



FP7-JPROG-2011-RTD Project no. 277606-JHEP

JHEP

Coordination action in support of the implementation of a Joint Programming Initiative (JPI) on Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge for Europe

Instrument: Coordination and support actions (Coordinating type)

Deliverable 3.3

Report on analysis procedure for call launch

Due date of deliverable: September, 2013.

Actual submission date: December, 2013

Start date of project: 1st October 2011

Duration: 3 Years

Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities (Italy)

Project coordinator: Antonia Pasqua RECCHIA

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007- 2013)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	ü
pp	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
INTRODUCTION	3
1. JHEP FIRST PILOT CALL: COUNTRIES INVOLVED AND PROCESS DOCUMENTS DEFINITION	4
2. PILOT CALL DOCUMENTS ANALYSIS.....	5
2.1 CALL ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL TEXT.....	5
2.2. GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS	10
2.3 PROJECT TEMPLATE	19
3. FINAL GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT CALL	25
ANNEX I JPICH –JHEP PILOT CALL ANNOUNCEMENT	26
JPI CULTURAL HERITAGE – JHEP.....	ERRORE. IL SEGNALIBRO NON È DEFINITO.
OPENS THE JOINT PILOT TRANSNATIONAL CALL FOR PROPOSALS: FUNDING OF RESEARCH PROJECTS IN CULTURAL HERITAGE	ERRORE. IL SEGNALIBRO NON È DEFINITO.
1. TOPIC OF THE CALL.....	26
2. EXPECTED PROJECTS	26
3. APPLICATION PROCEDURE.....	26
4. ELIGIBILITY AND EVALUATION	26
5. FORMS, GUIDELINES AND FURTHER INFORMATION	26
6. CONTACT PERSONS OF PARTICIPATING COUNTRIES AND REGIONS	27
ANNEX II JPICH-JHEP PILOT CALL GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS.....	29
ANNEX III JPICH-JHEP PILOT CALL PROJECT TEMPLATE.....	30
COVER PAGE	30
SECTION H: 1.7 ETHICAL AND LEGAL ISSUES	32
<u>WORK PACKAGE (WP) OVERVIEW LIST</u>	38
<u>DELIVERABLES OVERVIEW LIST</u>	38
<u>MILESTONES OVERVIEW LIST</u>	39
<u>SUMMARY OVERVIEW OF STAFF EFFORT (IN PERSON MONTHS)</u>	40

Introduction

This deliverable 3.3 is the first of four documents produced within the Work Package 3 (WP3, Task 3.3) for the purpose of analysing the whole process and documents implemented for the first pilot joint transitional call in the frame of JHEP, the first Coordination and Support Action (CSA) for the Joint Programming Initiative “Cultural Heritage and global change: a new challenge for Europe” (JPICH).

The other deliverables foreseen will be:

- Deliverable 3.4 - Report on activities procedure for funding; related the lesson learned during the funding decision and activities
- Deliverable 3.5 - Report on procedure for project evaluation; related the lesson learned during the evaluation procedure
- Deliverable 3.6 - Report on testing launched calls, an overall analysis on the experience of both call launched during the JHEP project

According to the JHEP Description of Work (DoW): This Work Package is dedicated to implementing the Joint Programming Initiative “Cultural Heritage”.

Work Package 3 is divided into the three following tasks:

- **Task 3.1:** Develop the Action Programme
- **Task 3.2:** Maximizing benefit from existing European initiatives for harmonization of activities within JPICH
- **Task 3.3:** Implementation of the Action Programme
New transnational initiatives, e.g. joint calls for proposals will be developed upon recommendation of members of the GB and based on the principle of variable geometry following the research areas identified in Task 3.1. For the dedicated participants, joint calls for proposals will be prepared and the framework for collaboration established. The Task Leader will ensure comprehensive information of the GB/EB and will collaborate with WP5 (Monitoring and Evaluation) Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation in feedback analysis of the initial joint call as well as in order to draw the lessons learned and amend the next joint calls.

This deliverable 3.3 addresses one of the first important issues in Task 3.3 – the lessons learned and amendments relating all documents involved in the launch of the pilot call, but it is also a starting point for improving the documents for the launch of the joint transnational calls.

For implementing a call several documents must be prepared. This deliverable 3.3 will examine the call supporting documents developed for the launch of the JPICH-JHEP first pilot call:

- Call announcement and call text
- Guidelines for applicants
- Project templates
-

Their purpose is to improve and make clearer the documents content for the next calls.

This deliverable 3.3 was produced by taking into account the contributions and suggestions of all Partners who participated in the first pilot call.

1. JHEP First pilot call: Countries involved and process documents definition

Before presenting the result of the analysis in detail, it is important to describe the documents process definition used by the JPICH Coordination unit.

First of all, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed by the Countries involved in this first pilot call, defined "Signatories" in the MoU.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) represents a mutual statement of commitments on the part of the JPI Participants, each of which agrees to make every reasonable effort to fulfil the intentions expressed in the joint pilot call as well as in the financial framework.

