Organisation: Assistant Professor, Department of History

Profile

Haris Dajč, an historian, has been working at the Faculty of Philosophy, Department of History since 2010 (Research assistant 2010, Assistant 2013, Assistant Professor 2016, MA History 2008 Belgrade University, MA Central and South-East European Studies 2011 SSEES UCL, PhD History 2015 Belgrade University). His undergraduate courses are: Early Modern History, World History 19-20th century, US State and society, History of Mediterranean 16-19th century. Postgraduate courses: Balkans in Modern History, History of Mediterranean 16-19th century, History of Jews in Southeast Europe 16-20th century. His archival research has focused on Serbian and British archives. He has been researching since 2008 in the National Archives (Public Record Office) records on Turkey, Venice, Balkans and Levant in 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. In Belgrade most of his archival experience relates to the Historical Archives of Belgrade on Jewish history. Some of the results were included in the paper on history of Belgrade synagogues since 1945. For that research he and Professor Nikola Samardžić were recognised by the Federation of the Jewish Communities of Serbia in 2012. Dr Dajč was a research fellow at University of Padova in 2015, working in Archivio di Stato, Venice. He was visiting lecturer at University of Vienna, Institut für Politikwissenschaft in 2016. Haris Dajč is Nahum Goldman alumnus. Haris Dajč is a member of a program council of the City of Belgrade for the concentration camp Staro Sajmište. His PhD thesis The Dusk of the Old Mediterranean: Ionian island 1774−1815 was published in 2016 by the NBI research centre and Hera publishing house. Since 2016 he is the Chair of the Centre for the collaboration with the UCL on behalf of the University of Belgrade and since January 2018 he has been involved as the scientist-in-charge for the H2020 project: ‘Delayed Transformational Fatigue in Central and Eastern Europe: Responding to the Rise of Illiberalism/Populism’ (FATIGUE) (2018-2021) coordinated by University College London (UCL SSEES).

Role in the project: I will act as scientist-in-charge on behalf of Faculty of Philosophy and will be joint coordinator for Work Package 4 (Politics) and will also act as a researcher on task 3.1 (New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans) and task 4.2 (History of populist political parties in
Yugoslavia and post-Yugoslav states). I will be engaged in the following work, which will form the basis of deliverable D4.3 and contribute to deliverable D4.7:

2. Research on dominant populist parties of former Yugoslavia and on the political and social consequences of the strengthening of national populist parties in Yugoslavia after the fall of the Berlin Wall.

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


Title and Full Name: Prof. Isidora Jarić (Female)

Position in Organisation: Associate Professor, Department of Sociology

Profile

Isidora Jaric, a sociologist, has been Associate Professor at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Sociology since 2007 and is currently Vice-Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy. From 2001-2007 she worked in the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory, University of Belgrade. (BA University of Belgrade, Department of Sociology; MPhil Central European University, Department for Gender and Culture; PhD University of Belgrade, Department of Sociology). Her undergraduate courses are: Introduction to Sociology of Education, Gender Studies 1, Gender and Culture, Teaching Didactics in Sociology. Her postgraduate courses are: Gender Studies 2, Sociology of Education, Sociology of School, Research in Higher Education and Education and Politics. She is editor of three collections of papers: Bologna reform of higher education in Serbia: Problems, doubts, fears and expectations of the teaching staff at the University of Belgrade (Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory Filip Visnjic and IP, Belgrade, 2010), Politics of Parenthood (Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade, 2015) and co-editor with Nada Sekulic and Ognjen Radonjic of Under the shadow of public policies (LIMES Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, No 2/2017, HERAedu). Co-author, with Zagorka Golubovic, of the book: Culture and the Transformation of Serbia: value orientations of Serbian citizens in changes after 2000 (Službeni glasnik and Res publika Official, Belgrade, 2010) and author of the books: Overt and Hidden Curricula (Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2014) and Parenthood under Risk: A Sociocultural Analysis of the Stigma Attached to Rare Disease Patients (Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2017).

Role in the project

I will be co-leader for Work Package 3(Culture) and will also act as a researcher on task 3.1 (New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans) and 3.4 (Gender identities in transformation: patriarchy, misogyny and homophobia as elements of populist politics’ discourses in Serbia). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Monograph on Populism and Transgender
2. Editor of the monograph/collection of papers Masculinity under the Pressure in the Time of Populism
3. Articles on: (a) new media in populist’s political discourses, and (b) social, cultural and political interplay of populist discourses and different gender identities.
List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

5. Isidora Jarić (2013): „Osobine rodnih režima unutar cyber realnosti desno orijentisanih ekstremističkih političkih grupa

Title and Full Name: Prof. Nikola Samardžić (Male)
Position in Organisation: Professor, Department of History
Profile
I am Full Professor at the University of Belgrade. He was a Fulbright Scholar at New York University in 2003. I have studied in Italy, France, Spain and the United States. At all levels of studies I run courses from the Early Modern History and General History of the 19th and 20th Centuries, and in particular the USA courses: State and Society and the History of Jazz. Since 2012 I have been teaching at the University of Donja Gorica in Podgorica. At the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade, I held the functions of the Head of the Department for General History of the New Century, the Head of the Department of History and the President of the Council of the Faculty of Philosophy. I am the founder, co-owner and manager of the New Balkan Institute and Scientific Society for the History of Health Culture (a restored institution, otherwise established in 1955). I am head of the projects of the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, Modernisation of the Western Balkans (from 2005 and 2010). I also participated in international projects: The Scholars' Initiative. I am also the editor-in-chief of the scientific journals Belgrade's Historical Gazette, LimesPlus and Acta Historiae Medicinae Stomatologiae Pharmaciae Medicinae Veterinariae.

Role in the project
I will be the lead researcher of the task 3.2 (South-East European populism, post-conflict transitional stress and Russian influence) and also a researcher on task 3.4 (Gender identities in transformation: patriarchy, misogyny and homophobia as elements of populist politics’ discourses in Serbia). The deliverables will be as follows:
1. Articles on South-East European populism, post-conflict transitional stress and Russian influence and
2. Editor of the monograph/collection of papers South-East European populism, post-conflict transitional stress and Russian influence

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements


Title and Full Name: Dr Milivoj Bešlin (Male)

Position in Organisation: Research Associate

Profile

Milivoj Bešlin is an historian. He is a Research Associate at the Institute for Philosophy and Social Theory of the University in Belgrade. Bešlin received his BA and MA in History at the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Novi Sad. He received a PhD degree from the same university in 2015. In his empirical and theoretical works, he has dealt with: political and social history of socialist Yugoslavia; nationalism studies; modernisation theory; theory of history; reformatory attempts in the second Yugoslavia; the attitude of Yugoslav communists towards Serbian nationalism; the national question in Serbia in the second half of the 20th century; Yugoslav-Soviet relations; 1968 student protests; the relation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia to the Spanish Civil War; influence and characteristics of tabloids in the Belgrade public in the interwar period; basic elements of Yugoslav federalism – constitution and development; Serbian-Croatian relations in the second Yugoslavia; the problem of antifascism and historical revisionism; the Second World War in Yugoslavia; Vojvodina autonomy in Yugoslav federalism; the role of Yugoslavia in the 1956 revolution in Hungary; the problem of the intellectual engagement and nationalism; the idea and practice of "euro communism" as the theory of the "third way".

Role in the project

He will act as a researcher on tasks 3.2 (South-East European populism, post-conflict transitional stress and Russian influence) and 4.2 (History of populist political parties in Yugoslavia and post-Yugoslav states) which will form the basis of deliverable 4.4 and contribute to deliverable 4.7.
1. Research on the genesis and causes of populism in socialist Yugoslavia and post-Yugoslav countries.
2. Research on populism and nationalism in SEE (Post-Yugoslav states).

List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements

5. Bešlin, Milivoj, Samardžić, Momir, „Soviet-Yugoslav reconciliation as a basic for understanding Tito's role in Hungarian revolution of 1956“, Limes plus, br. 1/2017, pp. 49-64. ISSN 1820-0869
### Vladimir Ninković (Male)

**Position in Organisation:** PhD student at the Faculty of Security, University of Belgrade, Research Assistant

**Profile**

Vladimir Ninković (1981) is a PhD student at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade. His academic interests are right wing extremism, geopolitics, risk and crisis management, energy security, corporate security. Vladimir holds the Bachelor's degree in Hispanic Studies from the Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, where he also obtained the MA degree in Sociolinguistics – Critical Discourse Analysis (MA thesis – Political Discourse on ETA Terrorism in Spain). He obtained Postgraduate Certificate in Security Management at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade (Thesis – Risk and Crisis Communication in Serbia). Vladimir has authored and co-authored a number of research papers and participated in various international and regional conferences and academic projects. Vladimir has been an active member of the security academic and professional community in Serbia since 2009. As the TransConflict Serbia foundation ([www.transconflict.com](http://www.transconflict.com)) program manager for security, he has managed and coordinated a number of projects dealing with the human, regional and national security, and inter-ethnic conflicts in the Western Balkans. In that capacity he has also published a number of articles and analyses on ongoing security issues in the region, which were republished by the Los Angeles Times, Energy Observer, South-East European Times (SEE Times), Eurasia Review etc.

**Role in the project**

I will act as a researcher on task 3.1 (New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans). The deliverables will be as follows:

1. Monograph on New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans (coauthor).
2. Articles on New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans.

