

Transnational Joint Call on Research and Innovation Year XXX

Terms of Reference

List of Abbreviations	2
Regulatory Bodies of Joint Call	3
1. Background Information	4
2. Group of Funding Parties (GFP) and governance of the 2nd Joint Call.	5
3. Funding model and commitment	5
4. Themes and scope of the Joint Call	6
5. Eligibility, composition and duration of the proposals	6
6. Allowable costs	8
7. Submission of Proposals	8
8. Evaluation and Selection of Proposals	9
9. Decision Making by the Group of Funding Parties	13
10. Project Contracts, Consortium Agreement and Project Monitoring	14

Annexes:

1. Detailed formulation of research topics
2. Template for National regulations of Funding Parties
3. Template for Letter of Commitment
4. Calendar of implementation
5. Overview of contributions by the participating funding organizations to each topic
6. Glossary

List of Abbreviations

CELAC	Community of Latin-American and Caribbean States
CS	Call Secretariat
EU-MS/AC	European Member States and Associated Countries
GFP	Group of Funding Parties
JTC	Joint Call
CCP	Call Contact Person
SAB	Scientific Advisory Board
SEC	Scientific Evaluation Committee
SOM	EU-CELAC Senior Officials Meeting
ToR	Terms of Reference

Regulatory Bodies of the Call

Body	Members	Function
Group of Funding Parties (GFP)	<p>A group of EU-CELAC funding agencies, ministries and other institutions which provide funds and administrative services to support national beneficiaries in collaborative projects to be jointly selected.</p> <p>Each funding party selects one representative for the GFP. The GFP is chaired by DLR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Central coordinating body for the Call - Defines the principles of the Call: the steering, decision making and monitoring of its implementation - Defines and organizes the Call, the application procedures and the review of proposals - Approves eligibility of proposals - Supervises the entire evaluation process - Each member of the GFP nominates 5 or more experts / evaluators per research field in which s/he participates as funder - Takes the final decision on the selection of projects to be funded based on the evaluation carried out by SEC - Suggests experts to be part of the SEC, approves the final SEC composition and nominates the chair - Each GFP member checks compliance with its individual national eligibility requirements before sending the proposal to evaluation - Approves the minutes of the final meeting formulated by the Call Secretariat.
Scientific Evaluation Committee (SEC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International high-level scientific experts who evaluate the proposals. - Each SEC has a chair approved by the GFP - The final composition of the SECs is approved by the GFP - Each member of the GFP has the right to propose a member of SEC - Preferably, SEC members will not participate in the peer review phase of the evaluation - Each SEC member will sign a declaration that there is no conflict of interest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ranks the proposals according to their evaluation results and recommends an evaluation cut for potential funding (in the ranking, a boundary between fundable and non-fundable proposals must be defined) - Forwards the funding recommendation to the GFP, including: final overall score and ranking list of proposals, funding categories and report on strengths and weaknesses.
Scientific Advisory Board (SAB)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - International high-level scientific experts - Each Topic has a SAB consisting of at least 2 SAB experts - Each member of the GFP has the right to propose a member of the SAB - The experts may be members of the Funding Organizations' staff - The final composition of the SAB is agreed by the GFP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To assess and provide feedback for the scientific queries during the submission phase - To assign the proposals to the evaluators according to their expertise. The SAB assignment must be validated by the GFP
Call Secretariat (CS)	<p>Comprised by MINECO CYTED-FECYT and DLR, located at the premises of CYTED in Madrid</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Manages all administrative processes of the Joint Call - Assists GFP in all administrative tasks - Checks the central eligibility rules of the submitted proposals in coordination with CCP

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensures that peer review is properly done - Informs GFP about the results of the eligibility checks providing the rationale for (non)eligibility of proposals - Provides to SECs and GFP the peer review evaluations before consensus meeting - Assists SECs in organizing ranking of proposals - Informs the applicants about (non-) eligibility of their proposals - Informs applicants of the final outcome of the evaluation
Call Contact Person (CCP)	One (or more) persons nominated by each member of the GFP in their home country	- Informs all applicants and interested parties about Joint Call regulations and their individual international call- and funding rules

1. Background Information

XXXX

Building on the mutual interest of Programme Owners' and Programme Managers' organisations in the Latin-American, Caribbean and the European member states and associated countries to implement coordinated joint activities towards a multilateral funding scheme, a **"Group of Funding Parties"** ("GFP") has been established.

