



# PlanetData

Network of Excellence FP7

– 257641

---

## D8.3 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program

---

**Coordinator: Alice Carpentier (UIBK)**

**With contributions from: Elena Simperl (KIT)**

**1<sup>st</sup> Quality reviewer: Andreas Harth**

**2<sup>nd</sup> Quality reviewer: Giorgos Flouris**

Deliverable nature:	Report (R)
Dissemination level: (Confidentiality)	Public version for website
Contractual delivery date:	M24: September 2012
Actual delivery date:	M26: November 2012
Version:	1.0
Keywords:	PlanetData Program; Call for Proposals; Linked Data

## **Abstract**

This deliverable reports on the setup and outcome of the PlanetData Programs Call 2. It describes the topic, dissemination, organisation and results of a call for proposals of sub-projects to be carried out in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program.

## Executive summary

In addition to the pre-defined work packages and tasks for the nine core partners of the PlanetData consortium, PlanetData has set up an open partnership scheme. The PlanetData Programs provide a framework through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. The Joint Programme of Activities schedules two PlanetData Programs during the runtime of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, each having the duration of 18 months.

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program, a call for project proposals focused on the combination of aspects related to data dynamicity, quality and provenance, including access control, privacy and trust, was opened on 15 August 2012, and closed on 19 September 2012, 17:00 Brussels time. The call was disseminated via newspapers, magazines and the PlanetData website. In response to the call, 13 project proposals were submitted, all of which were eligible for the evaluation. The proposals were evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. After the evaluation, six proposals were considered eligible for funding. Taking into consideration the budget available for funding sub-projects in the framework of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program, the four best ranked relevant proposals were selected for funding.

Pending approval by the European Commission, the four coordinating institutions who submitted these proposals will be invited to join the PlanetData Network of Excellence as new partners and to receive funding in order to carry out the sub-projects they proposed in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program.

The selected projects and new partners promise to complement the existing PlanetData consortium and activities very well and PlanetData significantly contributes expertise to the new partners. The partners can provide important research contributions and compelling use cases and showcasing applications for the consumption of Linked Data, a key topic in the PlanetData roadmap.

## Document Information

<b>IST Project Number</b>	FP7 - 257641	<b>Acronym</b>	PlanetData
<b>Full Title</b>	PlanetData		
<b>Project URL</b>	http://www.planet-data.eu/		
<b>EU Project Officer</b>	Leonhard Maqua		

<b>Deliverable</b>	<b>Number</b>	D8.3	<b>Title</b>	2 <sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program
<b>Work Package</b>	<b>Number</b>	WP8	<b>Title</b>	Project Management

<b>Date of Delivery</b>	<b>Contractual</b>	M24	<b>Actual</b>	M26
<b>Status</b>	version 1.0		final X	
<b>Nature</b>	prototype <input type="checkbox"/> report X dissemination <input type="checkbox"/>			
<b>Dissemination level</b>	public <input type="checkbox"/> consortium X			

<b>Authors (Partner)</b>	UIBK			
<b>Responsible Author</b>	<b>Name</b>	Alice Carpentier	<b>E-mail</b>	<a href="mailto:alice.carpentier@sti2.at">alice.carpentier@sti2.at</a>
	<b>Partner</b>	UIBK	<b>Phone</b>	+43 512 507 53708

<b>Abstract (for dissemination)</b>	This deliverable reports on the setup and outcome of the PlanetData Programs Call 2. It describes the topic, dissemination, organisation and results of a call for proposals of sub-projects to be carried out in the course of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program.
<b>Keywords</b>	PlanetData Program; Call for Proposals; Linked Data

<b>Version Log</b>			
<b>Issue Date</b>	<b>Rev. No.</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Change</b>
11-Oct-12	0.1	Alice Carpentier	First draft
15-Nov-12	0.2	Elena Simperl	Revision
21-Nov-12	0.3	Alice Carpentier	Implementation of reviewers' comments (Giorgos Flouris)
27-Nov-12	0.4	Alice Carpentier	Implementation of reviewers' comments (Andreas Harth)
28-Nov-12	0.5	Alice Carpentier	Implementation of reviewers' comments (Anna Fensel)

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	2
Executive summary .....	3
Document Information .....	4
Table of Contents .....	5
Abbreviations .....	6
1 Introduction .....	7
2 Call for project proposals .....	8
2.1 Call background.....	8
2.2 Call dissemination .....	9
2.3 Call opening phase .....	10
3 Evaluation of submitted proposals .....	10
3.1 Evaluation process.....	10
3.2 Evaluation results .....	11
4 Conclusions .....	12
References .....	13
Annex A Announcement of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> competitive call for additional project partners.....	14
Annex B Confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration .....	16
Annex C Evaluation consensus form .....	17
Annex D Guide for applicants Call2.....	19

## Abbreviations

NoE – Network of Excellence

RDF – Resource Description Framework

SPARQL – SPARQL Protocol and RDF Query Language

HTTP – Hypertext Transfer Protocol

URI – Uniform Resource Identifier

UK – United Kingdom

US – United States

EU – European Union

EC – European Commission

SME – Small and medium enterprises

# 1 Introduction

The major objective of the PlanetData project is to establish an interdisciplinary, sustainable European community of researchers, aiding organizations to expose their data on the Web. The network aims to push the state-of-the-art of data management and its applications in large scale for creation of useful, open data sets.