**List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements**


### Danica BaLaban (Female)

**Position in Organisation:** PhD student at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade, Research Assistant

**Profile**

Danica BaLaban (1976), PhD student at the Faculty of Political Science, University of Belgrade. She is working as media analyst in Ebart Media Archive since 2009. From the late 1990s to the mid 2000s she was working as journalist and editor at several electronic media outlets: RTS (2000-2004), BK TV (1999-2000) and TV Politika (2000 - 2004). She has extensive experience in media research, visibility and training of media professionals.
She has cooperated with a number of Serbian and international organizations and institutions, such as the OSCE, the Council of Europe and BBC Trust.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will act as a research assistant on task 3.4 (Gender identities in transformation: patriarchy, misogyny and homophobia as elements of populist politics’ discourses in Serbia). The deliverables will be as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Two articles on social, cultural and political interplay of populist discourses and different gender identities in media.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. OEBS (2016) - Research on the reporting of local and national print media about the relationship of representatives of local self-government Leskovac to media (chief researcher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Praxis / Gayten LGBT (2015-2016) - Project: Sensitization of national and local media on the position of trans persons, supported by the Office for Human and Minority Rights of the Government of the Republic of Serbia (chief researcher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Personnel Involved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title and Full Name:</strong> Maja Krek (Female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in Organisation:</strong> PhD student on the Department of Sociology, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Research Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Profile**

Maja Krek (1980) is a PhD student at the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade. Her academic interests are political sociology, gender studies and minority studies. Maja Krek holds a BA and MA in Sociology from the Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade. She has taken part in number of sociological research projects at the Institute for Sociological Research, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade.

Maja Krek has been an active member of the professional sociological community in Serbia. From 2014-2016 she was a coordinator of Section for Feminist Research and Critical Studies of Masculinities of the Serbian Sociological Association.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role in the project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I will act as a research assistant on task 3.1 (New media and populism: cyber-politics and media literacy in the Western Balkans) and 3.4 (Gender identities in transformation: patriarchy, misogyny and homophobia as elements of populist politics’ discourses in Serbia). The deliverables will be as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Articles on: (a) new media in populists’ political discourses, and (b) social, cultural and political interplay of populist discourses and different gender identities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of publications, and/or products, services, patents or achievements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Partner 7: Edgeryders

Partner description:

Our record dates back to 2013 as a company registered in the United Kingdom. In late 2016 - early 2017, in the aftermath of the British majority vote for withdrawal from the European Union, Edgeryders directors remained firmly committed to safeguarding our ability to work as a distributed organisation having extensive mobility and access to European resources. We consequently created a new non-profit in Estonia. The Estonian Edgeryders OÜ is a new organisation from a legal perspective, but it takes fully onwards the legacy of our British company, with its track record, leadership, expertise and modus operandi.

Edgeryders provides expert advice and community engagement based on collective intelligence, as a service to corporate and governmental organisations. It develops and deploys community building tools and cutting edge research techniques to detect, aggregate and analyse citizen innovation in response to key societal, economic, ecological and political challenges. Driven by a people centric approach, we engage and connect citizens them in its active, global community of 3,514 civic enthusiasts, social innovators, activists, makers, technologists, artists and consumers.

The Edgeryders online interactive platform is hosted on open source software and open for anyone to join. In everything we do, we maintain a culture of openness and transparency. By fostering collaboration on a massive scale, we are able to wire seemingly isolated initiatives and unique points of view towards a theory of change backed by solid scientific arguments and ultimately aspiring to contribute to more grounded European public policy.

We are consistently working in Europe at transnational level (Council of Europe, European Commission funded projects), reaching the periphery (esp. Georgia, Armenia, Belarus and Egypt, resulting from several projects with the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Volunteers) and overall building a network that spans the globe (solid membership and collaborations in Nepal). Throughout all this, our organisation is able to infuse projects with high quality knowledge stemming from the latest trends in professional, social, geographic mobility, community driven welfare, youth transition and many other hot topics in Europe.

Role in the project
In POPREBEL, Edgeryders is responsible for designing and running a massive online conversation on populism by activating and on-boarding members of civic and political constituencies with first hand experience across the
populist landscape. This conversation will be analysed through social semantic network analysis to enable the consortium to navigate a collective mental map of populism, and filter it to produce high-level "big pictures".

In WP2 where ER is the leading organisation, we will couple community engagement and community management methodologies to ensure an interface between online and offline participation, and between individuals who are digitally at ease and those farther off the Internet map. Edgeryders will collaborate closely with networks across Poland, Serbia and Czech in order to start from active communities on the ground and use the social network model to reach further citizens in other European countries. We employ one of the world’s foremost community managers and the first ever online community manager, John Coate, to oversee the Citizen Journalism program resulting in high quality contributions that will inspire new participants. We complement online discussions with physical Onboarding Workshops throughout the whole project, making sure to disseminate at large deeper insights about populist themes and findings.

In close collaboration with consortium partners University College London, Univerzitet U Beogradu and Univerzita Karlova V Praze we will reference communities spanning the life-cycle of Populist dynamics across Poland, Serbia and Czech, including training researchers at these institutions in community management to ensure quality and respectful dialogue in Polish, Czech, Serbian and English. We will deploy and expand our open research tool Open Ethnographer (see below) to harvest the content of the discussions (WP2), including leading ethnographic coding, managing a coding ontology and training researchers associated to consortium partners University College London, Univerzitet U Beogradu and Univerzita Karlova V Praze to engage in ethnographic coding across the online conversation’s four languages.

### Personnel involved

**John Coate**, male, Internet pioneer and technologist. He was employee number two at The WELL, where he was instrumental in creating the online community that Wired Magazine called the “world’s most influential.” There he was the first to work as what is now known as an "online community manager” and he wrote the first treatise on building online community. He co-founded the first major news website, sfgate.com, that today has more than thirty million monthly visitors and more than 340K Twitter followers. He was the online manager of a teen social network and game site that had thousands of members. He managed a regional media organization that combined terrestrial radio and the internet in innovative ways. Through it all the core of his community knowledge comes from direct personal experience living and working with others who are consciously building lasting relationships as the building blocks of community.

**Alberto Cottica**, male, economist and policy expert, with a long experience on designing, delivering and evaluating open government projects. Background in environmental economics; PhD in quantitative economics with a strong network science slant (expected graduation: Summer 2018). He is a leading voice on open government in his country, Italy. Ten years of experience launching online communities for youth, the creative economy and social innovation at the subnational (Visioni Urbane, Italy, 2007-2008), national (Kublai, Italy, 2008-ongoing) and supranational (Edgeryders, Council of Europe, later an independent company: 2011-ongoing) levels. Substantial expertise as a researcher both in academia and the public sector. In his spare time: founder of the Spaghetti Open Data online community (2010), and president of Italian open government NGO Wikitalia.

**Nadia EL-Imam**, female, user experience (UX) designer and engineer with a solid experience in designing and delivering engaging participatory experiences on- and offline. Specializing as a policy advisor for new forms of democratic participation. A regular speaker at international conferences with strong social media presence, a
bridge person between activist networks of marginalised groups, artists, civil society, business, media and
government. Named Minister of Labour in a “dream government of New Thinkers” imagined for Sweden by the
leading financial newspaper in Scandinavia. Prior to Edgeryders, Nadia held senior roles as creative director and
planner Designs and runs university courses on design for demographic and social change. A polyglot and global
citizen with roots in Africa, Asia, and Europe.

**Amelia Hassoun**, female, anthropologist with a research focus on the social impacts of digital technologies. Has
extensive ethnographic research experience both online and offline, in both public and private sector, focusing
on the power of participatory communities to facilitate transparent, efficient solutions to public problems. Has
technical experience designing and developing a bespoke patient information website, as well as interviewing
community members, gathering and analysing qualitative and quantitative data, and generating ethnographic
reports. Currently a doctoral researcher at the Oxford Internet Institute analysing community-based civic
technology initiatives, ethnographically examining how community members creatively interact with and rework
“smart” urban technologies.

**Matthias Ansorg**, male, computer scientist and technology generalist with a long experience in open source
software and hardware development. A social innovator and digital entrepreneur who has studied alternative
value measurement and non-monetary economic exchange mechanisms extensively for his award-winning
communs funding platform PayCoupons (former Makerfox). Solid expertise in software development, integration
and maintenance; has built the edgeryders.eu online platform.

**Noemi Salantiu**, female, social scientist specialising in quantitative analysis and using qualitative data for
professional community management. As a member of the Council of Europe’s in-house research team for
Edgeryders’ founding project, she participated in analysis of data and producing policy recommendations for the
Council’s 47 member states. Recent interest and expertise is in harnessing collective intelligence through high
quality community building and engagement, especially through a combination of digital technology and soft
skills (human-to-human interaction).

**Anique Yael Vered**, female, change agent specialising in strategic alliances and community partnerships through
open research, the commons and experimental programming. Fifteen years experience in collaborative
communities of practice across North America, Europe, Australia, Asia and the MENA region. Currently focused
on open and citizen science, young feminist leadership, policy advocacy, social innovation and next generation
digital infrastructures. Renowned for programming award winning high profile and high impact incubators,
festivals and symposia, as well as place-based participatory development frameworks spanning heritage, social
inclusion and smart cities. Graduate from Australian National University Master of Studies and former Visiting
Researcher at Concordia University Montreal.