This Group of Funding Parties is supported in this process by XXXX *consortium* which will facilitate the preparation process of joint activities to be realized and assist the operational management of their implementation.

The present document is a compilation of the Terms of Reference for the Joint Call (JTC) launched by the Group of Funding Parties on transnational research and innovation projects on the following thematic areas: XXXXXXXT (Annex 1: Detailed formulation of research topics).

The Joint Call will be launched on (day, month, year). The final submission date will be (day, month, year, exact time: LAC and EU). With this Joint Call, interested project consortia composed of partners from the countries represented within the GFP will be invited to submit project **proposals**. All participating funding organisations are asked to disseminate the pre-announcement through their networks. A pre-announcement will be provided by ????. The pre-announcement will be disseminated by all funding agencies as of ???

The GFP will provide funds and administrative services for supporting national beneficiaries in collaborative projects to be jointly selected. Details of the implementation of the Joint Call have been agreed upon by all members of the GFP in an Implementation Agreement with these Terms of Reference being an integral part thereof.

2. Group of Funding Parties (GFP) and governance of the 2nd Joint Call.

The following programme owners have signed the **LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO FUND the present joint call** confirming their participation in the Group of Funding Parties (GPF) and their readiness to pledge financial contributions for funding the respective eligible partners from their country in the transnational proposals selected through the Joint Call:

- 1. Country: Funding organization
- 2. Country: Funding organization
- 3. Country: Funding organization
- 4. Country: Funding organization
- 5. Country: Funding organization
- 6. Country: Funding organization
- 7. Country: Funding organization

The GFP is the central coordinating body for the Joint Call. It is chaired by the Project Management Agency at ???. The GFP is composed by one representative from each Funding Party participating in the Call. It is responsible for defining and organising the Joint Call, the application procedures and the review of proposals. The GFP will be assisted by the Call Secretariat comprised by XXXX which is located at the premises of XXXX, in all administrative tasks.

3. Funding model and commitment

The Joint Call will be implemented through a *coordinated funding scheme* whereby each Funding Party will fund its own national scientific institutions within a multilateral project ("**Virtual Common Pot**"), with a view to harmonize the funding contributions in order to guarantee the funding of the highest-quality projects with added value for bi-regional cooperation which have been selected through a peer review process.

The total amount of funding by each Funding Party available for the present call is given in the following table (funding commitments will be Euro according to the exchange rate at the time of the call):

TABLE of FUNDING ORGANIZATIONS & BUDGETS

ORGANIZATION	TOTAL COMMITMENT
1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
SUM	XXX €

See Annex 5: Overview of contributions by the participating funding organizations to each topic

The indicative total financial contribution to the Joint Call will be XXX €.

The funding of an individual proposal will depend on the nature and duration of the proposed activities and must be justified in terms of the resources needed to achieve the objectives of the project. The funding requested should therefore be realistically adjusted to the actual needs of the proposal, taking into account any other funds available.

Individual regulations of the Funding Parties will be published in the Call text: See template for National Regulations (Annex 2).

Recommendation on Funding Limit

The GFP recommends that each funding organization fixes an upper funding limit per proposal in its institutional funding regulations in order to guarantee that a maximum number of proposals that are excellent can be funded.

4. Themes and scope of the Joint Call

Background on how the topics were identified.

Topic 1: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 2: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 3: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 4: XXX

Participating countries:

Transnational consortia are invited to submit proposals related to these topics.