The MoU consists of seven articles and may be considered the framework agreement among the Countries, defining the "ground rules" of the first pilot call.

The following table provides a list of the Signatories involved in this first pilot call:

Country	Ministry/Agency/Council
Italy	Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (MIUR). Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali (MiBAC).
Belgium	Belgian Federal Science Policy – BELSPO. Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO).
Cyprus	Research Promotion Foundation (RPF)
Denmark	The Danish Council for Independent Research Humanities (FKK)
France	Ministère de la culture et de la communication (MCC)
Ireland	Heritage Council (HC)
Lithuania	Research Council of Lithuania (RCL)
Netherlands	NWO Humanities Department - Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research RCE Dutch Cultural Heritage Agency
Norway	Research Council of Norway – RCN
Poland	National Science Centre (NCN)
United Kingdom	Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)

All the necessary documents for the call have been prepared by adopting a bottom-up process and with a broad involvement of all the Signatories: the draft documents were presented, discussed, amended and finally approved by the Signatories.

Usually the draft documents were sent to the Signatories before meetings, discussed during meetings, where the amendments were collected, and finally approved. However, before any final approval, the draft documents were circulated among the Signatories, who were asked for their comments by a deadline, after which the document was finalized.

All the call documents were published on the JPI Cultural Heritage Web site, Heritage Portal Web site and also, at the national level, on Participating Programme Owners web sites.

2. Pilot call documents analysis

In order to improve and make clearer the documents content for the next JPICH calls, a short questionnaire, one for each document produced, was circulated among all the Signatories in order to collect suggestions. Subsequently, the documents were modified on the basis of their experiences for implementation in the next call.

The three supporting documents developed for the launch of the JPICH-JHEP first pilot call were:

- Call announcement and call text
- Guidelines for applicants
- Project templates

Each of them was analytically examined point by point. The following paragraphs summarise the comments received.

2.1 Call announcement and call text

The call announcement is a brief description of the basic call parameters, including participating countries, eligible applicants, dates, deadlines, call scope and title, description of projects and consortia to involve, and criteria for projects evaluation.

The call announcement was published at the same time on the day of the launch of Call on the JPI Cultural Heritage web site, Heritage Portal web site and also, at the national level, on Ministry or Agency web sites. It is a binding document.

The JPICH-JHEP first pilot call was structured in the following six paragraphs:

1. Topic of the Call
2. Expected projects
3. Application Procedure
4. Eligibility and Evaluation
5. Forms, Guidelines and further information
6. Contact persons of participating countries and regions

For each paragraph the Partners were requested to supply information and advice about what should be improved.

Table 1 below provides a summary of Partner inputs.

Table 1 – Summary of call announcement and call text comments

Partner/Paragraphs	1. Topic of the Call	2. Expected projects	3. Application Procedure	4. Eligibility and Evaluation	5. Forms, Guidelines and further information	6. Contact persons of participating countries and regions	What other information would have been useful for the call announcement?
MIBACT (JPICH Coordinator)	Better define contents and difference among topics.	Define (Glossary) collaborative research	---	---	---	---	
	Specify if it is possible to submit a proposal on more than one topic						
AHRC (UK)	Provide more information on call topics and make clear that proposals can address more than one topic.	Define what collaborative research is and define what research networking is. Be clear that networking within a collaborative research project does not mean that this meets the national criteria for those countries supporting networking projects only	Reference where the information can be found, on which countries can collaborate together on either collaborative research or research networking.		Contacting the National Contact point is necessary. Those who have not contacted the National Contact Point are deemed ineligible.		

Partner/Paragraphs	1. Topic of the Call	2. Expected projects	3. Application Procedure	4. Eligibility and Evaluation	5. Forms, Guidelines and further information	6. Contact persons of participating countries and regions	What other information would have been useful for the call announcement
AHRC (UK)		Would be good to emphasise the need for inter or transdisciplinarity projects					Perhaps provide a matrix that makes it clear which countries can collaborate together on either collaborative research or research networking, and on what topics.
NCN (Poland)			A faster submission system. Some researchers had to wait for 4-5 days after sending a registration request.	Decide before the call is launched what happens to the whole research consortium, when one of the partners does not meet the eligibility criteria or there is no budget coverage for one of the partners.	Introduce budget tables as used in other multilateral.		It would be very useful to introduce a Q&A document.
				Inform whether a research team may be considered as a single researcher, or whether it must consist of at least two researchers.	National eligibility requirements of all Partners should be available along with the text of the Call. These documents should be available in English, as the Principal Investigators from different countries often need to consult the eligibility criteria of their Partners from abroad.		