**Relevant publications (up to 5) and/or services or other achievements relevant to the call**

4. European Social Innovation Award 2013. Makerfox, then called Economy App, won the European Commission’s European Social Innovation Award for the invention and potential of network barter (fluid


### Relevant previous projects or activities (up to 5) connected to the subject of the proposal

1. **OpenCare**: Open Participatory Engagement in Collective Awareness for REdesign of Care Services (January 2016 - December 2017) Project funded by the European Commission in the Horizon 2020 programme (call ICT-10-2015- CAPSSI). European scale research on smart communities as solution finders and providers of alternative health and social care: understanding them, scaling them and implications for policy [http://opencare.cc](http://opencare.cc)


3. **The Baltic Edge**. (2013) Edgeryders was commissioned the Swedish think tank Global Challenge to detect trends in employment and participation of youth in the Baltic Sea Region and engaged citizen experts to validate each other’s experiences. The [final publication](http://opencare.cc) is available upon request.

4. **Edgeryders guide to the future**. (July 2011 – December 2012) For Council of Europe and the European Commission, Edgeryders founders designed and ran a network weaving exercise that connected policy makers with grassroots innovators and researched how young Europeans are transitioning to an independent life during a period of economic crisis. Online dialog was analyzed with online ethnography and network analysis. Results are published in “The Edgeryders Guide to the Future”.


### Description of any significant infrastructure and/or technical equipment relevant for the proposed work

1. **The [http://edgeryders.eu](http://edgeryders.eu) platform** hosts a growing social infrastructure stewarded by the organisation through its various projects. Edgeryders’ main asset and expertise is its wildly diverse, exuberant community, which connects the Edgeryders company directly or near-directly with most social innovation, grassroots movements, advocacy groups and change-makers in the European Union, and also with many public bodies and policy-making institutions.

2. **OpenEthnographer** Free of charge, fully customizable web hosting can be provided on Edgeryders’ VPS servers. Based on an open source software stack, run in a German data centre. Open Ethnographer is Edgeryders own web based research tool funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It lives as an installation on edgeryders.eu and includes the following functionality to work with tags (category markers applied by ethnographers to a selection of text): code manager, annotations with tags and comments, visual author indication, rapid tag selection via auto-suggest search, permission system for viewing, creating, editing own taggings and others’, data export to RQDA free and open source CAQDAS software.
4.2. Third parties involved in the project (including third party resources)

No third parties involved.
5. Ethics and Security

5.1 Ethics

POPREBEL will adopt a combination of multidisciplinary, methodological approaches and data-generation methods, including case studies, Semantic Social Network Analyses, large-n quantitative surveys, ethnographical studies and discourse analyses. POPREBEL will ensure that the ethical issues that may arise out of the project will be dealt with in the appropriate manner, as outlined below. Researchers based at universities will follow national and institutional regulations on research ethics and will obtain ethical approval from the Research Ethics Committee of their own institutions. Researchers based at EDGERYDERS will follow their own ethics procedures. Different ethical procedures will be followed for research involving human participants offline and online.

Principles

POPREBEL partners are well aware of the current regulations and fully conform to national legislation and applicable codes of conduct. They will seek the approval of the relevant ethics committee prior to the start of any RTD activities (99/167/EC; Council Decision of 25/1/99). In addition, research activities comply with the international conventions and codes of conduct, as well as the relevant EC legislation, chiefly the already mentioned EU General Data Protection Regulation, 2016/679. Finally, we follow the ethical checklist proposed for Horizon 2020. For those research activities carried out by the Serbian partner UBFF in the countries of former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, BiH and Montenegro, the UK legislation will be followed. In case activities undertaken in non-EU countries raise ethics issues, appropriate measures, to ensure that the research conducted outside the EU is legal in at least one EU Member State, will be taken.

Involvement of humans (offline)

Offline interviews are conducted with men and women who are potentially vulnerable due to their experience of populist policies. As the interviews will ask participants to narrate their personal experiences, some of these experiences may have been difficult and the memories therefore painful. Ethical approval will be sought from the Research Ethics Committee of the researchers’ institutions. All potential participants will have to be over 18 and demonstrate competence to make a rational and autonomous decision about involvement. Potential participants will be given appropriate information in their native language about the project and adequate time to consider their participation. Before the interview begins, each participant will confirm that are freely consenting to participate. Informed consent procedures will emphasise the voluntary nature of participation and that consent may be withdrawn at any time. It will be made it clear to participants that, during the interview, they are free not to discuss specific issues and can stop the interview altogether at any time. Appropriate care will be taken to ensure that study procedures are non-obtrusive and that confidentiality is protected at all times. No identifying data will be kept with the interview transcripts.

Concerning personal data, interviews will be recorded but the interviewees will be identified only by a number and the date of the interview. A spreadsheet listing the interviewees’ names will be kept on the interviewer’s PC in a password-protected file. All references to the interviewees in subsequent presentations and publications will be anonymised and pseudonyms used to protect their identities, and will comply with the general requirements of Directive 95/46/EC. Interviewees will not be asked for their names or addresses and it will not thus be possible for the researchers or anyone else to trace the information provided by the participants back to them. Further to this, any necessary authorisations for collecting and processing sensitive data will be acquired via the national data protection authorities.
**Involvement of humans (online): attention to data protection and its governance**

It is of utmost importance to stress here that the online conversation in WP 2, co-ordinated by EDGERYDERS, will operate at the boundary between political and cultural debate and social networking. As for many other ecosystems that came to existence in the last decade with the advent of the social web, the project will move on ethical grounds, where the right to freedom of expression can come into conflict with the most rigorous interpretations of the rights to privacy. This is reflected in the still lively public debate on the right to be forgotten (later ‘right to erasure’), existing in the European Union since Directive 95/46/EC, art.12, and reinforced in article 17 of the EU General Data Protection Regulation, 2016/679.

POPREBEL aims at empowering the actors engaged in participation to the shaping of political and cultural narratives, in the broadest possible sense. Its conversation is an information device for them to become aware of each other’s practices and tactics, and compare notes to better further their own goals. In all project communication it will be clear that POPREBEL has no claim or agenda of its own. However, the project does stand firm on the principles of human rights and democracy, as enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights.

The main potential source of ethical tensions in online research is **data protection**. EDGERYDERS is the partner running the platform ([https://edgeryders.eu](https://edgeryders.eu)) which hosts the conversation in WP 2. In order to minimise data protection-related risks, EDGERYDERS has put in place the following measures.

- **Does not** ask questions pertaining to anything personally sensitive (address, ethnicity, medical conditions, political opinions and so on). Users may share information about themselves in post form, intended for publication, but such information is never saved in a structured database.
- **Does not** do surveillance. Cookies are used only to provide notifications (e.g. new replies to the user’s post).
- **Never shares its data with third parties.** Login through IDs provided by commercial companies (Facebook, Google etc.) is disallowed.
- **Does not** enforce a real name policy, though some users do elect to use their real names as user names.
- **Does** store one personal datapoint for each and every user, which is the email address. The user cannot be created without it. However, users are allowed (and pointed to in the information pages) to use one-time email services, such as Guerrillamail ([https://www.guerrillamail.com/](https://www.guerrillamail.com/))
- **Does** have fields in the user ID for Facebook and Twitter identities. These are, however, not necessary to creating a user.
- **Does** encrypt passwords (via a hashing algorithm) and transactions (via https).
- **Is compliant** with European data protection law. Specifically:
  - Has established an appropriate data protection policy.
  - Has appointed a data protection lead, Mr Matthias Ansorg.
  - Has registered with the Information Commissioner’s Office.
  - Has made privacy notices readily available to individuals.
  - Has established a simple process to recognise and respond to individuals’ requests to access their personal data.

The measures above are applied to everything that takes place on the edgeryders.eu platform. Some additional measures are applied to POPREBEL-related activities.
Advisory Board for Ethics and Impact

1. EDGERYDERS appoints an Advisory Board for Ethics and Impact to obtain independent peer reviewing of the practices proposed within the project as it develops. Its members are:
   a. Dr Marco Manca, a medical doctor (http://www.linkedin.com/in/mmanca). He is Senior Research Fellow at CERN and co-founder of ScImpulse Foundation. He leads the ethics section at OPENCARE (https://opencare.cc), a project that was applauded by reviewers for its highly advanced ethical stance.
   b. Dr Alberto Alemanno, a legal scholar (he is Jean Monnet Chair for EU law at HEC Paris), and a civil society activist operating at a European level (founder of The Good Lobby: http://thegoodlobby.eu/).

2. Working with the ABEI, we produce a detailed and clear ‘consent funnel’, replacing the traditional (and ethically ineffective) ‘I accept the Terms and Conditions’ box to tick. A consent funnel is a gateway to the platform where participants can consent to sharing and handling of their information for the purpose of the project, inspired to the principles of honesty and transparency of the Portable Legal Consent (http://sagebase.org/e-consent). The idea is that the platform asks first-time users questions aimed at making sure they understand that they are in a public space for debate and should not reveal personal information unless they are comfortable with it being public. Users are not allowed to post until they get the questions right.

3. The rules for access to all data, the mechanisms of protection, and the risks that entails from technical incompleteness (even with best practice) are disclosed in natural and clearly understandable language, with easy to get pointer to the mechanisms to opt in and out at any time.