In order to reach this goal, the members of the PlanetData consortium have agreed on a Joint Programme of Activities. For the nine core partners, this includes a pre-defined work plan broken down into work packages and tasks around four main activities: research, data provisioning and data management, impact, and project management.

In addition, PlanetData has set up an open partnership scheme. The PlanetData Programs provide a framework through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. The Joint Programme of Activities schedules two PlanetData Programs during the runtime of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, each having the duration of 18 months. The process for these Programs includes calls for project proposals focused on a specific topic. Interested parties can then submit proposals, which are evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. Selected proposers are then invited to join the PlanetData network to carry out the proposed sub-projects.

For the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program, a call for project proposals focused on the topic of “Purposeful provisioning and management of (new types of) data”, was opened on 15 August 2012 and closed on 19 September 2012, 17:00 Brussels time. The remainder of the report is structured as follows: section 2 describes the topic, dissemination and organisation of the call, section 3 presents the results of the call with evaluations of the proposals that have been submitted and section 4 provides conclusions and next steps for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program.

## 2 Call for project proposals

This section describes the background information and motivation behind the PlanetData Programs Call 2, dissemination activities around the Call, and the acquired proposals.

### 2.1 Call background

Potential topics for the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program were identified and discussed with external experts and EC representatives during three workshops:

- 14 November 2011, 1<sup>st</sup> workshop on topics, Vienna<sup>1</sup>
- 08 January 2012, 2<sup>nd</sup> workshop on topics, Luxembourg<sup>2</sup>
- 30 May 2012, 3<sup>rd</sup> workshop on topics, Heraklion, Crete, co-located with the European Semantic Web Conference<sup>3</sup>

The first workshop was mainly geared towards academia and their views on the most relevant developments of the large-scale data management community. It consisted of a combination of invited, long and short presentations on topics as diverse as scalability and reasoning, publishing and consuming data online, problemsolving methods, information extraction, and benchmarks. The results of the follow-up discussions are summarized in a white paper available for download on the PlanetData Web site.<sup>4</sup>

The second workshop included a strong industrial presence, in particular by companies based or active in EU member states. The participants were a mixture of PlanetData researchers, companies (large multi-nationals as well as European SMEs) and EU representatives. The list of topics addressed was as follows:

- “Big Data: alignment of supply and demand” by Nuria De-Lama Sanchez, ATOS
- “Perspectives for Open Data and large data analytics” by Georg Hackenbroich, SAP
- “Linked Open Data and RDF Stores meet Search Based Applications” by Christoph Goller, Intrafind Software
- “Opinion Analytics: a virtuous circle for business and society” by Hugo Zaragoza, Websays
- “Big Data Requirements for Environmental Sensing” by Joachim Schaper, AGT

The discussions resulted in a second white paper, published on the PlanetData Web site.<sup>5</sup>

The third workshop aimed at international outreach. It involved a selection of high-profile speakers from prominent US companies and research institutions such as Twitter and Google. Slides and abstracts of the talks can be found on the workshop Web site.<sup>5</sup>

Based on the results of these expert workshops, complemented by an analysis of the current state and future plans of project partners, we produced a call which combines the specific dimensions of the PlanetData research roadmap with insights and ideas from academia and industry active in this space. The call solicited proposals related to data dynamicity, quality and provenance, including access control, privacy and trust. These proposals had to present methods and techniques, as well as develop services and applications that consider any of these dimensions or

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.planet-data.eu/events/one-day-strategic-workshop-call-2>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.planet-data.eu/events/planetdata-roadmapping-workshop-experts>

<sup>3</sup> <http://planet-data.eu/events/3rd-planetdata-roadmapping-workshop>

<sup>4</sup> <http://planet-data.eu/sites/default/files/PlanetData%20Roadmapping.pdf> <sup>5</sup> <http://planet-data.eu/sites/default/files/PlanetData%20Roadmapping.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.planet-data.eu/events/3rd-planetdata-roadmapping-workshop>

combinations of them. The developments could rely on existing data sets available as Linked Data, or open up datasets that fill a gap in existing publishing initiatives (in the context of the Linked Open Data Cloud or beyond) with respect to the types of data they cover (e.g., sensor networks, social media streams), or in terms of the quality of self-descriptive metadata available. Three main topics of interest were identified, which the proposers could consider in their submissions; this list was, however, by no means exhaustive and aimed at providing a starting point for the type of research and development work sought through this call.