5. Eligibility, composition and duration of the proposals

Applicants must be eligible for funding according to the regulations of their respective national Funding Parties. They can represent public and private scientific, research, technological and innovation institutions on national, federal or EU-LAC regional level, research active industry and NGOs and other institutions involved in research activities, as long as they are eligible for funding according to the respective national regulations.

Only transnational projects will be funded. Each collaborative consortium should have the optimal critical mass to achieve ambitious scientific/innovation goals and should clearly show an added value from working together.

5.1 Eligibility of proposals and applicants

To be eligible a proposal must:

1. Conform to the scope and the thematic focus of the Call as described in Annex 1;
2. Meet the consortium composition and partnership requirements as specified below (see 5.2) and comply with the maximum allowed duration (see 5.5);
3. Secure that every individual partner/applicant of the proposal complies with the funding regulations of its respective national Funding Party (see National Funding Regulations in the Call Text).
4. Be complete according to the rules and in line with the required proposal structure described in these Terms of Reference;
5. Be submitted in English, using the XXX Webtool: [https:// XXX](https://XXX), before the submission deadline on XXX

Only proposals meeting all the above-mentioned eligibility criteria will be processed by the Call Secretariat. Non-eligible proposals will be rejected. The applicants will be informed by the Call Secretariat.

Each partner in the consortium must ensure that no doubts exist about the eligibility of their institution (university, academic institutions, industry), the eligibility of their Principal Investigator ¹(permanent staff, position secured for the duration of the project), and their eligible costs. Therefore, **applicants are strongly advised to check their national funding regulations and to contact their national Call Contact Person (CCP) in due time before the submission. The CCP will be available by phone and mail in their respective country** and oblige themselves to respond to all questions within three labour days.

Preferably, the national funding regulations should not exceed 4 pages per country. The national funding regulations of each country will be enclosed as annex to the call text. The call text will include a request to consult the regulations before submitting the proposal.

Decisions by the GFP about eligibility of proposals are final.

5.2 Composition of the proposal research consortium

- Each consortium submitting a proposal must involve a minimum of four eligible partners from four different countries with at least two countries from each region (see the list of funding organizations above).
- A maximum number of national partners applying for funding will be defined in the institutional rules of each funding organisation. The coordinator and the majority of partners in a consortium must be eligible for the funding organizations participating in this Call.

5.3 Associated partners

Self-financed associated partners may also be part of the consortia if they can clearly demonstrate an added value to the consortium and secure their own funding.

¹ See definition of PI on page 4

The associated partners must provide the Call Secretariat with a **signed official** letter of support from their Head of Department, Financial Director, or equivalent position, stating the commitment of the organization/company to provide its own funding. This letter must be included as an annex at the end of the proposal submission form.

5.4 International coordinator

Each consortium must nominate a project International Coordinator who will represent the consortium, submit the proposal, and establish any further communication with the Call Secretariat. The contact data for the Coordinator her/himself (and optionally for her/his support staff) as well as for the institution should be given in the proposal.

Each of the other national groups participating in the consortium must name a person who will be the contact for their respective national funding organization.

It is recommended that the coordinators counter check the eligibility of all partners with the CCPs. The list of CCPs (see above 5.1) is provided on the ERA-Net LAC website and in the Guidelines for Applicants. All coordinators are allowed to contact the partners' national CCPs.

5.5 Duration

The duration of a project can be **up to XXX months** (national regulations of individual Funding Parties apply). Approved projects are recommended to start between XXXX and XXX.

6. Allowable costs

The funding of proposals will be administrated according to a virtual common pot model: each Funding Party will fund its national applicants within the selected proposals according to its own regulations, proceedings, and legal requirements.

The items or concepts (personnel, travel, equipment, materials, overheads, etc.) that are fundable depend on the different regulations of every Funding Party, and might differ for the individual partners/applicants of a given proposal.

The applicants are therefore strongly advised to check the allowable costs of their respective national Funding Party (see call text), and to contact its Call Contact Person (see call text) to confirm the eligibility of the requested costs.