Fig. 5.1.1 – An example of ethical funnel, related to a project on health and social care

Attention to fairness

Participatory politics has a fairness issue. In fact, everything participatory does. Even celebrated citizen science projects like Fold and Galaxy Zoo do not fully account for, and give credit to, our fellow citizens for their contribution. Heterogeneous scoring systems (often serving also the purposes of gamification of the tasks), and occasional acknowledgements or symbolic authorships in the resulting outcome, are the best practices out there. The very word “crowd” in “crowdsourcing” usually denotes a sense of “rightless volunteer”, an impersonal force to exploit, whose only return will be the availability of the results of their contribution, mediated as it real owner (the initiator and aggregator of the effort) will see fit [Deng and Joshi 2013].
Consistently with the objectives of the project and our own values, we attempt to take out exploitation out of the participatory politics picture. This is done by underwriting an explicit social contract with the POPREBEL community, styled as a collective author and researcher. This constitutes particularly a part of D2.2, but this participatory philosophy underpins all our research activities. To this end, we run a social lab to reflect on the nature of accountability, governance, and ownership in distributed participatory design in care provision. The ethnographic account of the narratives of expectations and fears of the participants resulting from this activity, and a systematic study of the technical tools available to empower a fully scalable citizen participation, are documented and published for peer evaluation and reproduction.

This social contract can and should be reused to underpin subsequent exercises in collective intelligence. We view it as an essential part of the methodology POPREBEL aims to build.

**Open data/open access**

POPREBEL is committed to an uncompromising openess. All research is published as open access – Gold if possible, Green if necessary. All data generated are irreversibly committed to the commons as open data. This includes the online conversation itself: consistently with the policy of the edgeryders.eu platform, which hosts it, the POPREBEL conversation is published under a Creative Commons International 4.0 – Attribution licence. Once we encode our data in semantic social network form, we store them on zenodo.org under the same licence. This is our contribution to building an open ethnographic data commons.

5.2 Security

No activities raising security issues

No EU-classified information as background or results.
Bibliography
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### ESTIMATED BUDGET FOR THE ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form of costs</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit²</th>
<th>Unit²</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flat-rate¹²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EU contribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reimbursement rate %</th>
<th>Maximum EU contribution¹</th>
<th>Maximum grant amount¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>605 455.75</td>
<td>684 455.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated costs of in-kind contributions not used on premises</th>
<th>Declaration of costs under Point D.4</th>
<th>Estimated costs of beneficiaries/linked third parties not receiving funding/international partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

1. See Article 6 for the eligibility conditions.
2. Indirect costs already covered by an operating grant (received under any EU or Euratom funding programme; see Article 6.5(b)) are ineligible under the GA. Therefore, a beneficiary-linked 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 budgeted costs by the reimbursement rate). This theoretical amount is capped by the 'maximum grant amount' (that the Agency decided to grant for the action) (see Article 5.1).
4. The 'maximum grant amount' is the maximum grant amount decided by the Agency. It normally corresponds to the requested grant, but may be lower.
5. Depending on its type, this specific cost category will or will not cover indirect costs. Specific unit costs that include indirect costs are: costs for energy efficiency measures in buildings, access costs for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure and costs for clinical studies.
6. See Article 5 for the forms of costs.
7. Unit: hours worked on the action; costs per unit (hourly rate) - calculated according to the beneficiary's usual accounting practice.
8. See Annex 2A 'Additional information on the estimated budget' for the details (costs per hour (hourly rate)).
9. Unit: hours worked on the action; costs per unit (hourly rate) - calculated according to the beneficiary's usual accounting practice.
10. 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).
11. See Annex 2A 'Additional information on the estimated budget' for the details (units, costs per unit).
ANNEX 2a

ADDITIONAL 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.

⚠️ Transitory period: Until SyGMA fully supports Annex 2a, you must prepare it manually (using this template by choosing and deleting the options/entering the appropriate data). For the ‘unit cost tables’: either fill them out manually or use currently existing tables from Annex 1 or the proposal. The document can then be uploaded in SyGMA and attached to the grant agreement.

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:

\[
\text{Amount per unit} = \left( \frac{\text{the monthly living allowance for researchers in MSCA-IF actions}}{143 \text{ hours}} \right) \times \left( \text{country-specific correction coefficient of the country where the beneficiary is established} \right)
\]

The monthly living allowance and the country-specific correction coefficients are set out in the Work Programme (section 3 MSCA) in force at the time of the call:

- for calls before Work Programme 2018-2020:
  - for the monthly living allowance: **EUR 4 650**

- for calls under Work Programme 2018-2020:
  - for the monthly living allowance: **EUR 4 880**
  - for the country-specific correction coefficients: see Work Programme 2018-2020 (available on the Participant Portal Reference Documents page)

**[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

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:
{EUR 0.1 x estimated total kWh saved per m² 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)³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short name beneficiary/linked third party</th>
<th>BEST No</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data from the ‘building energy specification table (BEST)’ that is part of the proposal and Annex 1.
Research infrastructure unit cost

3. Access costs for providing trans-national access to research infrastructure

Units\(^2\): 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:

\[
\text{average annual total access cost to the installation (over past two years\(^3\))} \div \text{average annual total quantity of access to the installation (over past two years\(^4\))}
\]

Estimated number of units: see (for each access provider and installation) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

<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

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

\* Amount calculated, for the cost components of each task, as follows:

For personnel costs:

For personnel costs of doctors: ‘average hourly cost for doctors’, i.e.:

\[
\text{[certified or auditable total personnel costs for doctors for year N-1]} \div \text{number of full-time-equivalent for doctors for year N-1 x estimated number of hours to be worked by doctors for the task (per participant)}
\]

For personnel costs of other medical personnel: ‘average hourly cost for other medical personnel’, i.e.:

\[
\text{[certified or auditable total personnel costs for other medical personnel for year N-1]} \div \text{number of full-time-equivalent for other medical personnel for year N-1}
\]

---

\(^2\) 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.
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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.:

{certified or auditable total personnel costs for technical personnel for year N-1
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.:

{certified or auditable total costs of purchase of the consumable in year N-1
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.:

{certified or auditable total depreciation costs in year N-1 + certified or auditable total costs of purchase of services in year N-1 for the category of equipment concerned
multiplied by
estimated number of units of use of the equipment for the task (per 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.:

{certified or auditable total costs of purchase of the service in year N-1
multiplied by
estimated number of patients or subjects included in the clinical studies for which the service was delivered in year N-1

‘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:

{{{cost component ‘personnel costs’ + cost component ‘consumables’ + cost component ‘medical equipment’}
minus
{costs of in-kind contributions provided by third parties which are not used on the beneficiary’s premises + costs of providing financial support to third parties (if any))
multiplied by
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.

Estimated number of units: see (for each clinical study and beneficiary/linked third party) the ‘unit cost table’ attached

Unit cost table: clinical studies unit cost

<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 Linked third party 1a [short name]</th>
<th>Costs year N-1 Beneficiary 2 [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>Sequence No. 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task No. 1</td>
<td>Blood sample</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other Medical Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phlebotomy (nurse), 10 minutes</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Processing (lab technician), 15 minutes</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syringe</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannula</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood container</td>
<td></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></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of centrifuge, 15 minutes</td>
<td></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></td>
<td>Cleaning of XXX</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></td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task No. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount per unit (unit cost sequence 1):</td>
<td></td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence No. 2</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>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Same table as in proposal and Annex 1.
### Personnel costs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Medical Personnel</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Personnel</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs of consumables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs of medical equipment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Costs of services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Indirect costs (25% flat-rate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
<td>XX EUR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Task No. 2

- Amount per unit (unit cost sequence 2): XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR
- Amount per unit (unit cost entire study): XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR  XX EUR
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to become beneficiary No (‘5’)

in Grant Agreement No 822682 (‘the Agreement’)

between UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),
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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.
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ACCESSION FORM FOR BENEFICIARIES

UNIVERZITET U BEOGRADU - Filozofski fakultet (UBFF), established in CIKA LJUBINA 18-20, BELGRADE 11000, Serbia, VAT number: RS100050474, (‘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 822682 (‘the Agreement’)

between UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Populist rebellion against modernity in 21st-century Eastern Europe: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism (POPREBEL)’.

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

Danijel SINANI with ECAS id nsinanid signed in the Participant Portal on 09/11/2018 at 12:14:43 (transaction id 51c1e9e3-f620-41b1-a44b-7e1b625c53d5) . Timestamp by third party at Fri Nov 09 12:14:52 CET 2018
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EDGERYDERS OU (Edgeryders), established in KAI TN 1 KESKLINNA DISTRICT, TALLIN 10111, Estonia, VAT number: EE101972833, (‘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 822682 (‘the Agreement’)

between UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON and the Research Executive Agency (REA) (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’),

for the action entitled ‘Populist rebellion against modernity in 21st-century Eastern Europe: neo-traditionalism and neo-feudalism (POPREBEL)’.

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

Alberto COTTICA with ECAS id ncottiebe signed in the Participant Portal on 13/11/2018 at 12:26:38 (transaction id Sigld-164238-
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### Financial Statement for [Beneficiary [name]]/Linked Third Party [name] for Reporting Period [reporting period]

#### Eligible Costs (per budget category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Form of Costs</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Flat rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Direct personnel costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1 Employees (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.3 Seconded persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.4 SME owners without salary</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.7 Seconded persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.8 Seconded persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.9 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Direct costs of subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Direct costs of fn. support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other direct costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.1 Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.2 Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.3 Other goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.4 Costs of large research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.5 Costs of internally invoiced goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Indirect costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1 Indirect costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2 Costs of...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Formulae

1. **Form of costs**
   - **Actual**
   - **Unit**

2. **Total costs**
   - **Receipts**
   - **Reimbursement rate %**
   - **Maximum EU contribution**
   - **Requested EU contribution**

#### Notes

- **1. Eligible costs**
  - 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. Indirect costs**
  - 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.