#### *Data dynamicity*

- Generation and exploitation of data streams across different data modalities (e.g., text, numerical values, sensor data, multimedia)
- Characterization of dynamic data sources
- Integration of heterogeneous dynamic data sources across different modalities, with a special attention to dealing with large and very large data volumes
- Data versioning and curation approaches for dynamic data sources
- Novel applications and services combining static and dynamic data sets, exposed according to Linked Data principles or similar

#### *Data quality and curation*

- Assessment and improvement of the quality of large data sets
- Applications proposing new, or evaluating existing, quality assessment metrics for large data sets
- Applications proposing combinations of automatic and crowdsourced techniques to improve the quality of data sets (for instance, by adding labels, correcting facts etc.)
- Empirical studies on the quality of Linked Data and on the trade-offs associated with the additional effort required to curate data vs its expected increased usability

#### *Data provenance, access control, privacy and trust*

- Evaluation and exploitation of provenance information for large datasets
- Evaluation and exploitation of access control information for large datasets
- Evaluation and exploitation of privacy information for large datasets
- Evaluation and exploitation of trust information for large datasets
- Integration of provenance propagation in SPARQL query and update languages.

Proposals could also aim at providing integrated repositories/portals for specific fields (e.g., geospatial information, public administration, etc.) addressing the topics discussed above.

## **2.2 Call dissemination**

Information about the call was published on the PlanetData website [1] in August 2012, including the call announcement with a detailed description of the topic (see Annex A) and an accompanying guide for applicants (see Annex D).

In August 2012, the call announcement was published in an international selection of high-profile newspapers and magazines, namely the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ) in Germany, Die Presse in Austria, the Heti Világgazdaság in Hungary, and the international ComputerWorld journal based in the USA.

The call announcement was also sent to various mailing lists related to the topic, e.g. to the mailing list of the Semantic Web Interest Group at the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), as well as circulated on social networks

such as LinkedIn, Twitter and Facebook by several PlanetData members. Potential proposal evaluators have been informed about the call via individual emails, and had been partially recruited already at this stage.

## 2.3 Call opening phase

On 15 August 2012, the call was opened for submissions via e-mail. A helpdesk was set up to support potential proposers via e-mail and telephone/Skype, providing answers to formal questions as well as to questions regarding content, e.g. about the relevance of proposal drafts to the call. This helpdesk communication channel was well used by the potential appliers. On 19 September 2012, at 17:00 Brussels time, the call was closed. At this point of time, 13 valid proposals were submitted.

The total EC contribution requested by the 13 proposals combined amounted to 624,592 Euro. The coordinator proposer organisations are based in 10 different countries, as shown in Table 2.

**Table 1: Countries of proposal coordinator organisations**

Country	Number of Proposals
Denmark	1
Hungary	1
Spain	3
Poland	1
Italy	2
Austria	1
Germany	1
Cyprus	1
Croatia	1
Ireland	1

## 3 Evaluation of submitted proposals

This section presents the onsite evaluation process and the PlanetData Programs Call 2 results.

### 3.1 Evaluation process

The submitted project proposals were evaluated according to the following criteria:

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)
2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management
3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

Ratings for each of these criteria were given on a scale from 0 (failure to address the criterion) to 5 (criterion successfully addressed in all aspects) points. In sum, a proposal can thus reach a maximum rating of 15 points. Proposals with a rating of at least 10 points were considered eligible for funding.

The evaluations were carried out by a selection of independent international evaluators, coming from both research and industry, listed in Table 3. The evaluators were asked to sign a declaration (see Annex B) assuring that they will keep information from the evaluation process confidential and that they do not have a conflict of interest with any of the proposals they evaluate. Each evaluator has received (via email) 4 to 5 proposal submissions right after the Call's closure for their reviews and the production of individual evaluation reports.

Each proposal was reviewed by 3 evaluators. They gave individual reviews of the proposals via an evaluation form (see the end of Annex D). In order to reach consensus on the reviews, evaluation meetings were organised in Crete, Greece, on 03-04 October 2012. The proposal evaluators came together to discuss their individual reviews, produce consensus evaluation summary reports (see Annex C) and to agree on the final proposal ratings. Each of the 13 individual proposal evaluation meetings was moderated by a member of the PlanetData consortium. The duration of the meetings dedicated to each proposal was on average 1.5 hours.

**Table 2: PlanetData Programs Call 2 evaluators**

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Country</b>
Ioana Ciuciu	Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium	Belgium
Stamatia Dasiopoulou	Centre for Research and Technology Hellas, Greece	Greece
Juan Miguel Gomez	Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain	Spain
Alina Dia Miron	Recognos	Romania
Ilya Zaihrayeu	University of Trento, Italy	Italy
Orri Erling	Virtuoso	Netherlands
Barry Bishop	Ontotext	Bulgaria
Claudia Wagner	JOANNEUM RESEARCH	Austria
German Toro del Valle	Universidad Polit�cnica de Madrid	Spain
Peter Haase	fluid Operations	Germany

### 3.2 Evaluation results

This subsection summarizes the results of the evaluation. Details of the evaluated proposals and the reviews are not published publicly, as this information is confidential.