7. Submission of Proposals

Only proposals submitted through the online submission system hosted by "XXXX" will be accepted. Proposals sent by mail, e-mail, telex or facsimile will be rejected without notice.

All applicants must review their national regulations regarding national submission.

All members of the GFP will be provided reading access to the on-line submission system.

Double Submission

A given proposal may only be submitted for one of the topics supported within the framework of the call; otherwise it will be considered non eligible.

Researchers are only allowed to participate in one proposal as principal investigator of the coordinating institution (see page 37 definition of PI).

8. Evaluation and Selection of Proposals

8.1. Fundamental principles and steps of the evaluation process

The fundamental principles governing the evaluation of project proposals are:

- **Transparency.** The process for reaching funding decisions will be clearly described and available to any interested party.
- **Equality of treatment.** All proposals shall be treated alike, irrespective of where they originate or the identity of the applicants.
- **Ethical considerations.** Any proposal that contravenes fundamental ethical principles of a Funding Party may be excluded from being evaluated and selected at any time by decision of the GFP.

With respect to equality of treatment, the Group of Funding Parties (GFP) commits to taking all reasonable steps to avoid conflict of interest in the reviewing process (see section 8.5). This process is described in detail in the "Guidelines for Evaluators".

The evaluation process involves four steps:

- 1) **Eligibility check:** Will be done by the Call Secretariat, in cooperation with the national partner representatives.
- 2) **External written peer review:** Will be done remotely by at least three experts covering the specific fields of the research topic(s) addressed in the present Call. Each evaluator fills in an individual evaluation form whereby s/he assigns a score to each evaluation item. The evaluator also assesses the alignment of the Proposal with the objectives and scope of the call.
- 3) **Ranking of proposals according to the external evaluation results, selection of the best proposals and funding recommendations:** Will be done by the Scientific Evaluation Committees (SECs) in a consensus meeting, organized by the Call Secretariat. Each SEC should have at least three experts.
- 4) **Selection of the proposals recommended for funding:** Will be done by the Group of Funding Parties Final funding decision: Will be done by the respective national Funding Party, taking into account the evaluations and the budget allocated, and all applicable national regulations.

The SECs will formulate a short consensus report for each proposal (strengths and weaknesses) that can be forwarded to the applicants upon request.

Each funding agency may decide to forward the assessments from the individual evaluators to the applicants.

8.2 Eligibility check

Following the proposals reception, the eligibility will be checked in two steps:

- 1) The Call Secretariat (CS) will check the eligibility of the submitted proposals against the criteria agreed by the Group of Funding Parties, GFP. The CS will inform the GFP about the results providing the rationale for non-eligibility of individual proposals.
- 2) Each Funding Party will check the eligibility of its national applicants according to its national regulations (see call text for National Regulations), informing the CS afterwards.

Following the eligibility check, and if considered relevant, the GFP may open a correction process under the conditions defined in due course.

The ultimate decision on the eligibility of an applicant relies on its respective Funding Party.

The coordinators of the non-eligible proposals will be informed right after the eligibility check is concluded.

8.3 Peer review procedure

The selection of the proposals for funding is based on an **international, independent peer-review procedure**, as follows:

First, a dedicated **pool of evaluators** appointed by the GFP, consisting of external independent experts, will anonymously assess the merits of the submitted proposals. Each Funding Party should nominate at least 5 experts within each of the topics / themes they are funding. Funding institutions that are focusing on one thematic area by nature, will just nominate 5 national and international or more experts within their specific field.

The evaluators in the pool will be selected on the basis of their competence, irrespective of their nationality, age and affiliation.

Evaluators must have skills and expertise appropriate for the proposal to be assessed.

Knowledge of and experience in European-Latin-American / Caribbean research collaboration will be considered an advantage toward selection as evaluator.

All evaluators must have proven experience in one or more of the following areas or activities:

- Management or evaluation of ST&I projects;
- International cooperation in science and technology;
- Use of the results of research and technological development projects;

Evaluators must also have appropriate skills in usage of the English language. Detailed guidelines for evaluators will be provided.