Partner/Paragraphs	1. Topic of the Call	2. Expected projects	3. Application Procedure	4. Eligibility and Evaluation	5. Forms, Guidelines and further information	6. Contact persons of participating countries and regions	What other information would have been useful for the call announcement
HC (Ireland)	Better definition of the contents of each area. Technical description of each theme was very scant.						
MCC (France)	If several different topics are developed, it is necessary to better define their contents.			Eligibility rules for administrative checking have to be clarified, in order to avoid the presentation of non-valid proposals for the scientific evaluation step.			
	Necessity to clearly confirm that different topics can be developed through the same proposal						

Call announcement and call text conclusion

As can be seen from the table above, the main problems concerned:

1. **Topic of the Call:** it is necessary to better define their contents and clarify that proposals can address more than one topic, in the case of several.
2. **Forms, Guidelines and further information:** National eligibility requirements of all Partners should be available in English for all participants
3. **Eligibility and evaluation:** Eligibility rules for the administrative checking have to be clarified, in order to avoid the presentation of non-valid proposals for the scientific evaluation step.

In addition, it may be useful to provide as an Annex a matrix that makes it clear which countries can collaborate together, as well as a Q&A document.

2.2. Guidelines for applicants

The guidelines for applicants contain all information concerning the joint call and detailed descriptions. Additionally, national requirements that are not the same for all call participants, shall be explicitly mentioned. In theory, the level of such additional requirements should be sought to be kept at a minimum level. It is important that requirements are known to the applicants in advance and not after the submission of the proposals. The names of the National Contact Point should also be published, with a recommendation to contact these persons prior to submission of proposals, in order to clarify national requirements and other national issues of importance.

In particular, the Guidelines for applicants to the JHEP/JPI Cultural Heritage pilot call were structured in the following paragraphs:

1. FOREWORD
2. CALL ANNOUNCEMENT
 - 2.1 Objectives of the Call for Proposals (JPCP)
 - 2.2 Research Topics
 - 2.3 Eligibility Requirements
 - 2.4 Project budget
 - 2.5 Project duration
 - 2.6 Dates and deadlines
 - 2.7 Funding rules
3. APPLICATION PROCEDURE
4. MANAGEMENT AND EVALUATION
 - 4.1 Management of the call
 - 4.2 Before the evaluation procedure
 - 4.3 Evaluation procedure
 - 4.4 Decision process, funding and start of the projects
 - 4.5 Payment Conditions
- Annex 1 - Funding Programmes (alphabetic order by country)
- Annex 2 - Contact Point details
- Annex 3 – Synthesis for countries of typology of project funded, supported topics, amount granted for national participants and total national amount for the call
- Annex 4 - Evaluation criteria

For each paragraph, the Partners were requested to supply information and advice about what should be improved.

The following Table 2a and 2b provide a summary of Partner inputs.

Table 2a – Summary of Guidelines for applicants comments (Part A)

Partner/Paragraphs	1. FOREWORD	2.1 Objectives of the Call for Proposals (JPCP)	2.2 Research Topics	2.3 Eligibility Requirements	2.4 Project budget	2.5 Project duration	2.6 Dates and deadlines	2.7 Funding rules
MIBACT (JPICH Coordinator)			Better define contents and difference among topics	_____	_____	_____		
			Specify whether it is possible to submit a proposal for more than one topic.					
AHRC (UK)	Could focus more on the call rather than the process for the JPI.	The strategic objectives would be better placed before the list of agencies/countries.	Provide more information on call topics and be clear that proposals can address more than one topic	For the first bullet point, 'Project consortia must consist of at least 3 ELIGIBLE research groups.....'. Then, if one of any of the groups is not eligible, the project as a whole is not considered eligible. This will avoid any problems with budgets etc at the Scientific Committee stage.	Separate budgets for each participating country required, perhaps as an appendix and following national criteria.	I think we could have had different durations for the different types of project - 36 months for collaborative research, 18 months for networking	Not all projects should be required to start on 1st November.	More information generally could have been provided on the eligibility rules for each country - perhaps a side of A4 per country in the annex with a link to the more detailed eligibility criteria
AHRC (UK)		Would be good to emphasise the need for inter or transdisciplinarity	Define what collaborative research is and define what	Perhaps provide a matrix that makes it clear which countries can	Make it clear that any country exceeding the limit set by their country's funding			

		projects in the objectives	research networking is. Be clear that networking within a collaborative research project does not mean that this meets the national criteria for those countries supporting networking projects only.	collaborate together on either collaborative research or research networking, and on what topics.	agency will be ineligible.			
AHRC (UK)			Be clear that projects can cover more than one topic.	Need a bullet point to explain the requirement for inter or transdisciplinarity projects	Would have been better to have set upper limits for the projects - for example, €1m for collaborative research, €100k for networking projects.			
NCN (Poland)				National eligibility requirements of all partners should be available along with the text of the Call. These documents should be available in English as the Principal Investigators from different countries often need to consult the eligibility criteria of their partners from abroad.	Introduce budget tables.			