- **3. Indirect costs claimed**
  - The indirect costs claimed by the system are calculated automatically (by multiplying the reimbursement rate by the total costs declared). The amount you request (in the column 'requested EU contribution') may be less.

- **4. 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)

- **5. Flat rate**
  - Only specific unit costs that do not include indirect costs

---

**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).
ANNEX 5

MODEL FOR THE CERTIFICATE ON THE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

- For options [in italics in square brackets]: choose the applicable option. Options not chosen should be deleted.
- For fields in [grey in square brackets]: enter the appropriate data
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INDEPENDENT REPORT OF FACTUAL FINDINGS ON COSTS DECLARED UNDER A GRANT AGREEMENT FINANCED UNDER THE HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
Terms of Reference for an Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs declared under a Grant Agreement financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

This document sets out the ‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ under which

[OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]  [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]

agrees to engage

[insert legal name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’)

to produce an independent report of factual findings (‘the Report’) concerning the Financial Statement(s) drawn up by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] for the Horizon 2020 grant agreement [insert number of the grant agreement, title of the action, acronym and duration from/to] (‘the Agreement’), and

to issue a Certificate on the Financial Statements’ (‘CFS’) referred to in Article 20.4 of the Agreement based on the compulsory reporting template stipulated by the Commission.

The Agreement has been concluded under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme (H2020) between the Beneficiary and [OPTION 1: the European Union, represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)][ OPTION 2: the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom,) represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)] [OPTION 3: the [Research Executive Agency (REA)] [European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA)] [Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA)] [Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)] (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’).

The [Commission] [Agency] is mentioned as a signatory of the Agreement with the Beneficiary only. The [European Union][Euratom][Agency] is not a party to this engagement.

1.1 Subject of the engagement

The coordinator must submit to the [Commission][Agency] the final report within 60 days following the end of the last reporting period which should include, amongst other documents, a CFS for each beneficiary and for each linked third party that requests a total contribution of EUR 325 000 or more, as reimbursement of actual costs and unit costs calculated on the basis of its usual cost accounting practices (see Article 20.4 of the Agreement). The CFS must cover all reporting periods of the beneficiary or linked third party indicated above.

The Beneficiary must submit to the coordinator the CFS for itself and for its linked third party(ies), if the CFS must be included in the final report according to Article 20.4 of the Agreement.

The CFS is composed of two separate documents:

- The Terms of Reference (‘the ToR’) to be signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor;

---

1 By which costs under the Agreement are declared (see template ‘Model Financial Statements’ in Annex 4 to the Grant Agreement).
The Auditor’s Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’) to be issued on the Auditor’s letterhead, dated, stamped and signed by the Auditor (or the competent public officer) which includes the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) to be performed by the Auditor, and the standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) to be confirmed by the Auditor.

If the CFS must be included in the final report according to Article 20.4 of the Agreement, the request for payment of the balance relating to the Agreement cannot be made without the CFS. However, the payment for reimbursement of costs covered by the CFS does not preclude the Commission / Agency, the European Anti-Fraud Office and the European Court of Auditors from carrying out checks, reviews, audits and investigations in accordance with Article 22 of the Agreement.

1.2 Responsibilities

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]:

- must draw up the Financial Statement(s) for the action financed by the Agreement in compliance with the obligations under the Agreement. The Financial Statement(s) must be drawn up according to the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] accounting and 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.]

---

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
[d d 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) 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:

---

**Explanation (to be removed from the Report):**

If a Finding was not applicable, it must be marked as ‘N.A.’ (‘Not applicable’) in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table and means that the Finding did not have to be corroborated by the Auditor and the related Procedure(s) did not have to be carried out.

The reasons of the non-application of a certain Finding must be obvious i.e.

i) if no cost was declared under a certain category then the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) are not applicable;

ii) if the condition set to apply certain Procedure(s) are not met the related Finding(s) and those Procedure(s) are not applicable. For instance, for ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euro’ the Procedure and Finding related to ‘beneficiaries with accounts established in euro’ are not applicable. Similarly, if no additional remuneration is paid, the related Finding(s) and Procedure(s) for additional remuneration are not applicable.

---

**List here all Findings considered not applicable for the present engagement and explain the reasons of the non-applicability.**

....

**Exceptions**

Apart from the exceptions listed below, the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] provided the Auditor all the documentation and accounting information needed by the Auditor to carry out the requested Procedures and evaluate the Findings.

---

**Explanation (to be removed from the Report):**

- If the Auditor was not able to successfully complete a procedure requested, it must be marked as ‘E’ (‘Exception’) in the corresponding row on the right-hand column of the table. The reason such as the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability of data that prevents the Auditor from carrying out the Procedure must be indicated below.

- If the Auditor cannot corroborate a standard finding after having carried out the corresponding procedure, it must also be marked as ‘E’ (‘Exception’) and, where possible, the reasons why the Finding was not fulfilled and its possible impact must be explained here below.

---

**List here any exceptions and add any information on the cause and possible consequences of each exception, if known. If the exception is quantifiable, include the corresponding amount.**

....
Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. The Beneficiary was unable to substantiate the Finding number 1 on ... because ....
2. Finding number 30 was not fulfilled because the methodology used by the Beneficiary to calculate unit costs was different from the one approved by the Commission. The differences were as follows: ...
3. After carrying out the agreed procedures to confirm the Finding number 31, the Auditor found a difference of ___________EUR. The difference can be explained by ...

Further Remarks

In addition to reporting on the results of the specific procedures carried out, the Auditor would like to make the following general remarks:

Example (to be removed from the Report):

1. Regarding Finding number 8 the conditions for additional remuneration were considered as fulfilled because ....
2. In order to be able to confirm the Finding number 15 we carried out the following additional procedures: ....

Use of this Report

This Report may be used only for the purpose described in the above objective. It was prepared solely for the confidential use of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the [Commission] [Agency], and only to be submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] in connection with the requirements set out in Article 20.4 of the Agreement. The Report may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the [Commission] [Agency] for any other purpose, nor may it be distributed to any other parties. The [Commission] [Agency] may only disclose the Report to authorised parties, in particular to the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.

This Report relates only to the Financial Statement(s) submitted to the [Commission] [Agency] by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] for the Agreement. Therefore, it does not extend to any other of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statement(s).

There was no conflict of interest\(^4\) between the Auditor and the Beneficiary \(\text{and Linked Third Party}\) 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.
Grant Agreement number: [insert number] [insert acronym] [insert call identifier]

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>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | The Auditor draws a sample of persons whose costs were declared in the Financial Statement(s) to carry out the procedures indicated in the consecutive points of this section A.  
*(The sample should be selected randomly so that it is representative. Full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 people (including employees, natural persons working under a direct contract and personnel seconded by a third party), otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 people, or 10% of the total, whichever number is the highest)*  
The Auditor sampled ______ people out of the total of ______ people. |                         |                       |
### Ref

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.1 PERSONNEL COSTS</strong></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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 1-5 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed the following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the payslips of the employees included in the sample;</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o the Beneficiary’s usual policy regarding payroll matters (e.g. salary policy, overtime policy, variable pay);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o applicable national law on taxes, labour and social security and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o any other document that supports the personnel costs declared.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Auditor also verified the eligibility of all components of the retribution (see Article 6 GA) and recalculated the personnel costs for employees included in the sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 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
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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…);</td>
<td>7) The amount of additional remuneration paid corresponded to the Beneficiary’s usual remuneration practices and was consistently paid whenever the same kind of work or expertise was required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o recalculated the amount of additional remuneration eligible for the action based on the supporting documents received (full-time or part-time work, exclusive or non-exclusive dedication to the action, 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’).</td>
<td>8) The criteria used to calculate the additional remuneration were objective and generally applied by the Beneficiary regardless of the source of funding used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘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.</td>
<td>9) The amount of additional remuneration included in the personnel costs charged to the action was capped at EUR 8,000 per FTE/year (up to the equivalent pro-rata amount if the person did not work on the action full-time during the year or did not work exclusively on the action).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IF ANY PART OF THE REMUNERATION PAID TO THE EMPLOYEE QUALIFIES AS &quot;ADDITIONAL REMUNERATION&quot; AND IS ELIGIBLE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 6.2.A.1, THIS CAN BE CHARGED AS ELIGIBLE COST TO THE ACTION UP TO THE FOLLOWING AMOUNT:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) IF THE PERSON WORKS FULL TIME AND EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION DURING THE FULL YEAR: UP TO EUR 8 000/YEAR;</td>
<td>10) The personnel costs included in the Financial Statement were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practice. This methodology was consistently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) IF THE PERSON WORKS EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION BUT NOT FULL-TIME OR NOT FOR THE FULL YEAR: UP TO THE CORRESPONDING PRO-RATA AMOUNT OF EUR 8 000, OR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) IF THE PERSON DOES NOT WORK EXCLUSIVELY ON THE ACTION: UP TO A PRO-RATA AMOUNT CALCULATED IN ACCORDANCE TO ARTICLE 6.2.A.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Additional procedures in case “unit costs calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices” is applied:</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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>factual findings 10-13 listed in the next column:</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For natural persons included in the sample and working with the Beneficiary under a direct contract other than an employment contract, such as consultants (no subcontractors).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 14-17 listed in the next column the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the contracts, especially the cost, contract duration, work description, place of work, ownership of the results and reporting obligations to the Beneficiary;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the employment conditions of staff in the same category to compare costs and;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o any other document that supports the costs declared and its registration (e.g. invoices, accounting records, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For personnel seconded by a third party and included in the sample (not subcontractors)