In order to create a dedicated expert database, the Funding Parties will be invited to suggest additional evaluators to be registered in the database.

Each Proposal will be evaluated by three independent evaluators. Each Funding Agency must nominate at least five potential evaluators for the topics the agency participates in, providing names and contact data to the CS. The candidates must be contacted by the agencies before the names are submitted in order to guarantee that they are willing to participate in the evaluation process.

In order to keep a regional balance, each proposal will preferably have one evaluator from the Latin-America/Caribbean region and one from an EU-MS/AC region.

The final reviewers will be pre-selected from the pool of evaluators with a view to achieving maximum competence for the evaluation. The allocation of proposals to evaluators will be carried out by the Scientific Advisory Board coordinated by the Call Secretariat.

The evaluation reports will be submitted through the online evaluation system to the Call Secretariat, which forwards them to the **Scientific Evaluation Committees, SECs**.

8.3.1 Evaluation criteria

The evaluation procedure will be done according to the criteria defined in the following:

1. Excellence

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description:

- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;

- Credibility of the proposed approach;
- Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant;
- Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches).

2. Impact

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:

- The expected impacts listed in the topic description under the relevant topic;
- Enhancing research and innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge;
- Any other environmental and socially important impacts;
- Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant.
- In case of industry and SME participation: Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of global markets, and where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets
- Added value for the EU-LAC cooperation in R&D&I

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources;
- Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant);
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management.

8.3.2 Rating Scores

Each of the mentioned evaluation criteria will be measured through categories and on the below 5 - 0 scale.

EXCELLENT = 5 points The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.
VERY GOOD = 4 points The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
GOOD = 3 points The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
FAIR = 2 points The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
POOR = 1 point The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
0 points The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

The threshold for the individual criteria is 3.

8.4 Scientific Evaluation Committees, SEC.

The Scientific Evaluation Committees (SECs), approved by the GFP and constituted by experts or scientific experts, will assess and consolidate the results of the peer review evaluation process.

8.4.1 Composition and definition of the SEC

There will be one SEC per topic. In Bioeconomy there will be one SEC for both topics, as both topics refer to "biorefineries". Each Funding Party and the call secretariat has the right to propose members for the SEC.

The SEC membership will be defined through a voting process among the Funding Parties in case there are sufficient nominations.

The SEC members may come from non-participating countries as well as from participating countries in the Call. Members should be scientifically renowned experts and have large experience in managing, following and evaluating transnational projects. The Group of Funding Parties will consolidate the suggestions ensuring a balance between the fields of expertise addressed by the Joint Call and keeping in mind the gender and geographical balance. **The SECs will only be accepted once approved by the Funding Parties.**

8.4.2 Performance and objectives of the SEC

Each SEC will consolidate the results of the evaluation and make recommendations to the GFP in the form of a ranking list of proposals proposed for funding. Each SEC will in particular consider: i) proposals that have received a big difference of scores among the evaluators and ii) proposals with equal scores, giving priority following the criteria from section 8.3.1.

The SEC members are asked to sign a confidentiality agreement and must declare conflicts of interest according to the set rules in the ToR for the SEC and the guidelines for evaluators. The process for dealing with conflict of interest in the SEC is also summarized in 8.5.

The specific tasks and objectives of the Scientific Evaluation Committees are:

A) To ensure the quality and coherence of the scores and comments of the evaluation reports.

B) To assess and consolidate the evaluation results, defining by consensus for each proposal:

- A final overall score on the basis of the evaluation results, which will lead to the overall ranking.
- Assignment of the proposal to one of the three following funding categories:
 - Highly recommended for funding.
 - Recommended for funding.
 - Recommended for funding only after further consultation to the funding agencies.
- A feedback to the applicants based on the evaluation results.

The final recommendation for funding rests with the GFP. The formal funding decision will be made by the Funding Parties.