Partner/Paragraphs	1. FOREWORD	2.1 Objectives of the Call for Proposals (JPCP)	2.2 Research Topics	2.3 Eligibility Requirements	2.4 Project budget	2.5 Project duration	2.6 Dates and deadlines	2.7 Funding rules
				Inform whether a research team may be considered as a single researcher or whether it must consist of at least two researchers.				
HC (Ireland)			Develop in more detail each research topic (or priority), what is expected, to what outcome, links or differences with other topics (priorities)	Decide before the Call is launched what happens to the whole research consortium, when one of the partners does not meet the eligibility criteria or there is no budget coverage for one of the partners. Thereby avoiding the two scenarios (with associated lengthy debate and voting) presented at the final day meeting in Rome on July 18.	Project expenditure ceilings to ensure that the budget of one country is not exhausted on one - two project(s) with knock-on implications for projects further down the ranking list.		Allow greater lead in time on all dates and deadlines, in particular on application submission and on evaluation.	
HC (Ireland)					Explain to applicants briefly how the virtual common-pot model works. This is important.			

Partner/Paragraphs	1. FOREWORD	2.1 Objectives of the Call for Proposals (JPCP)	2.2 Research Topics	2.3 Eligibility Requirements	2.4 Project budget	2.5 Project duration	2.6 Dates and deadlines	2.7 Funding rules
BELSPO (BE)		Change phrase on page 5 into: The strategic objective of the JPI-JHEP Joint Pilot Call for Proposals (JPCP) is to enable researchers in different countries to build effective collaborative networks on common transnational research topics in cultural heritage.	Develop in more detail each research topic (or priority): framework, what is expected, to what outcome, links or differences with other topics (priorities)	Why talk here about "Full proposals" if there is no prior process such as "call for expression of interests"	It would be good to discuss between the participating countries a general/maximum budget per project Partner, as a function of project type (collaborative or networking).			
			Specify that a proposal can cover one or more topics.					
			More attention needs to be drawn here to the different types of projects: its differences and the related national eligibility conditions (in bold, bigger font, ...). "Strongly recommended" is too weak. It should be obliged.					

Partner/Paragraphs	1. FOREWORD	2.1 Objectives of the Call for Proposals (JPCP)	2.2 Research Topics	2.3 Eligibility Requirements	2.4 Project budget	2.5 Project duration	2.6 Dates and deadlines	2.7 Funding rules
MCC (France)			If several different topics are developed, it is necessary to better define their contents.	It seems necessary to compare and homogenise, if possible, the national eligibility criteria	Specify the maximum budget allocated per proposal.	Homogenise the duration of proposals among partners		Duration for the establishment of funding grant agreement unrealistic. This has to be revised for the next call.
			Necessity to clearly confirm that several topics can be developed in the same proposal.	Eligibility rules for administrative checking have to be clarified in order to avoid the presentation of non-valid proposals for the scientific evaluation step. Particularly in the case of proposals involving more than three different "countries" research teams.	National/regional/federal grant providers must give an indication on the average budget they plan to allocate to their research team in a proposal. Grant providers should also have an idea of the number of proposals they could support.			Provide a single document with all the national/regional/...eligibility criteria.

Table 2b – Summary of Guidelines for applicants comments (Part B)

Partner/Paragraphs	3. APPLICATION PROCEDURE	4.1 Management of the call	4.2 Before the evaluation procedure	4.3 Evaluation procedure	4.4 Decision process, funding and start of the projects	4.5 Payment Conditions	ANNEX (1-4)
MIBACT (JPICH Coordinator)						Clarify that the each national/regional agency manages the applicants of own country	
						Clarify that the cost accounting is made at national level.	
AHRC (UK)	Under point 5, a detailed budget per country is required. Many projects provided this as one table, which a) makes it difficult for the evaluators to see the detail and b) means that we had to contact each UK team for more detailed budgetary information.		For the third bullet point, 'Proposals must involve at least 3 ELIGIBLE participants/teams'. Then if one of any of the groups is not eligible, the project as a whole is not considered eligible. This will avoid any problems with budgets etc. at the Scientific Committee stage.				<p>Annex 1: More information generally could have been provided on the eligibility rules for each country - perhaps a side of A4 per country in the annex with a link to the more detailed eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Annex 3: A maximum grant for national participant should be set for each country and should be proportional to the national budget allocated to the call. See comments for Annex 1.</p> <p>Annex 4: Would have been helpful to have had a criterium for interdisciplinarity.</p>

Partner/Paragraphs	3. APPLICATION PROCEDURE	4.1 Management of the call	4.2 Before the evaluation procedure	4.3 Evaluation procedure	4.4 Decision process, funding and start of the projects	4.5 Payment Conditions	ANNEX (1-4)
	We could do with a 'justification of resources' section, so that they have to explain why the different budgetary items are required.						Annex 1: A maximum grant for national participant should be set for each country and should be proportional to the national budget allocated to the call. For example, the UK National budget was €120,000 and the maximum budget for the national participant was €50,000. Given the UK funding rules, we would have been able to fund 3 projects which is what has happened.
BELSPO (BE)	Adapt if comments on Project template...	Don't hit the applicants with too many acronyms.					
		Adapt phrase: "MiBAC will be assisted in its coordination role by the STC. Each of the Signatories will manage administrative procedures related to successful applicants (signing the contract with successful applicants, the administrative collection of (financial) reporting, etc)."					