In the evaluation process, 6 proposals with rank 10 and higher were chosen as eligible candidates for funding. The ranking score is based on the criteria presented in Section 3.1.

The proposals were sorted in descending order according to their ranking. The highest ranked proposal received a rating of 14 points by the evaluators, followed by four proposals with a rating of 12 points. In the cases of equal ratings, more detailed considerations of the quality and the relevance of each proposal for the PlanetData network were used to rank the proposals. In particular, three of the four 12-point proposals were ranked higher in the general final assembly of evaluators and PlanetData members, as they add highly perspective and relevant expertise to the PlanetData consortium as well as effectively aligned with the technology present in the PlanetData network. The other 12-point proposal was rated equally well by the evaluators, but in direct comparison was ranked lower due to less relevance to the PlanetData's topics.

## 4 Conclusions

This deliverable has reported on the progress of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program. The PlanetData consortium has been running a call for project proposals on the topic of “Consuming Linked Data”, open from 15 August to 19 September 2012, 17:00 Brussels time. 13 proposals have been received, all of which were valid and evaluated according to scientific and/or technological excellence, quality, and impact. After the evaluation, 6 proposals were considered eligible for funding. Taking into consideration the budget available for funding sub-projects in the framework of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program, four proposals were selected for funding.

Pending approval by the European Commission, the four institutions who submitted these proposals will be invited to join the PlanetData Network of Excellence as new partners and to receive funding in order to carry out the sub-projects they proposed in the course of the 2<sup>nd</sup> PlanetData Program with a running time of up to 12 months, starting earliest in October 2013. The selected projects and new partners promise to complement the existing PlanetData consortium and activities very well, and vice versa. For the objectives of the PlanetData Network of Excellence, the selected projects can provide significant scientific contributions and compelling use cases and showcasing applications for the three dimensions of our research agenda: dynamicity, quality and context, as well as provenance and access control.

## References

- [1] <http://www.planet-data.eu/>, <http://www.planet-data.eu/news/call2>

## **Annex A    Announcement of the 2<sup>nd</sup> competitive call for additional project partners**

**Project acronym:** PlanetData

**Project grant agreement number:** 257641

**Project full name:** PlanetData

*The project PlanetData, currently active in the Seventh Framework programme of the European Commission for research, technological development and demonstration activities contributing to the creation of the European research area and to innovation (2007-2013), requires the participation of new partners to carry out specific tasks within the project. We have vacancies in our consortium for partners established in an EU Member State or in any FP7 Associated State, eligible for EU FP7 funding, and having comprehensive research and technological expertise in any of the areas covered by PlanetData and specifically addressed among the suggested topics of this call.*

*The remainder of this announcement document provides an overview of the tasks and topics solicited through the call. This document is subject to changes. Its final version is expected to be published in August 2012, while intermediary versions might be made available on the project Web site at <http://www.planet-data.eu>.*

### **What is PlanetData**

The aim of the Network of Excellence PlanetData is to establish an interdisciplinary community of researchers helping organizations to get their data exposed online in a useful form. This is achieved through an integrated program comprising research, data and technology provisioning, as well as training and dissemination, pushing forward the state-of-the-art in large-scale data management and its application to the creation of useful, open data sets; supporting data owners in mobilizing their data following Linked Data principles; and enabling consumers to leverage such data sources in a variety of scenarios and domains.

The network brings together thirteen core partners spread over ten European countries, with a renowned profile in the database, data and Web mining, and semantic technologies communities, and an ecosystem of collaborators worldwide. To strengthen the interaction with data owners, technology and application providers, and researchers working on large scale data management topics, PlanetData has set-up an open partnership scheme. This includes a thematic PlanetData Program, through which new partners can join the consortium to undertake tasks that expand and further develop the scope of the project. For the present call of the PlanetData Program, PD-2-2012, the area we are focusing on is the publication of new species of data according to Linked Data principles and on methods to improve the usefulness of existing data sets (possible as an integral part of the publishing life cycle). We introduce this area in more detail in the following.

### **Topics of the competitive call**

We solicit proposals for research projects that deal with any of the dimensions explored by PlanetData, with a special focus for this call on the combination of aspects related to data dynamicity, quality and provenance, including access control, privacy and trust. Proposals should propose methods and techniques, as well as develop services and applications that consider any of these dimensions or combinations of them. Proposals may use existing data sets available as Linked Data, or open up datasets that fill a gap in existing publishing initiatives (in the context of the Linked Open Data Cloud or beyond) with respect to the types of data they cover (e.g., sensor networks, social media streams), or in terms of the quality of self-descriptive metadata available. We identified three main topics of interest, which the proposers could consider in their submissions; this list is, however, by no means exhaustive and aims at providing a starting point for the type of research and development work we are seeking through this call.