8.5 Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality

The GFP relies on the integrity of evaluators and SEC members to base their opinion with strict impartiality exclusively on the basis of the information given in the proposal and against the established evaluation criteria.

When choosing and allocating an evaluator, the Call Secretariat will take all reasonable steps to ensure that s/he is not faced with a conflict of interest in relation to the proposals s/he is requested to assess. The evaluators will commit themselves to inform the CS whenever a conflict of interest arises in the course of their duties. To facilitate this, the online evaluation mechanism will contain a section specifically requiring the evaluator to indicate possible conflict of interest, for each proposal evaluated. When informed of such conflict, the CS will take all necessary steps to replace him/her.

The evaluators are committed to maintaining the confidentiality of the information contained within the proposals they evaluate and of the outcome of the evaluation process.

The CS is committed to maintaining the anonymity of the evaluators. However, members of the CS will have access to all information relating to the evaluation process. Under no circumstances will the identity of an evaluator of a specific proposal be made available to anyone without the evaluator's written consent.

The GFP will take all reasonable steps to avoid conflict of interest in the SECs. SEC members who have timely declared a conflict of interest with one or more of the proposals will be replaced. When a conflict of interest is declared at a very late stage, ad hoc measures will be taken to avoid bias in the results of the meeting of the SECs.

9. Decision Making by the Group of Funding Parties

The members of the GFP will take the final decision regarding the proposals on a consensus basis, based on the recommendations of the Scientific Evaluation Committees. For the purposes of final selection, a meeting of the GFP will be convened.

In preparation for said meeting, the ranking list prepared by the individual SECs will be presented to

the Funding Parties, who will check the eligibility of requested funds and return an estimated national budget for each project based on their own national regulations.

The GFP will create two lists of projects considered for funding: one shortlist of projects to be funded according to the committed budget of the Funding Parties and a reserve list of those projects which cannot be funded by one or more Funding Parties as a result of their committed budget having been exhausted.

A core criterion for the first short list will be that at least one project per Funding Party will be funded, assuming that this project meets a threshold of 66% of the maximum evaluation score.

The minutes of the meeting will be prepared by the Call Secretariat and adopted by the GFP within 2 weeks. When adopted and signed by all Funding Parties, the minutes are binding for the members of the GFP, adoption by each serving as confirmation of its funding commitment.

With respect to the reserve list, several options will be considered by the Funding Parties:

- A Funding Party might decide to increase its committed budget in order to allow for projects from the reserve list to be funded normally.
- Provided the minimum eligibility criteria are still met in a given proposal (see section 8.3.1), a consortium might decide to re-distribute the work among the funded project partners by taking over the activities of a project partner whose funding organisation run out of funds. This option could only be considered if the workload to be redistributed is less than 25% of the total project workload. The non-funded partner is not obliged to leave the consortium.
- Provided the minimum eligibility criteria for funded beneficiaries in a given project consortium are still met (see section 8.3.1), additional partners might be invited to participate at their own expense.

In all cases the project consortium must still meet the requirements as specified in Section 8.3.1.

These options will be explored by the respective Funding Parties within 4 weeks after the concluding meeting of the GFP. In this time span each Funding Party will inform the GFP as to its proposed course of action. According to the resulting funding options for the reserve list based on the information received from the individual Funding Parties, the GFP will take a final decision and approval by written procedure within 6 weeks after the concluding meeting of the GFP.

The Call Secretariat will inform the applicants about the results of the evaluation process. Successful applicants will be informed regarding the next steps for concluding the individual project grant agreements at a national level by their respective Funding Parties.

10. Project Contracts, Consortium Agreement and Project Monitoring

Following the final decision taken by the GFP, the Call Secretariat will provide the necessary information to the Funding Parties in order to start national procedures necessary for project funding in their home countries.

The project consortium partners selected for funding must sign a consortium agreement (CA) for co-operation addressing the issues given in "Guidelines for applicants" on consortium agreements.