Partner/Paragraphs	3. APPLICATION PROCEDURE	4.1 Management of the call	4.2 Before the evaluation procedure	4.3 Evaluation procedure	4.4 Decision process, funding and start of the projects	4.5 Payment Conditions	ANNEX (1-4)
MCC (FR)			Improve the identification of experts for the remote evaluation process.	Ease the work of the Scientific Committee when establishing the ranking list through better work schedule between the remote evaluation experts and the scientific committee	Duration for the establishment of funding grant agreement unrealistic. This has to be revised for the next call.	Clarify the role between MIBAC Coordination, the funding signatories, during the contractual issues	Provide a single document with all the national/regional/...eligibility criteria

Guidelines for applicants comments conclusions

As in the previous case, comments stressed the need for a better definition of the content of the topics. In addition, the eligibility rules for administrative checking require better clarification in order to avoid the presentation of non-valid proposals at the scientific evaluation step.

For the next call, it will be useful adopt a consistent terminology: in the document, the words participants/teams/consortium are used to describe the same thing.

Furthermore, the applicants will be informed that if one of any of the groups is not eligible, then the project as a whole is not considered eligible. This will avoid problems at the Scientific Committee evaluation stage and in making funding decisions.

Finally, more information generally could have been provided on the eligibility rules for each country, even a A4 per country in the dedicated annex, with a link to the more detailed eligibility criteria.

2.3 Project template

In order to facilitate the evaluation and selection process, applicants were asked to use the same template to submit the project proposal. This template was available in download from the JPICH website in doc format to permit a simple compilation by the applicant.

Specifically, the project template used for JHEP/JPI Cultural Heritage first pilot call, was composed by the following sections:

- Section A: Project Summary
- Section B: Consortium description
- Section C: Project contents
- Section D: Description of the work
- Section E: Implementation and Project costs
- Section F: Exploitation of results and impact
- Section G: Dissemination plan of project results
- Section H: Ethical and legal issues
- Section I: Short profile (CVs) of the staff members
- Checklist for Proposers

For each paragraph, the Partners were requested to supply information and advice about what should be improved.

Table 3a and 3b below provide a summary of Partner inputs.

Table 3a – Summary of Project template comments (Part A)

Partner/Paragraphs	Section A: Project Summary	Section B: Consortium description	Section C: Project contents	Section D: Description of the work	Section E: Implementation and Project costs	Section F: Exploitation of results and impact
MIBACT (JPICH Coordinator)					Specify mandatory budget items (i.e. personnel costs, travel, equipment, etc.)	
					Require a mandatory budget for country and a budget for applicant	
					Require mandatory to specify proposal total budget and requested grant	
AHRC (UK)	Proposed start dates required for each project. Not all should be required to start on 1st November.		This section should include the bibliography. Applicants should not be allowed to add sections to the form.		Separate budgets for each participating country required, perhaps as an appendix and following national criteria.	
AHRC (UK)					Clarity required on the cost section and allowable costs. For example, the UK does not allow 'unforeseen costs'.	

Partner/Paragraphs	Section A: Project Summary	Section B: Consortium description	Section C: Project contents	Section D: Description of the work	Section E: Implementation and Project costs	Section F: Exploitation of results and impact
					Uniformity on Layout of this information would also have been helpful.	
BELSPO (BE)				Detailed work plan should include a clear indication of the implication of the different partners and their role.	This section should include a detailed budget table per project partner, to detail the requested costs for the different budget lines (i.e. personnel costs, functioning, equipment, subcontracting, overheads, etc.)	
				I think it would be better to merge the info in 1 section.	The table with the staff effort could be merged with the table in section D1.	
HC (Ireland)					Specify mandatory budget items (i.e. personnel costs, travel, equipment, etc.)	
					Require mandatory to specify proposal total budget and requested grant and greater detail to be required in this section generally.	