*Data dynamicity*

- Generation and exploitation of data streams across different data modalities (e.g., text, numerical values, sensor data, multimedia).
- Characterization of dynamic data sources.
- Integration of heterogeneous dynamic data sources across different modalities, with a special attention to dealing with large and very large data volumes.
- Data versioning and curation approaches for dynamic data sources.
- Novel applications and services combining static and dynamic data sets, exposed according to Linked Data principles or similar.

#### *Data quality and curation*

- Assessment and improvement of the quality of large data sets.
- Applications proposing new, or evaluating existing, quality assessment metrics for large data sets.
- Applications proposing combinations of automatic and crowdsourced techniques to improve the quality of data sets (for instance, by adding labels, correcting facts etc)
- Empirical studies on the quality of Linked Data and on the trade-offs associated with the additional effort required to curate data vs its expected increased usability.

#### *Data provenance, access control, privacy and trust*

- Evaluation and exploitation of provenance information for large datasets.
- Evaluation and exploitation of access control information for large datasets.
- Evaluation and exploitation of privacy information for large datasets.
- Evaluation and exploitation of trust information for large datasets.
- Integration of provenance propagation in SPARQL query and update languages.

Proposals may also aim at providing integrated repositories/portals for specific fields (e.g., geospatial information, public administration, etc.) addressing the topics discussed above.

## Evaluation criteria

Submissions will be evaluated according to the following criteria: (i) Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call); (ii) quality and efficiency of the implementation plan; and (iii) potential impact. As mentioned earlier we welcome a wide variety of proposals, including research targeting novel algorithms, methods and techniques, as well as technology and application development. Research-oriented proposals will be primarily assessed according to the scientific excellence of the approach implemented and tested within the 6-12 months of the proposal. Technology and application development proposals should foremost show engineering excellence and promising impact in the business/societal area of interest. The guide for applicants will include a proposal template including concrete details about the expected maximum length of the individual sections of the proposal document. Proposals not complying with these requirements may be rejected by default.

## Facts and figures

**Call open:** The call will be open for submissions from 15th August 2012. **Call identifier:** PD-2-2012.

**Deadline for submission of proposals:** 19th September 2012; 17h00 Brussels time.

**Expected duration of participation in project:** 6 to 12 months, starting earliest in October 2013.

**Proposal format:** proposals can include one or more organizations eligible for EU funding, and should have an indicative funding **between €15,000 and €50,000**.

**Language in which proposal should be submitted:** English.

**Email address for proposal submission:** [planetdata\\_call2@sti2.at](mailto:planetdata_call2@sti2.at)

**Full call text** [Call announcement full final.pdf](#)

**Guide for applicants** [Guide for applicants.pdf](#)

**Email address for further information:** [alice.carpentier@sti2.at](mailto:alice.carpentier@sti2.at)

## **Annex B Confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration**

I the undersigned declare that, in participating as an independent expert in the evaluation of proposals received in the competitive call of the ICT project PlanetData.

I undertake to treat as confidential all information contained in the proposals which I am asked to evaluate, both during the evaluation and afterwards.

I will not reveal to any third party the identity or any details of the views of my fellow evaluator(s), neither during the evaluation nor afterwards

I do not, to the best of my knowledge, have any interest in any of the proposals submitted in this call, I have not been involved in their preparation and I do not benefit either directly or indirectly from the eventual selection. Should I discover a conflict of interest during the evaluation, I undertake to declare this and to withdraw from the evaluation.

Name	
Signature	
Date	

## Annex C Evaluation consensus form

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<p><b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</b>  <i>Note: when a proposal only <b>partially addresses the topics</b>, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion</i></p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 3/5;          Weight 1)</i></p>
<p><b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 3/5;          Weight 1)</i></p> <p><i>For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an above-threshold score for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the proposer(s) has the operational capacity to carry out the work</i></p>

<p><b>3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b> <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</i></p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> <i>(Threshold 10/15)</i></p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

**NO**      **YES**

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name		Name	
Signature		Signature	
Date		Date	

Name		Name	
Signature		Signature	
Date		Date	

## Annex D Guide for applicants Call2

# GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

participating in a competitive call for additional beneficiaries in an ICT Integrated Project or Network of excellence

**Additional beneficiaries in the ICT Project  
Number 257641 Acronym PlanetData**



**PD-2-2011**

**August-2012**

### CONTENTS

1. Introduction ..... 22

1.2 Funding of participation ..... 22

2. How to prepare and submit a proposal ..... 23

    2.1 One stage submission ..... 23

    2.2 Proposal language ..... 23

    2.3 Submission of proposals ..... 23

    2.4 Acknowledgement of receipt ..... 23

3. Proposal evaluation and selection ..... 24

4. Support to proposers ..... 24

    4.1 Call Helpdesk ..... 24

    4.2 National Contact Points ..... 24

    4.3 The Intellectual Property Rights Helpdesk ..... 24

        Annex 1 – Proposal format ..... 25

Annex 2 – Evaluation form ..... 33

# Guide for applicants for the selection of additional beneficiaries in an ICT Integrated Project or Network of excellence