To confirm standard factual findings 18-21 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed following information/documents provided by the Beneficiary:

- their secondment contract(s) notably regarding costs, duration, work description, place of work and ownership of the results;
- if there is reimbursement by the Beneficiary to the third party for the resource made available (in-kind contribution against payment): any documentation that supports the costs declared (e.g. contract, invoice, bank payment, and proof of registration in its accounting/payroll, etc.) and reconciliation of the Financial Statement(s) with the accounting system (project accounting and general ledger) as well as any proof that the amount invoiced by the third party did not include any profit;
- if there is no reimbursement by the Beneficiary to the third party for the resource made available (in-kind contribution free of charge): a proof of the actual cost borne by the Third Party for the resource made available free of charge to the Beneficiary such as a statement of costs incurred by the Third Party and proof of the registration in the Third Party’s accounting/payroll;

<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></td>
<td>results were generated by itself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Their costs were not significantly different from those for staff who performed similar tasks under an employment contract with the Beneficiary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>The costs were supported by audit evidence and registered in the accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Seconded personnel reported to the Beneficiary and worked on the Beneficiary’s premises (unless otherwise agreed with the Beneficiary).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If personnel is seconded against payment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>The costs declared were supported with documentation and recorded in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding</td>
<td>Result (C / E / N.A.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o any other document that supports the costs declared (e.g. invoices, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2</td>
<td><strong>PRODUCTIVE HOURS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the annual productive hours applied were calculated in accordance with one of the methods described below,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the full-time equivalent (FTEs) ratios for employees not working full-time were correctly calculated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>If personnel is seconded free of charge:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22) The Beneficiary applied method [choose one option and delete the others]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[A]: 1720 hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[B]: the ‘total number of hours worked’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[C]: ‘standard annual productive hours’ used correspond to usual accounting practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23) Productive hours were calculated annually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24) For employees not working full-time the full-time equivalent (FTE) ratio was correctly applied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

‘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.

<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></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary applied method B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>25) The calculation of the number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was verifiable based on the documents provided by the Beneficiary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the Beneficiary applied method C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A.3 **HOURLY PERSONNEL RATES**

I) For unit costs calculated in accordance to the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practice (unit costs):

If the Beneficiary has a "Certificate on Methodology to calculate unit costs " (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.

If the Beneficiary does not have a "Certificate on Methodology" (CoMUC) approved by the Commission, or if the methodology approved was not applied, then the Auditor:

- reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;
- recalculated the unit costs (hourly rates) of staff included in the sample following the results of the procedures carried out in A.1 and A.2.

II) For individual hourly rates:

The Auditor:

- reviewed the documentation provided by the Beneficiary, including manuals and internal guidelines that explain how to calculate hourly rates;

<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>27</td>
<td>The ‘annual productive hours’ used for calculating the hourly rate were consistent with the usual cost accounting practices of the Beneficiary and were equivalent to at least 90% of the ‘annual workable hours’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Beneficiary applied [choose one option and delete the other]:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Option I: “Unit costs (hourly rates) were calculated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices”]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Option II: Individual hourly rates were applied]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

"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 VERIFIED IN LINE WITH PROCEDURE A.2 (FULL FINANCIAL YEAR HOURLY RATE);**

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).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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. “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 verified in line with procedure A.2 (full financial year hourly rate); B) by dividing the actual monthly amount of personnel costs of an employee verified in line with procedure A.1 by 1/12 of the number of annual productive hours verified in line with procedure A.2 (monthly hourly rate).</td>
<td>activities irrespective of the source of funding.</td>
<td>(C / E / N.A.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A.4 TIME RECORDING SYSTEM

To verify that the time recording system ensures the fulfilment of all minimum requirements and that the hours declared for the action were correct, accurate and properly authorised and supported by documentation, the Auditor made the following checks for the persons included in the sample that declare time as worked for the action on the basis of time records:

- description of the time recording system provided by the Beneficiary (registration, authorisation, processing in the HR-system);
- its actual implementation;
- time records were signed at least monthly by the employees (on paper or electronically) and authorised by the project manager or another manager;
- the hours declared were worked within the project period;
- 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);
- the hours charged to the action matched those in the time recording system.

*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).*

If the persons are working exclusively for the action and without time records

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.

<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.4</td>
<td><strong>TIME RECORDING SYSTEM</strong></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></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></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></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></td>
<td>36) The exclusive dedication is supported by a declaration signed by the Beneficiary and by any other evidence gathered.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COSTS OF SUBCONTRACTING

**B.1** The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of subcontracting costs and sampled **cost items selected randomly** (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 items, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).

To confirm standard factual findings 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).

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.

<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>B</td>
<td>COSTS OF SUBCONTRACTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.1</td>
<td>The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of subcontracting costs and sampled <strong>cost items selected randomly</strong> (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 items, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).</td>
<td>37) The use of claimed subcontracting costs was foreseen in Annex 1 and costs were declared in the Financial Statements under the subcontracting category.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To confirm standard factual findings 37-41 listed in the next column, the Auditor reviewed the following for the items included in the sample:</td>
<td>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 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>o the use of subcontractors was foreseen in Annex 1;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o subcontracting costs were declared in the subcontracting category of the Financial Statement;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o supporting documents on the selection and award procedure were followed;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the Beneficiary ensured best value for money (key elements to appreciate the respect of this principle are the award of the subcontract to the bid offering best price-quality ratio, under conditions of transparency and equal treatment. In case an existing framework contract was used the Beneficiary ensured it was established on the basis of the principle of best value for money under conditions of transparency and equal treatment).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In particular,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. if the Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive 2004/18/EC (or 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii. if the Beneficiary did not fall under the above-mentioned category the Auditor verified that the Beneficiary followed their usual procurement rules and respected the Terms and Conditions of the Agreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39) The subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the items included in the sample the Auditor also verified that:</td>
<td>of the consortium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the subcontracts were not awarded to other Beneficiaries in the consortium;</td>
<td>40) All subcontracts were supported by signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o there were signed agreements between the Beneficiary and the subcontractor;</td>
<td>41) There was evidence that the services were provided by the subcontractors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o there was evidence that the services were provided by subcontractor;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C COSTS OF PROVIDING FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES

C.1 The Auditor obtained the detail/breakdown of the costs of providing financial support to third parties and sampled ______ cost items selected randomly (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest).

The Auditor verified that the following minimum conditions were met:

- a) the maximum amount of financial support for each third party did not exceed EUR 60 000, unless explicitly mentioned in Annex 1;

- b) the financial support to third parties was agreed in Annex 1 of the Agreement and the other provisions on financial support to third parties included in Annex 1 were respected.

42) All minimum conditions were met
### D. OTHER ACTUAL DIRECT COSTS

#### D.1 COSTS OF TRAVEL AND RELATED SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES

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 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 ______ 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.
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:

| 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. |

In addition, the Auditor verified that these goods and services were acquired in conformity with...
the Beneficiary's internal guidelines and procedures, in particular:

- if Beneficiary acted as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directive 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.

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)

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.

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.

### 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

### D.5.1 Notes:

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.

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 cost or costs included in other
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.

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

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.

**USE OF EXCHANGE RATES**

**E.1** a) For Beneficiaries with accounts established in a currency other than euros

The Auditor sampled ______ cost items selected randomly and verified that the exchange rates used for converting other currencies into euros were in accordance with the following rules established in the Agreement (full coverage is required if there are fewer than 10 items, otherwise the sample should have a minimum of 10 item, or 10% of the total, whichever number is highest):

**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.
DETERMINED OVER THE CORRESPONDING REPORTING PERIOD.

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.**

67) The Beneficiary applied its usual accounting practices.

---

[legal name of the audit firm]

[name and function of an authorised representative]

[dd Month yyyy]

<Signature of the Auditor>
ANNEX 6

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

INDEPENDENT REPORT OF FACTUAL FINDINGS ON THE METHODOLOGY CONCERNING GRANT AGREEMENTS FINANCED UNDER THE HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
Terms of reference for an audit engagement for a methodology certificate in connection with one or more grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme

This document sets out the ‘Terms of Reference (ToR)’ under which

[OPTION 1: [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)] [OPTION 2: [insert name of the linked third party] (‘the Linked Third Party’), third party linked to the Beneficiary [insert name of the beneficiary] (‘the Beneficiary’)]

agrees to engage

[insert legal name of the auditor] (‘the Auditor’)

to produce an independent report of factual findings (‘the Report’) concerning the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual accounting practices for calculating and claiming direct personnel costs declared as unit costs (‘the Methodology’) in connection with grant agreements financed under the Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Framework Programme.