Partner/Paragraphs	Section A: Project Summary	Section B: Consortium description	Section C: Project contents	Section D: Description of the work	Section E: Implementation and Project costs	Section F: Exploitation of results and impact
MCC (FR)					<p>Information on budget is too general. It needs to be detailed according to budget's components (i.e. personnel costs, travel, equipment) for the whole proposal and for each "country" team. Indeed, except if the funding signatory asks for a specific information document, it is impossible for him to get an idea on what will be supported.</p> <p>At the MCC level, this document was a requirement for the administrative eligibility checking of the French research teams, published on the MCC web site.</p>	

Table 3b – Summary of Project template comments (Part B)

Partner/Paragraphs	Section F: Exploitation of results and impact	Section G: Dissemination plan of project results	Section H: Ethical and legal issues	Checklist for Proposers	What other information should we have asked applicants to provide?
AHRC (UK)					We could do with a 'justification of resources' section, so that they have to explain why the different budgetary items are required.
					Introduce a new section for Short profile and set a page limit per person for this section
BELSPO (BE)			Ethical and legal issues: this should be explained. No explanation is given in the 'Guidelines for applicants'.	The list should be worked out in detail: put a line for every criteria with regard to the Call Guidelines.	
				The 3rd row: "all partners who are not eligible...": this should also be clearly mentioned in the Guidelines for applicants.	

Partner/Paragraphs	Section F: Exploitation of results and impact	Section G: Dissemination plan of project results	Section H: Ethical and legal issues	Checklist for Proposers	What other information should we have asked applicants to provide?
HC (Ireland)				Additional tick box for applicant to confirm that they have discussed application with individual national co-ordinators and more importantly have designed the proposal in accordance with National eligibility issues.	



Project template comments conclusions

Partners who posted comments almost all agree that the main problem in the project template currently used is the lack of detail in the definition of the budget of the project according to budget components (i.e. personnel costs, travel, equipment) for the whole proposal and for each "country" team.

In addition, it should be made mandatory to specify proposal's total budget and requested grant, in order to determine the allocation of the budget among Partners.

Finally, the introduction of a new section is suggested, to include a short profile (setting a page limit per person), which could also be useful to help the evaluators committee.

3. Final general recommendations for next call

In view of the experience of the first pilot call, regarding the documentation required for the next call, the main improvements to be made can be summarised as follows:

- better definition and detail in the description of topics;
- better definition and detail in the description of national eligibility criteria to be made available to all applicants in the English language;
- request for a more detailed budget for each applicant and for each country;
- make clearly explicit, especially to applicants, that in event of the non-eligibility of a partner, the entire project will be considered not eligible.



ANNEX I JPICH –JHEP Pilot Call announcement

The First Transnational JHEP Pilot Call for Proposals is open today 10 January 2013. Deadline for submission will be April 5, 2013.

1. Topic of the Call

The research topics on which this JPICH-JHEP Joint Call is focused are:

1. Methods, tools (including non-invasive instruments) and modelling for understanding damage and decay mechanisms (including the effects of weathering and climate change) on tangible heritage (including buildings, sites and landscapes);
2. Materials, technologies and procedures for the conservation of tangible cultural heritage;
3. Use and re-use of buildings and landscapes, including the relationship between changes of use and public policy, including costs and added value (for example as a result of planning regulations and urban development);
4. Increasing understanding of cultural values, valuation, interpretation, ethics and identity around all forms of cultural heritage (tangible, intangible and digital heritage).

2. Expected projects

Funding possibilities will be offered to excellent and innovative networking and / or collaborative research projects. The project must have a maximum duration of 36 months. The overall budget of the call is about 3 million Euros. "

3. Application Procedure

Consortia consisting of at least 3 research groups, each based in an eligible institution from different country participating in this call (see the list below).

Applicants need to take into account the respective national eligibility criteria and funding conditions (see Guidelines for Applicant on www.jpi-culturageheritage.eu). All consortium partners must prove sufficient financial stability to conduct the project properly. The project coordinator has to make sure that all consortium partners provide the necessary information as requested from the agencies/ministries (see Guidelines for Applicant) to ensure the eligibility of the project. The deadline for submitting the project proposals is **April 5, 2013**. The applicants will be informed about the funding decision by August 2013.

4. Eligibility and Evaluation











Eligible proposals according to the JPICH/JHEP Joint Call criteria, will be forwarded to the relevant national funding institutions for national eligibility checks based on the eligibility criteria of the relevant national funding programmes.

All eligible proposals will be peer reviewed by experts prior to the final assessment and ranking by the Scientific Committee. The evaluation criteria fall into four equally important categories: 1) Scientific and technical content, 2) Trans-national added value, 3) Consortium and Project Management, 4) Work plan, 5) Resources, 6) Impact and 7) Exploitation of results


5. Forms, Guidelines and further information

As each country / region participating in the JPICH/JHEP Joint Call may have additional national requirements it is strongly recommended to contact their national contact persons before submission for further information.