## 1. Introduction

The participants in the consortium managing an Integrated project or Network of excellence funded by the *Seventh Framework programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities contributing to the creation of the European research area and to innovation (2007-2013)* can, during their initial grant agreement negotiation with the Commission, reserve a portion of the project budget for specific tasks to be carried out by a new beneficiary or beneficiaries which will join the consortium at a later date. These later-joining beneficiaries are selected by means of a competitive call.

This **Guide for applicants** contains the basic information needed to guide you in preparing a proposal to join an existing ICT project which has launched such a competitive call. It gives instructions on how to structure your proposal. It also describes how the proposal should be submitted, and the criteria on which it will be evaluated.

Conditions of participation and funding are those of the Seventh Framework programme, as defined principally in *Regulation (EC) No 1906/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 laying down the rules for the participation of undertakings, research centres and universities in actions under the Seventh Framework Programme and for the dissemination of research results (2007-2013)*. This can be found at [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html) in the document "EC Rules for participation".

The proposer which is selected to join the consortium will be required to accede to the existing grant agreement; a model example of which can also be found at the above website ("Standard model grant agreement"). It will also be required to sign the existing consortium agreement, an internal project document concerning the relations between the partners.

**This Guide for applicants does not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Seventh Framework Programme**

## 1.2 Funding of participation

Participation as a beneficiary in an FP7 project is on a cost-shared basis, the Commission making only a partial contribution to the total cost of the work.

The following may receive EU funding in an FP7 project:

- Any legal entity established in a Member State or an FP7 Associated country<sup>6</sup> (including the European Commission's Joint Research Centre), or created under Community law (e.g. a European Economic Interest Grouping),
- Any international European interest organisation,
- Any legal entity established in an FP7 International Cooperation Partner Country (ICPC). A complete list of these countries is given in annex 1 of the ICT Workprogramme<sup>7</sup>, but in principle it includes the

---

<sup>6</sup> The FP7 Associated countries are Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey.

<sup>7</sup> Obtainable at <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/>

developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America, as well as those European countries which are not already Member states or Associated countries.

Organisations from certain other countries may also receive a Community financial contribution, as defined in the Rules of Participation in FP7.

Fuller details of the Commission's funding arrangements can be found at [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/finddoc\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/finddoc_en.html) in the document "Guide to Financial Issues".

## 2. How to prepare and submit a proposal

### 2.1 One stage submission

Proposals for selection as an additional beneficiary in an ICT project are submitted in a single stage, by submitting a complete proposal application which is prepared as described in Annex 1 of this document.

Existing participants in the ICT project may not respond to this call.

### 2.2 Proposal language

The proposal must be prepared in the working language of the ICT project which you wish to join. This is identified in the Call announcement which the project published. Proposals submitted in any other language will not be evaluated.

### 2.3 Submission of proposals

Proposals must be submitted electronically in PDF format to the address given in the call announcement.

If you discover an error in your proposal, and provided the call deadline has not passed, you may submit a new version. Only the last version received before the call deadline will be considered in the evaluation.

Proposals must be received by the closing time and date of the call. Late proposals, or proposals submitted to any other address or by any other means than email, will not be evaluated.

**Do not wait until the last minute to submit your proposal. Failure of your proposal to arrive in time for any reason, including communications delays, is not acceptable as an extenuating circumstance. The time of receipt of your message as recorded by the email system will be definitive.**

### 2.4 Acknowledgement of receipt

You should request a delivery receipt for your email (For example, in Microsoft Outlook select this under View/Options)

As soon as possible after the close of call, an Acknowledgment of receipt will be emailed to you by the ICT project. The sending of an Acknowledgement of receipt does not imply that your proposal has been accepted as eligible for evaluation.

### 3. Proposal evaluation and selection

The ICT project will evaluate proposals received in the light of the criteria that governed the Commission's original evaluation and selection of their project, using the form shown in Annex 2 of this document and with the assistance of at least two experts who are independent of any member of the consortium and of any proposer. The experts will be individuals from the fields of science, industry and/or with experience in the field of innovation and also with the highest level of knowledge, and who are internationally recognised authorities in the relevant specialist area.

Each independent expert will record his/her individual opinion of each proposal on the attached form. They will then meet or communicate together to prepare a "consensus" form for each proposal. Using the results given on the consensus form, the consortium will normally select the proposal with the highest overall score.

However, the ICT project is not obliged to select the highest scoring proposal where it has objective grounds, for example commercial competition. In this case the choice may pass to the next-ranked proposal.