The procedures to be carried out for the assessment of the methodology will be based on the grant agreement(s) detailed below:

[title and number of the grant agreement(s)] (‘the Agreement(s)’)

The Agreement(s) has(have) been concluded between the Beneficiary and [OPTION 1: the European Union, represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)] [OPTION 2: the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom), represented by the European Commission (‘the Commission’)] [OPTION 3: the [Research Executive Agency (REA)] [European Research Council Executive Agency (ERCEA)] [Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA)] [Executive Agency for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (EASME)] (‘the Agency’), under the powers delegated by the European Commission (‘the Commission’).]

The [Commission] [Agency] is mentioned as a signatory of the Agreement with the Beneficiary only. The [European Union] [Euratom] [Agency] is not a party to this engagement.

1.1 Subject of the engagement

According to Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement, beneficiaries [and linked third parties] that declare direct personnel costs as unit costs calculated in accordance with their usual cost accounting practices may submit to the [Commission] [Agency], for approval, a certificate on the methodology (‘CoMUC’) stating that there are adequate records and documentation to prove that their cost accounting practices used comply with the conditions set out in Point A of Article 6.2.

The subject of this engagement is the CoMUC which is composed of two separate documents:

- the Terms of Reference (‘the ToR’) to be signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor;

- the Auditor’s Independent Report of Factual Findings (‘the Report’) issued on the Auditor’s letterhead, dated, stamped and signed by the Auditor which includes; the standard statements (‘the Statements’) evaluated and signed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party], the agreed-upon procedures (‘the Procedures’) performed by the Auditor and the standard factual findings
The information provided through the Statements, the Procedures and the Findings will enable the Commission to draw conclusions regarding the existence of the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] usual cost accounting practice and its suitability to ensure that direct personnel costs claimed on that basis comply with the provisions of the Agreement. The Commission draws its own conclusions from the Report and any additional information it may require.

1.2 Responsibilities

The parties to this agreement are the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and the Auditor.

The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party]:
- is responsible for preparing financial statements for the Agreement(s) (‘the Financial Statements’) in compliance with those Agreements;
- is responsible for providing the Financial Statement(s) to the Auditor and enabling the Auditor to reconcile them with the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] accounting and bookkeeping system and the underlying accounts and records. The Financial Statement(s) will be used as a basis for the procedures which the Auditor will carry out under this ToR;
- is responsible for its Methodology and liable for the accuracy of the Financial Statement(s);
- is responsible for endorsing or refuting the Statements indicated under the heading ‘Statements to be made by the Beneficiary/Linked Third Party’ in the first column of the table that forms part of the Report;
- must provide the Auditor with a signed and dated representation letter;
- accepts that the ability of the Auditor to carry out the Procedures effectively depends upon the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] providing full and free access to the [Beneficiary’s] [Linked Third Party’s] staff and to its accounting and other relevant records.

The Auditor:
- [Option 2 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party has an independent Public Officer: is a competent and independent Public Officer for which the relevant national authorities have established the legal capacity to audit the Beneficiary].
- [Option 3 if the Beneficiary or Linked Third Party is an international organisation: is an [internal] [external] auditor in accordance with the internal financial regulations and procedures of the international organisation].

The Auditor:
- must be independent from the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party], in particular, it must not have been involved in preparing the Beneficiary’s [and Linked Third Party’s] Financial Statement(s);
- must plan work so that the Procedures may be carried out and the Findings may be assessed;
- must adhere to the Procedures laid down and the compulsory report format;
- must carry out the engagement in accordance with these ToR;
- must document matters which are important to support the Report;
- must base its Report on the evidence gathered;
- must submit the Report to the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].
The Commission sets out the Procedures to be carried out and the Findings to be endorsed by the Auditor. The Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence. As this engagement is not an assurance engagement the Auditor does not provide an audit opinion or a statement of assurance.

1.3 Applicable Standards

The Auditor must comply with these Terms of Reference and with¹:

- the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board (IAASB);
- the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA). Although ISRS 4400 states that independence is not a requirement for engagements to carry out agreed-upon procedures, the Commission requires that the Auditor also complies with the Code’s independence requirements.

The Auditor’s Report must state that there was no conflict of interests in establishing this Report between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party] that could have a bearing on the Report, and must specify – if the service is invoiced - the total fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report.

1.4 Reporting

The Report must be written in the language of the Agreement (see Article 20.7 of the Agreement).

Under Article 22 of the Agreement, the Commission, [the Agency], the European Anti-Fraud Office and the Court of Auditors have the right to audit any work that is carried out under the action and for which costs are 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.]

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\(^1\) submitted thereafter.

The scope of the Procedures and the definition of the standard statements and findings were determined solely by the Commission. Therefore, the Auditor is not responsible for their suitability or pertinence.

Since the Procedures carried out constitute neither an audit nor a review made in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, we do not give a statement of assurance on the costs declared on the basis of the [Beneficiary's] [Linked Third Party's] Methodology. Had we carried out additional procedures or had we performed an audit or review in accordance with these standards, other matters might have come to its attention and would have been included in the Report.

### Exceptions

Apart from the exceptions listed below, the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] agreed with the standard Statements and provided the Auditor all the documentation and accounting information needed by the Auditor to carry out the requested Procedures and corroborate the standard Findings.

List here any exception and add any information on the cause and possible consequences of each exception, if known. If the exception is quantifiable, also indicate the corresponding amount.

\[\text{.....}\]

\[\text{Explanation of possible exceptions in the form of examples (to be removed from the Report):}\]

\[i. \text{the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] did not agree with the standard Statement number ... because...;}\]
\[ii. \text{the Auditor could not carry out the procedure ... established because .... (e.g. due to the inability to reconcile key information or the unavailability or inconsistency of data);}\]
\[iii. \text{the Auditor could not confirm or corroborate the standard Finding number ... because ....}\]

### 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:

\[\text{Example (to be removed from the Report):}\]

\[\text{Regarding the methodology applied to calculate hourly rates ...}\]
\[\text{Regarding standard Finding 15 it has to be noted that ...}\]

\[\text{The [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] explained the deviation from the benchmark statement XXIV concerning time recording for personnel with no exclusive dedication to the action in the following manner:}\]

### Annexes

Please provide the following documents to the auditor and annex them to the report when submitting this CoMUC to the Commission:

---

\(^1\) Financial Statement in this context refers solely to Annex 4 of the Agreement by which the Beneficiary declares costs under the Agreement.
1. Brief description of the methodology for calculating personnel costs, productive hours and hourly rates;
2. Brief description of the time recording system in place;
3. An example of the time records used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party];
4. Description of any budgeted or estimated elements applied, together with an explanation as to why they are relevant for calculating the personnel costs and how they are based on objective and verifiable information;
5. A summary sheet with the hourly rate for direct personnel declared by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] and recalculated by the Auditor for each staff member included in the sample (the names do not need to be reported);
6. A comparative table summarising for each person selected in the sample a) the time claimed by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in the Financial Statement(s) and b) the time according to the time record verified by the Auditor;
7. A copy of the letter of representation provided to the Auditor.

Use of this Report

This Report has been drawn up solely for the purpose given under Point 1.1 Reasons for the engagement.

The Report:
- is confidential and is intended to be submitted to the Commission by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] in connection with Article 18.1.2 of the Agreement;
- may not be used by the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party] or by the Commission for any other purpose, nor distributed to any other parties;
- may be disclosed by the Commission only to authorised parties, in particular the European Anti-Fraud Office (OLAF) and the European Court of Auditors.
- relates only to the usual cost accounting practices specified above and does not constitute a report on the Financial Statements of the [Beneficiary] [Linked Third Party].

No conflict of interest exists between the Auditor and the Beneficiary [and the Linked Third Party] that could have a bearing on the Report. The total fee paid to the Auditor for producing the Report was EUR ______ (including EUR ______ of deductible VAT).

We look forward to discussing our Report with you and would be pleased to provide any further information or assistance which may be required.

Yours sincerely

[legal name of the Auditor]
[name and title of the authorised representative]
[dd Month yyyy]
Signature of the Auditor

---

2 A conflict of interest arises when the Auditor's objectivity to establish the certificate is compromised in fact or in appearance when the Auditor for instance:
- was involved in the preparation of the Financial Statements;
- stands to benefit directly should the certificate be accepted;
- has a close relationship with any person representing the beneficiary;
- is a director, trustee or partner of the beneficiary; or
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her independence or ability to establish the certificate impartially.
Statements to be made by the Beneficiary/Linked Third Party (‘the Statements’) and Procedures to be carried out by the Auditor (‘the Procedures’) and standard factual findings (‘the Findings’) to be confirmed by the Auditor

The Commission reserves the right to provide the auditor with guidance regarding the Statements to be made, the Procedures to be carried out or the Findings to be ascertained and the way in which to present them. The Commission reserves the right to vary the Statements, Procedures or Findings by written notification to the Beneficiary/Linked Third Party to adapt the procedures to changes in the grant agreement(s) or to any other circumstances.