6. Contact persons of participating countries and regions

Country	Organization	Contact person	Contact data (e-mail and phone)
	Belgian Federal Science Policy (BELSPO)	Maaïke Vancauwenberghe	vcau@belspo.be; T +32 2 238 36 78
	Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO)	Olivier Boehme	olivier.boehme@fwo.be; T. +32 2 550 15 45
	Research Promotion Foundation (RPF)	Eleana Gabriel	egabriel@research.org.cy; T. +357 22205046
	Danish Agency for Science, Technology and Innovation (DASTI)	Mette Bjerge	mbj@fi.dk; T. +45 7231 8302
	Ministère de la culture et de la communication (MCC) SG/SCPCI/ Département de la recherche, de l'enseignement supérieur et de la technologie (DDECT)	- Astrid Brandt-Grau - Sylvie Max-Colinart	astrid.brandt-grau@culture.gouv.fr; T. +33 1 40 15 80 45 sylvie.max-colinart@culture.gouv.fr; T. +33 1 40 15 83 02
	Heritage Council (HCI)	Eimear O'Connell	eoconnell@heritagecouncil.ie; T. +353 56 7770777
	Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (MIUR) Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali (MiBAC)	Patrizia Bianconi	patrizia.bianconi@beniculturali.it; T. +39 3486060558
	Research Council of Lithuania (RCL)	Kornelija Janavičiūtė	kornelija.janaviciute@lmt.lt; T. +370 5 210 7396
	NWO Humanities Department Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research	Bridit van der Pas	b.vanderpas@nwo.nl; T. +31 70 3440567
	Research Council of Norway (RCN)	- Eli Ragna Tærum - Nils Marstein	et@rcn.no; T. +47 22037283/+47 95898412 nils.marstein@ra.no; T. +47 98202828



	Narodowe Centrum Nauki (NCN)	Anna Plater-Zyberk	anna.plater@ncn.gov.pl; T. +48 12 341 90 28
	Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport (MESCS)	-Tatjana Švajger	tatjana.svajger@gov.si; T. +386 1 478 46 81
	Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (MINECO)	Aníbal González Pérez	anibal.gonzalez@mineco.es; T. +34 91 603 87 49
	Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)	Gail Lambourne	g.lambourne@ahrc.ac.uk; T. +44 1793 41 6082

ANNEX II JPICH-JHEP Pilot call Guidelines for applicants



ANNEX III JPICH-JHEP Pilot Call Project template

JPI - JHEP JOINT PILOT TRANSNATIONAL CALL for Joint Research Projects on Cultural Heritage

TEMPLATE APPLICATION FORM FOR PROJECT PROPOSAL (PP)

Cover Page

Proposal full title: _____

Proposal acronym: _____

Name of the lead coordinator person: _____

Contact details of the coordinator: _____

List of participants:

Participant no. *	Participant organisation name	Participant short name	Organisation type	Country
1 (Coordinator)				
2				
3				
...				

* Please use this numbering in all parts of your proposal.

It is highly recommended to study all the relevant Call Information (eg. Guide for Applicants, Template Application form) before starting to write the proposal.

For further information on the Call please visit <http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu>



Research Topics (choose the topic/topics of the project proposal)

£ 1. Methods, tools (including non-invasive instruments) and modelling for understanding damage and decay mechanisms (including the effects of weathering and climate change) on tangible heritage (including buildings, sites and landscapes);

£ 2. Materials, technologies and procedures for the conservation of tangible cultural heritage;

£ 3. Use and re-use of buildings and landscapes, including the relationship between changes of use and public policy, including costs and added value (for example as a result of planning regulations and urban development);

£ 4. Increasing understanding of cultural values, valuation, interpretation, ethics and identity around all forms of cultural heritage (tangible, intangible and digital heritage).

Type of project (choose the type of project proposal)

£ Networking

£ Collaborative research



JPI - JHEP JOINT PILOT TRANSNATIONAL CALL for Joint Research Projects on Cultural Heritage

CONTENT

Section A: Project Summary

Section B: Consortium description

Section C: Project contents

Section D: Description of Work

Section E: Implementation and Project costs

Section F: Exploitation of results and impact

Section G: Dissemination plan of project results

Section H: 1.7 Ethical and legal issues

Section I: Short profile (CVs) of the staff members



Section A: Project Summary

Full name of the Project:	The title should be no longer than 200 characters (spaces included) and should be understandable to non-specialists in the field.
Project acronym:	The acronym will be used to identify the proposal efficiently in this call. It should be no longer than 10 characters
Project duration in months:	Insert the estimated duration of the project in full months.
Project abstract:	<p>The abstract should provide the reader with a clear understanding of the objectives of the proposal, how they will be achieved, and their relevance to the research topic addressed. This summary will be used as the short description of the proposal in the evaluation process. It must therefore be short and precise.</p> <p><u>There is a limit of 2000 characters (spaces included).</u></p>
Keywords:	5 maximum
Project costs (in Euros):	<p>Estimated overall budget</p> <p>Estimated overall requested grant</p> <p>Estimated overall own funds</p>