Also the ICT project may conclude that even the highest scoring proposal is of inadequate quality, in which case it will make no selection. In the event of no selection being made, the project may or may not re-open the call at a later date.

All proposers will receive from the ICT project the report of the consensus view of the experts who examined their proposal. The selected proposer(s) will be invited to accede to the project's grant agreement with the Commission.

### 4. Support to proposers

#### 4.1 Call Helpdesk

For further information on the call, contact:

Telephone: +43 512 507 6485/88

#### 4.2 National Contact Points

The ICT Theme supports a network of National Contact Points (NCPs), which can be helpful to organisations from their country both in general advice and particularly on preparing proposals. Organisations should contact the NCP of their own country for further information. [http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/ncps\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/ict/ncps_en.html).

#### 4.3 The Intellectual Property Rights Helpdesk

The IPR-Helpdesk has as its main objective to assist potential and current beneficiaries taking part in Community funded projects on Intellectual Property Rights issues, and in particular on Community diffusion and protection rules and issues relating to IPR in international projects. <http://www.ipr-helpdesk.org>

### Annex 1 – Proposal format

**Proposals must be submitted:**

- as a single file in PDF format
- in the language stated in the call announcement
- to the address given in the call announcement (request a delivery receipt)
- before the date and time given as the call deadline in the call announcement

- with, as the subject line of your message, "PD Call 2\_submission proposal [add short name of proposal]".

**The length of the proposal must not exceed 20 A4 pages, excluding the Title Page and the Table of Contents. The minimum font size allowed is 11 points; the allowed line spacing is 1.0. All margins (top, bottom, left, right) should be at least 20 mm (not including any footers or headers).**

### **Front page**

Full title of the existing project you wish to join  
 Acronym of the existing project  
 Grant agreement number of existing project  
 Type of instrument (Integrated project/Network of excellence)

Date of preparation of your proposal Version  
 number (*optional*)

Your organisation name  
 Your organisation address  
 Name of the coordinating person  
 Coordinator telephone number  
 Coordinator email

**Email address to which the Acknowledgement of Receipt should be sent:**

*(insert)*

### **Proposal abstract**

*(maximum 2000 character summary of your proposed work)*

### **Contents page**

*(Show contents list)*

### **Cost and funding breakdown**

Please show your figures in euros (not thousands of euros)

	<b>RTD</b>	<b>Demonstration</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Management</b>	<b>Total</b>
1. Personnel costs					
2. Other direct costs					
3. Total direct costs (Sum of row 1 and 2)					

4. Indirect costs					
5. Total costs (Sum of row 3 and 4)					
6. Requested EC contribution					

In row 1, insert your personnel costs for the work involved, differentiating between:

**RTD activities:** activities directly aimed at creating new knowledge, new technology, and products including scientific coordination.

**Demonstration activities:** activities designed to prove the viability of new technologies that offer a potential economic advantage, but which cannot be commercialised directly (e.g. testing of product like prototypes).

**Other activities:** any specific activities not covered by the above mentioned types of activity such as training, coordination, networking and dissemination (including publications). These activities should be specified later in the proposal.

**Management activities** include the maintenance of the consortium agreement, if it is obligatory, the overall legal, ethical, financial and administrative management including for each of the participants obtaining the certificates on the financial statements or on the methodology, the implementation of competitive calls by the consortium for the participation of new participants and, any other management activities foreseen in the proposal except coordination of research and technological development activities

In row 2, insert any other direct costs, for example equipment or travel costs.

In row 3, calculate the sum of your personnel and other direct costs

In row 4, insert your indirect (overhead) costs.

**Indirect costs** are all those eligible costs which cannot be identified by the participant as being directly attributed to the project but which can be identified and justified by its accounting system as being incurred in direct relationship with the eligible direct costs attributed to the project

You may use your actual overhead costs if this is possible within your organisation's accounting system. If not, you may use a calculated figure of 20% of the sum in row 3. If you are a non-profit public body, a research organisation, a secondary or higher education establishment or a small or medium enterprise, you may use a calculated figure of 60% of the sum in row 3.

In row 5, calculate the sum of your direct and indirect costs.

In row 6, insert your requested EC contribution

**RTD activities:** you may request up to 50% of the total cost figure. If you are a non-profit public body, a research organisation, a secondary or higher education establishment or a small or medium enterprise, you may request up to 75% funding.

**Demonstration:** you may request up to 50% funding

**Other, Management:** you may request up to 100% funding

Note: If you are successful in the evaluation, your final costs and funding estimates agreed with the ICT project will also be subject to legal and financial verification by the Commission services

## **Section 1: Scientific and/or technical quality, relevant to the topics addressed by the call**

### **1.1 Concept and objectives**

Describe in detail the S&T objectives of your proposed action. Show how they relate to the topic(s) addressed by the competitive call. These objectives should be those achievable within your proposed action, not through subsequent development. They should be stated in a measurable and verifiable form.

