



Researchers' night 2009 Information Day, Brussels, Filling in a proposal (part B) 13 November 2008



Section 1 (1)

1.1. Concept and objectives:

- · Main ideas behind your project
- · Specific objectives: <u>example</u>: gather at least XXXX people and researchers, demonstrate researchers' job importance in certain aspects of citizens' daily life...

1.2. Quality and effectiveness of the support mechanisms, and associated work plan

- · Overall strategy: general theme if relevant, locations, links between them, kind of activities, articulation of the various activities, combination of fun/researchers-linked activities...
- · Organisation in 4 Work packages (compulsory): awareness campaign, activities during the night, impact assessment, management
- · General timing: opening and closing hours
- · Deliverables (compulsory list, see further)
- · Detailed description of the Work packages:
 - · specific objectives, main tasks, who does what
 - · when several locations, possibility of sub WPs by location
- · Summary effort table, by participant and by Work Package
- · Significant risks and measures to tackle them (<u>examples</u>: bad weather if outdoors activities, insufficient response from potential public, insufficient mobilisation of researchers...)



Work packages list

Table 1.2.a Work package list

-								
\	WP n°	WP Title	Type of activit Y	Lead participant n°	Lead participan t short name	Person/ months	Start month	End month
1		Awareness campaign	SUPP				1	
2	2	Activities during the night	SUPP					
3	3	Impact assessment	SUPP					
4	1	Management	MGT				1	max 7
		TOTAL						



Deliverables list

Table 1.2.b Deliverables list

Deliverable n°	Deliverable name	WP n°	Nature	Dissemination level	Delivery date
1	Report on awareness campaign (overview of articles, programmes, interviews, communication activities (press, radio, TV) + Samples promotional products (posters, programmes, leaflets, promotional material)	1	<u>R</u> + <u>P</u>	PU	Suggested: last month of the project
2	Report on the night itself (description of activities, number of attendants, success rate, level of participation,	2	R (possibly accompanied by) O (videos, pictures, websites, DVD)	PU	Suggested: last month of the project
3	Impact assessment Report (achievement of the objectives, progress compared to similar/previous initiatives) + Samples (questionnaires in English, interviews)	3	<u>R</u> + <u>O</u>	PU	Suggested: last month of the project
4	Final management Report (Management report established in compliance with the reporting guidelines)	4	R	PU	Suggested: last month of the project



Work package description (detailed)

Table 1.2.d Work Package description

Objectives

- •Specific objective of the WP: <u>Example</u>: WP1: make the public at large aware of the event, make the public at large aware of the profession "researcher"...
- ·AVOID repetition of the general call's objectives

Description of work

- Describe the various actions planned as to achieve the objectives of the WP <u>Example</u>: WP 1: identification of the communication means, setting up of a website, of a blog, organisation of press conferences (target, audience, message), elaboration/production of written material...
- · <u>AVOID</u> too vague a description or too detailed list of actions: you have here to demonstrate that your strategy is consistent and efficient

Deliverables

- · One per Work package as listed above
- · Recommendation: foresee their delivery the last month of the project due to its short duration



Summary of staff effort

Table 1.2.e Summary of staff effort

Participant n°/ Short name

WP 1 Awareness

campaign

WP 2

the night

WP 3 Activities during **Impact**

assessment

WP 4 Management Total person/months

Participant 1/ ...

Participant 2/ ...

Participant 3/ ...

Participant 4/ ... etc.

TOTAL

- 1 person during 2 weeks= $\frac{1}{2}$ person/month
- 2 persons during 2 weeks= 1 person/month

!!! KEEP REALISTIC: the estimated staff effort has to be consistent with the total personnel costs !!!



Section 2 (1)

2.1. Management structures and procedures

- · Describe the architecture of the management: <u>Example</u>: management cell composed of ..., correspondents per WP and per participant, description of communication flows in the consortium (meetings, mails, reports), description of decision making process...
- · <u>AVOID</u>: too complicated a structure (it's a short project and it must be likely to quickly adapt to evolving circumstances), too centralised a decision-making structure (when several locations throughout the country, a certain autonomy of each of them might be more practical and relevant)

2.2. Individual participants

- · Provide a short « pedigree » of each participant
- · Briefly justify skills and experience of the participants against the needs of the project (as well as those of the persons to be directly in charge)
- ·AVOID: too long descriptions: focus on the aspects strictly linked to the project; too general statements: evaluators might not know the structures you refer to, being of a different nationality.



Section 2 (2)

2.3. Consortium as a whole

- · Underline potential synergies and complementarities between the various participants
- · Describe the tank of skills and experience you will have at disposal, making your consortium a « winning team »
- ·AVOID
 - · too numerous a partnership: only take on board the necessary partners
 - · too unbalanced a partnership: « equally » distribute the tasks amongst the partners

Subcontracting

- · Describe the tasks that are likely to be subcontracted and justify
- · Provide an estimates of the costs linked to subcontracting
- · Keep in mind that some minor tasks (mainly technical) may be subcontracted during the project's implementation without having been explicitly foreseen in the proposal

Other countries

Not relevant



2.4. Resources to be committed

- · Own resources: resources of the coordinator and the participants
- · Possibly resources set at disposal by third parties (example: other institutions)
- · Possibly funding provided by private sponsors (example: enterprises)
- · Possibly funding from public (national, regional, local) authorities
- · Potential EU funding

AVOID

- · Artificially increase the budget: too high a budget might led the experts to reject the proposal due to the limited amount of resources available for the call
- · Artificially reduce the budget; the budget will be the starting point for defining the EU contribution should your proposal be selected and, once decided, cannot be changed

Carefully plan the major costs

Check the existing possibilities for sponsoring and/or public support





3.1. Expected impact

- · Describe the projects' contribution to the achievement of the general objectives
- Provide figures (direct participation, number of people made aware)
- · Describe the various parameters to be sued for assessing the impact
- · Describe the method that will be applied for the impact assessment
- · AVOID: neglecting the aspect of « impact assessment » which will be carefully scrutinised by the evaluation experts

3.2. Dissemination and /or exploitation of results and IPR

• If relevant, explain what will be done with the project's results (transfer of knowledge, exchanging good practises, ...



As a rule not relevant





Do not hesitate to ask, directly now or:

Colette.renier@ec.europa.eu David.wizel@ec.europa.eu researchersineurope@ec.europa.eu