Section B: Consortium description

1. COORDINATOR (LEADING PARTNER)	
Country:	
Full legal name of organization in English:	For a Public Law Body , it is the name under which the organization is registered in the Resolution text, Law, Decree/Decision establishing the Public Body, or in any other document established at the constitution of the Public Law Body; for Private Law Body , it is the name under which the organization is registered in the national Official Journal (or equivalent) or in the national company register.
Organization short name in English:	Choose an abbreviation of the Organization's Legal Name, only for use in this proposal and all related documents. This short name should not be <u>more than 20 characters</u> long, and excluding special characters (./;...), e.g. CNR and not C.N.R.
Full legal name of organization in original language:	
Organization short name in original language:	
Organisation type:	
Full legal address:	
Web site:	
Contact person:	This is the main scientist or team leader in charge of the participant's proposal. For participant number 1 (the coordinator), this is the person who will be contacted regarding the proposal (e.g. for additional information, sending of evaluation results, etc.).
E-mail:	
Telephone 1 (including country code):	
Fax (including country code):	
Description of the institution-department:	
Participation in main tasks of the project per Work Package:	



2. PARTICIPANT n. 2	
Country:	
Full legal name of organization in English:	
Organization short name in English:	
Full legal name of organization in original language:	
Organization short name in original language:	
Full legal address:	
Web site:	
E-mail:	
Telephone 1 (including country code):	
Fax (including country code):	
Description of the institution-department:	
Participation in main tasks of the project per Work Package:	

3. PARTICIPANT n. 3	
Country:	
Full legal name of organization in English:	
Organization short name in English:	
Full legal name of organization in original language:	
Organization short name in original language:	
Full legal address:	
Web site:	
E-mail:	
Telephone 1 (including country code):	



Fax (including country code):	
Description of the institution-department:	
Participation in main tasks of the project per Work Package:	

PARTICIPANT n.	
Country:	
Full legal name of organization in English:	
Organization short name in English:	
Full legal name of organization in original language:	
Organization short name in original language:	
Full legal address:	
Web site:	
E-mail:	
Telephone 1 (including country code):	
Fax (including country code):	
Description of the institution-department:	
Participation in main tasks of the project per Work Package:	

Section C: Project contents

Maximum length for the whole of Section C (10 pages)

C.1 - Detailed project objectives



The objectives should be those achievable within the project, not through subsequent development. They should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form, including the milestones that will be reached.

C.2 - Short description of state of the art of the research/activities in the field of the project

C.3 - Added value of the project and transnational cooperation

Section D: Description of the work

A detailed description of the work plan should be presented, broken down into Work Packages (WPs), which should follow the logical phases of the project implementation (max. 10 WPs).

Maximum length for the whole of Section D (10 pages)

Section D.1 - Work Package description

Please insert for each WP:

Work Package no.		Start date ¹	
Work Package Leader			
Work Package title			
Type of Activity	(e.g. research, development, demonstration, management, etc.)		
Participant no.			
Participant short name			
Participant person months			

Objectives

Description of work

Deliverables (brief description and month of delivery from the project start date - month 1)
--

¹ Measured in months from the project start date (month 1)

--

<p>Milestones (brief description and month from the project start date - month 1)</p>
--

Section D.2 - Quality and effectiveness of the co-ordination mechanisms and associated work plan

Work Package lists, Deliverable lists, Milestone lists and GANTT

Work package (WP) overview list

WP no.	WP title	Type of activity	Lead. partic. no.	Lead. partic. short name	Person months	Start Month	End month
1	Management	Management					
2	Activities A	RTD					
3	Activities B	RTD					
4	Dissemination & Exploitation strategy	RTD					
...	Add more rows ...						
	TOTAL						

Texts in Italics are examples only.

Deliverables overview list



Del. no.	Deliverable name	from WP no.	Nature/type of deliverable	Dissemination level (Public or restricted)	Delivery date (project month)
D1	Mid-report				Month 18
D2	Final Report				Month 36
	Add more rows as required				

Milestones overview list

No.	Milestone name	WP involved	Expected date (project month)
	Add more rows as required		



Section E: Implementation and Project costs (Maximum length: 5 pages)

Section E.1 - Management structure and procedures

Section E.2 - Resources to be committed

Budget for Work Package

Budget for Participants per country

Summary overview of staff effort (in person months)

Partic. no.	Country	Participant short name	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	...	Total Person-months
1									
2									
3									
...		Add more rows as required							
Total Person-months									

Section F: Exploitation of results and impact (Maximum length: 10 pages)

Section F.1 - Expected results of the Project

Section F.2 - Exploitation of Project results

Section F.3 - Foreseen Impact of the Project

Section G: Dissemination plan of project results

Section H: Ethical and legal issues (max 1 page)

SECTION I: Short profile (CVs) of the staff members/previous experience relating to project tasks (Maximum 1 pages for each member)



Checklist for Proposers

The proposal conforms to the Call Guidelines (see Guidelines for Applicants and specific rules in your country, if available).	<input type="checkbox"/>
Every project partner has been in direct contact with his/her national or regional funding agency and has checked that their collaboration and their project contribution is eligible for funding.	<input type="checkbox"/>
All partners who are not eligible for 100% funding are able to provide financial resources for their own contribution.	<input type="checkbox"/>