### **1.2 S/T methodology and associated work plan**

A detailed work plan should be presented, broken down into work packages<sup>8</sup> (WPs) which should follow the logical phases of the implementation of your work, and include management and assessment of progress and results.

Please present your plans as follows:

- i) Describe the overall strategy of the work plan ii) Show the timing of the different WPs and their components (Gantt chart or similar).
- iii) Provide a detailed work description broken down into work packages:
  - Work package list (please use table 1.2a);
  - Description of each work package (please use table 1.2b)
  - Deliverables list (please use table 1.2c);
- iv) Provide a graphical presentation of the components showing their interdependencies (Pert diagram or similar)
- v) Describe any significant risks, and associated contingency plans

**Note:** The number of work packages used must be appropriate to the complexity of the work, a small action with very specific goals could consist of one work package only. The planning should be sufficiently detailed to justify the proposed effort and allow progress monitoring by the ICT project coordinator.

*Table 1.2a: Template - Work package list*

### Work package list

Work package No <sup>9</sup>	Work package title	Type of activity <sup>1011</sup>	Personmonths <sup>12</sup>	Start month <sup>12</sup>	End month <sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> A work package is a major sub-division of the proposed work with a verifiable end-point - normally a deliverable or a milestone in the overall action.

<sup>9</sup> Workpackage number: WP 1 – WP n.

<sup>10</sup> Please indicate one activity per work package:

RTD = Research and technological development; DEM = Demonstration; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities if applicable in this call, including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results and coordination activities.

<sup>11</sup> The total number of person-months allocated to each work package.

<sup>12</sup> Measured in months from your action start date (month 1).

---

	TOTAL				
--	-------	--	--	--	--

Table 1.2b: Template - Work package description

### Work package description

<b>Work package number</b>		<b>Start date or starting event:</b>	
<b>Work package title</b>			
<b>Activity type<sup>13</sup></b>			

**Objectives**

**Description of work** (possibly broken down into tasks)

**Deliverables** (brief description) and month of delivery

**Total effort (person months) -**

Table 1.2c: Template - Deliverables List

### List of Deliverables

<b>Del. no.</b> <small>15</small>	<b>Deliverable name</b>	<b>WP no.</b>	<b>Nature<sup>16</sup></b>	<b>Dissemination level</b> <small>17</small>	<b>Delivery date<sup>18</sup></b> <b>(proj. month)</b>

<sup>13</sup> Please indicate one activity per work package:

RTD = Research and technological development; DEM = Demonstration; MGT = Management of the consortium; OTHER = Other specific activities, if applicable in this call, including any activities to prepare for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and coordination activities.


<sup>15</sup> Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates. Please use the numbering convention <WP number>.<number of deliverable within that WP>. For example, deliverable 4.2 would be the second deliverable from work package 4.

<sup>16</sup> Please indicate the nature of the deliverable using one of the following codes: **R** = Report, **P** = Prototype, **D** = Demonstrator, **O** = Other

<sup>17</sup> Please indicate the dissemination level using one of the following codes:

**PU** = Public

**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).

<sup>18</sup> Measured in months from your action start date (month 1).

## Section 2. Implementation

### 2.2 Participant

Provide a brief description of your organisation, and your previous experience relevant to the tasks you will undertake in this action. Provide also a short profile of the main individuals who will be undertaking the work.

### 2.4 Resources to be committed

Describe how the totality of the necessary resources will be mobilised, including any resources that will complement the EC contribution. Show how the resources will be integrated in a coherent way, and show how your overall financial plan for the action is adequate.

Please identify any major non-personnel direct costs and explain why they are necessary for the activity you propose.

### **Section 3. Impact**

#### **3.1 Expected impact**

Describe how your activity will contribute towards the expected impact of the ICT project. Mention the steps that will be needed to bring about these impacts. Mention any assumptions and external factors that may determine whether the impacts will be achieved.

#### **3.2 Dissemination and/or exploitation of results, and management of intellectual property**

Describe the measures you propose for the dissemination and/or exploitation of the results of your action, first within the ICT project and then show how your contribution will increase the impact of the project as a whole.

If appropriate, describe your plans for the management of knowledge (intellectual property) acquired in the course of the action.

### **Section 4. Ethical Issues**

Describe any ethical issues that may arise in the action.

**Annex 2 – Evaluation form  
Individual evaluation**

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<p><b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</b>  <i>Note: when a proposal only <b>partially addresses the topics</b>, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion</i></p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 3/5;  Weight 1)</i></p>
<p><b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 3/5;  Weight 1)</i></p> <p><i>For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an above-threshold score for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the proposer(s) has the operational capacity to carry out the work</i></p>

<p><b>3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b> <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</i></p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> <i>(Threshold 10/15)</i></p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

**NO** | **YES**

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

Name	
Signature	
Date	