If this methodology certificate relates to the Linked Third Party’s usual accounting practices for calculating and claiming direct personnel costs declared as unit costs any reference here below to ‘the Beneficiary’ is to be considered as a reference to ‘the Linked Third Party’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>A. Use of the Methodology</td>
<td>Procedure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. The cost accounting practice described below has been in use since [dd Month yyyy].</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor checked these dates against the documentation the Beneficiary has provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. The next planned alteration to the methodology used by the Beneficiary will be from [dd Month yyyy].</td>
<td>Factual finding:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. The dates provided by the Beneficiary were consistent with the documentation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| B. Description of the Methodology | Procedure: |
| III. The methodology to calculate unit costs is being used in a consistent manner and is reflected in the relevant procedures. | ✓ The Auditor reviewed the description, the relevant manuals and/or internal guidance documents describing the methodology. |
| [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] | Factual finding: |
| [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: “...”] | 2. The brief description was consistent with the relevant manuals, internal guidance and/or other documentary evidence the Auditor has reviewed. |
| 3. The methodology was generally applied by the Beneficiary as part of its usual costs accounting practices. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Personnel costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Procedure:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td><em>The Auditor draws a sample of employees to carry out the procedures indicated in this section C and the following sections D to F.</em></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 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>V. Employees are hired directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with national law, and work under its sole supervision and responsibility;</td>
<td>✓ in particular, the Auditor reviewed the employment contracts of the employees in the sample to verify that:</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>i. they were employed directly by the Beneficiary in accordance with applicable national legislation;</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>ii. they were working under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Personnel costs are based on the payroll system and accounting system.</td>
<td>iii. they were remunerated in accordance with the Beneficiary’s usual practices;</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. <em>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.</em></td>
<td>iv. they were allocated to the correct group/category/cost centre for the purposes of calculating the unit cost in line with the Beneficiary’s usual cost accounting practices;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Personnel costs claimed do not contain any of the following ineligible costs: costs related to return on capital; debt and debt service charges; provisions for future losses or debts; interest owed; doubtful debts; currency exchange losses; bank costs charged by the Beneficiary’s bank for transfers from the Commission/Agency; excessive or reckless expenditure; deductible VAT or costs incurred during suspension of the implementation of the action.</td>
<td>✓ the Auditor verified that any ineligible items or any costs claimed under other costs categories or costs covered by other types of grant or by other grants financed from the European Union budget have not been taken into account when calculating the personnel costs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Personnel costs were not declared under another EU or Euratom grant</td>
<td>✓ the Auditor numerically reconciled the total amount of personnel costs used to calculate the unit cost with the total amount of personnel costs recorded in the statutory accounts and the payroll system.</td>
</tr>
</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>(including grants awarded by a Member State and financed by the EU budget and grants awarded by bodies other than the Commission/Agency for the purpose of implementing the EU 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:]

- ...

4. All the components of the remuneration that have been claimed as personnel costs are supported by underlying documentation.
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.
6. Their employment contracts were in line with the Beneficiary’s usual policy;
7. Personnel costs were duly documented and consisted solely of salaries, social security contributions (pension contributions, health insurance, unemployment fund contributions, etc.), taxes and other statutory costs included in the remuneration (holiday pay, thirteenth month’s pay, etc.);
8. The totals used to calculate the personnel unit costs are consistent with those registered in the payroll and accounting records;
9. To the extent that actual personnel costs were adjusted on the basis of budgeted or estimated elements, those elements were relevant for calculating the personnel costs and correspond to objective and verifiable information. The budgeted or estimated elements used were: — (indicate the elements and their values).
10. Personnel costs contained no ineligible elements;
11. Specific conditions for eligibility were fulfilled when additional
### Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Productive hours</strong></td>
<td>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 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[delete as appropriate]</td>
<td><strong>Procedure (same sample basis as for Section C: Personnel costs):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. The number of productive hours per full-time employee applied is <strong>[delete as appropriate]</strong>:</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor verified that the number of productive hours applied is in accordance with method A, B or C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 1720 productive hours per year for a person working full-time (corresponding pro-rata for persons not working full time).</td>
<td>✓ The Auditor checked that the number of productive hours per full-time employee is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. the total number of hours worked in the year by a person for the Beneficiary</td>
<td>✓ If method B is applied the Auditor verified i) the manner in which the total number of hours worked was done and ii) that the contract specified the annual workable hours by inspecting all the relevant documents, national legislation, labour agreements and contracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. the standard number of annual hours generally applied by the beneficiary for its personnel in accordance with its usual cost accounting practices. This number must be at least 90% of the standard annual workable hours.</td>
<td>✓ If method C is applied the Auditor reviewed the manner in which the standard number of working hours per year has been calculated by inspecting all the relevant documents, national legislation, labour agreements and contracts and verified that the number of productive hours per year used for these calculations was at least 90% of the standard number of working hours per year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factual finding:</strong></td>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong> The Beneficiary applied a number of productive hours consistent with method A, B or C detailed in the left-hand column.</td>
<td>12. The Beneficiary applied a number of productive hours consistent with method A, B or C detailed in the left-hand column.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong> The number of productive hours per year per full-time employee was accurate.</td>
<td>13. The number of productive hours per year per full-time employee was accurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If method B is applied</strong></td>
<td><strong>If method B is applied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was</td>
<td>14. The number of ‘annual workable hours’, overtime and absences was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Please explain any discrepancies in the body of the Report.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements to be made by Beneficiary</th>
<th>Procedures to be carried out and Findings to be confirmed by the Auditor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>If method C is applied</strong></td>
<td><strong>If method C is applied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX. The standard number of productive hours per year is that of a full-time equivalent.</td>
<td>XXV. The contract specified the working time enabling to calculate the annual workable hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI. The number of productive hours per year on which the hourly rate is based i) corresponds to the Beneficiary’s usual accounting practices; ii) is at least 90% of the standard number of workable (working) hours per year.</td>
<td><strong>If method C is applied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII. Standard workable (working) hours are hours during which personnel are at the Beneficiary’s disposal preforming the duties described in the relevant employment contract, collective labour agreement or national labour legislation. The number of standard annual workable (working) hours that the Beneficiary claims is supported by labour contracts, national legislation and other documentary evidence.</td>
<td>15. The calculation of the number of productive hours per year corresponded to the usual costs accounting practice of the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. The calculation of the number of productive hours per year corresponded to the usual costs accounting practice of the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. The calculation of the standard number of workable (working) hours per year was corroborated by the documents presented by the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. The number of productive hours per year used for the calculation of the hourly rate was at least 90% of the number of workable (working) hours per year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[If certain statement(s) of section “D. Productive hours” cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor:]

- ...

**E. Hourly rates**

The hourly rates are correct because:

XXIII. Hourly rates are correctly calculated since they result from dividing annual personnel costs by the productive hours of a given year and group (e.g. staff category or department or cost centre depending on the methodology applied) and they are in line with the statements made in section C. and D. above.

[If the statement of section ‘E. Hourly rates’ cannot be endorsed by the Beneficiary they should be listed here below and reported as exception by the Auditor:]  
- ...

**Procedure**

- The Auditor has obtained a list of all personnel rates calculated by the Beneficiary in accordance with the methodology used.
- The Auditor has obtained a list of all the relevant employees, based on which the 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.

**Factual finding:**
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>19. No differences arose from the recalculation of the hourly rate for the employees included in the sample.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Time recording

XXIV. Time recording is in place for all persons with no exclusive dedication to one Horizon 2020 action. At least all hours worked in connection with the grant agreement(s) are registered on a *daily/weekly/monthly* basis [delete as appropriate] using a *paper/computer-based system* [delete as appropriate];

XXV. For persons exclusively assigned to one Horizon 2020 activity the Beneficiary has either signed a declaration to that effect or has put arrangements in place to record their working time;

XXVI. Records of time worked have been signed by the person concerned (on paper or electronically) and approved by the action manager or line manager at least monthly;

XXVII. Measures are in place to prevent staff from:

i. recording the same hours twice,

ii. recording working hours during absence periods (e.g. holidays, sick leave),

iii. recording more than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and

iv. recording hours worked outside the action period.

XXVIII. No working time was recorded outside the action period;

XXIX. No more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates.

The Auditor reviewed the brief description, all relevant manuals and/or internal guidance describing the methodology used to record time.

**Procedure**

- The Auditor reviewed the brief description, all relevant manuals and/or internal guidance describing the methodology used to record time.

- The Auditor reviewed the time records of the random sample of 10 employees referred to under Section C: Personnel costs, and verified in particular:

  - that time records were available for all persons with not exclusive assignment to the action;
  - that time records were available for persons working exclusively for a Horizon 2020 action, or, alternatively, that a declaration signed by the Beneficiary was available for them certifying that they were working exclusively for a Horizon 2020 action;
  - that time records were signed and approved in due time and that all minimum requirements were fulfilled;
  - that the persons worked for the action in the periods claimed;
  - that no more hours were claimed than the productive hours used to calculate the hourly personnel rates;
  - 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;
  - the Auditor cross-checked the information with human-resources records to verify consistency and to ensure that the internal controls have been effective. In addition, the Auditor has verified that no more hours were charged to Horizon 2020 actions per person per year than the number of productive hours per year used to calculate the hourly rates, and verified that
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>present certificate¹.</td>
<td>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.

¹ The description of the time recording system must state among others information on the content of the time records, its coverage (full or action time-recording, for all personnel or only for personnel involved in H2020 actions), its degree of detail (whether there is a reference to the particular tasks accomplished), its form, periodicity of the time registration and authorisation (paper or a computer-based system; on a daily, weekly or monthly basis; signed and countersigned by whom), controls applied to prevent double-charging of time or ensure consistency with HR-records such as absences and travels as well as it information flow up to its use for the preparation of the Financial Statements.
**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 [Linked Third Party]&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;Signature of the Auditor&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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