A template of a consortium agreement can be provided by the funding agencies' participating in the call consortium upon request. Overall consistency between the consortium agreements will be ensured by the Members of GFP.

The Group of Funding Parties will be responsible for the overall monitoring of the projects.

If required, each participant should submit financial and scientific reports to their **national funding organisations**, according to national regulations. The progress and final results of each individual contract/letter of grant will be monitored by the respective national/regional funding organisations.

Funding recipients must ensure that all outcomes (publications, etc.) of funded projects include a proper acknowledgement of ERA-Net LAC and the respective national/regional funding partner organisations.

Annex 1: Topics

Topic 1: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 2: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 3: XXX

Participating countries:

Topic 4: XXX

Participating countries:

Annex 2: Template of National Funding Regulations plus check list.

Applicants will be advised to check with the respective national Call Contact Person the eligibility as to who may apply and what costs are eligible before a consortium submits the complete application.

Contact Details	
Institution	
Country	
First Name	
Surname	
Email	
Telephone number	
Initial Funding Commitment	

Who can apply?

What types of costs are eligible for funding?

- Direct Costs
- Indirect Costs

Upper funding limits for eligible costs?

Additional national eligibility criteria for the proposal beyond the general criteria in the Terms of Reference of the Joint Call

Call contact point:

Other Information:

Annex 3: LETTER OF COMMITMENT TO FUND Joint Call 2015/16

The *please enter the complete name of your institution / country* is willing to participate in the *????* Call

TAKING INTO CONSIDERATION the provisions of the Agreement *????*; we agree with the process and schedule described in the TERMS OF REFERENCE for the present Joint Call formulated during the Funding Agencies' Workshop in *???* on (date).

The following budget will be available for project funding: *please enter the amount listed in the table enclosed which was contains all the budget indications given during and following the workshop in Buenos Aires.*

The final funding decisions will be made by the funding parties according to national/regional procedures and regulations.

All information related to the projects will be kept confidential and not used for any other purpose than evaluation of the application, making a funding decision and monitoring of the project.

For this collaborative activity Mr./Mrs.(name and function)..... will be our contact person; contact data:

eMail:.....

Phone-Nr:.....

Legally authorized representative:

Name

Function

Date

Signature

Annex 4: Tentative Timetable

Call preparation and announcement, submission deadline and Evaluation Process

Activities	Deadline	Responsible institution
Publication of the Call for Proposals	Day, Month, Year, Time (EU and LAC)	
Deadline for proposal submission	Should be approx.. 3 months	
Eligibility check	Starting with the submission of the proposals, ending two weeks following the deadline	
External evaluations	2 months	
Scientific Evaluation Committees' meeting (ranking of proposals)	Should be realized in personal meetings	
Meeting of funding parties to decide which proposals will be funded	Following the ranking of proposals	
Information of applicants about the results of the evaluation	Latest 3 weeks after the funding decision meeting	
Preparation of national/ regional funding contracts/funding resolutions	Aprox. 1 mont	
Start of projects	The time period varies in each funding organization. All together some 2-3 months must be calculated	
Provision of Consortium Agreement to the Call Secretariat	Must be submitted with the beginning of the project	
Maximum duration of projects	Variable	
Publication of the Call for Proposals	Day, Month, Year, Time (EU and LAC)	
Deadline for proposal submission	Should be approx.. 3 months	
Eligibility check	Starting with the submission of the proposals, ending two weeks following the deadline	
External evaluations	2 months	
Scientific Evaluation Committees' meeting (ranking of proposals)	Should be realized in personal meetings	

Annex 5: Overview of contributions by the participating funding organizations to each topic

	Funding Organization EU 1	Funding Organization EU 2	Funding Organization LAC 3	Funding Organization EU 4	Funding Organization LAC 5	Funding Organization LAC 6	Funding Organization EU 7	C Funding Organization LAC 8	Funding Organization LAC 9
Topic 1									
Topic 3									
Topic 5									
Topic 7									
Topic 9									
SUM per FA									

Annex 6: Glossary

Acknowledgement of receipt

Applicants are informed after the deadline that a proposal has been successfully submitted (but not that it is necessarily eligible).

Applicant

The term used generally for a person or entity applying to a call for proposals. The term 'participant' is used in the more limited sense of a member of a proposal or project consortium (see below).

Associated countries

Non-EU countries which are party to an international agreement with the Community, under the terms or on the basis of which it makes a financial contribution to all or part of the Seventh Framework Programme. In the context of proposal consortia, organisations from these countries are treated on the same footing as those in the EU. Currently these are: Albania, FYR Macedonia, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Turkey.

Call Contact Person (CCP)

Informs all applicants, evaluators and interested parties about the Joint Call regulations and their individual national call- and funding rules

Call for proposals (or "call")

An announcement, probably in the Official Journal, inviting proposals for research activities addressing a specific theme.

Consensus meeting

The stage in the proposal evaluation process when experts come together to establish a common view on a particular proposal.

Consortium

Consortia are composed of a number of participants who agree to work together.

Coordinator

The coordinator leads and represents the applicants. He or she acts as the point of contact with the receiving programme managing entity.

Deadline

For a particular call, the moment after which proposals cannot be submitted to the receiving programme managing entity, and usually when the Electronic Proposal Submission Service closes for that call.

Eligibility criteria

The minimum conditions which a proposal must fulfil if it is to be retained for evaluation.

European Research Area (ERA)

The Commission proposed, in January 2000, the creation of a European Research Area by harmonizing and linking the research policies of the individual Member States.

Evaluation criteria

The criteria against which eligible proposals are assessed by independent experts. Find more details

Framework Programme (FP)

Framework Programme for research and technological development is the European Union's chief instrument for funding research and technological challenges over the period. The first Research Framework Programme was launched in 1984. (also see:

Funding scheme

The mechanisms for the funding of research projects. The funding schemes have different structures and objectives, and are implemented through grant agreements.

Joint Call

Coordinated awarding of funds by programme management agencies from different countries on the basis of a public call for the submission of project proposals.

Joint research programme

A joint research programme could be understood as a multi-annual programme defining (several) research activities to be implemented jointly by the participants (thus, the implementation goes beyond a single call).

National Contact Points (NCP)

Official representatives nominated by the national authorities to provide tailored information and advice on each theme of FP7, in the national language(s).

Participants

The members of a consortium in a proposal or project. These are legal entities, and have specific rights and obligations.

Principal Investigator

There should be one principal investigator (PI) for each national research group. One of these PIs should act as coordinator to represent the project externally and to be responsible for its internal management. Each PI will act as contact person for his or her national funders.

Programme Managers

Research councils, funding agencies, managing research programmes.

Programme Owners

Ministries or regional authorities defining research programmes.

Proposal

A description of the planned research activities, information on who will carry them out, how much they will cost, and how much funding is requested.

R & D

Research and Development

Research organisation

A legal entity established as a non-profit organisation which carries out research or technological development as one of its main objectives.

Call Secretariat / Secretariat for the Coordination of Transnational Calls

Office established by the consortium that implements and coordinates the transnational call and handles the

evaluation process.

SME

Small and medium-sized enterprises

Transnational cooperation / research

Policy / research activities that span across several Member States and/or Non-EU Member States.

Two-stage submission

Some calls require proposals to be submitted in two stages

Variable Geometry

Voluntary and flexible cooperation (e.g., to implement a transnational call) of different Member States in an undertaking to achieve common goals. 'Variable-geometry' Europe is the term used to describe the idea of a method of differentiated integration which acknowledges that there are irreconcilable differences within the integration structure and therefore allows for a permanent separation between a group of Member States and a number of less developed integration units.

Virtual Common Pot

Funding model of a transnational call. Even though a centrally coordinated call is carried out in a "Virtual Common Pot". Each country will fund its own national project partners in successful proposal