



ERANID



**“Society and responses
to drug use”**

***DOCUMENT FOR
GOVERNANCE OF THE
CALL AND EVALUATION
PROCEDURE***



“Society and responses to drug use”

Joint Transnational Call for proposals 2016

DOCUMENT FOR GOVERNANCE OF THE CALL AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE

This working document is a mutual statement of intention among all Parties organising the Joint Transnational Call (JTC) who agree to make every reasonable effort to fulfil the intents expressed in the JTC as well as its implementation as described below.

FUNDING GROUP (FG) AND JOINT PEER REVIEW PANEL (PRP)

The Funding Group (FG) is composed of representatives of funding organisations of ERANID countries that are participating in the call. The FG members are entitled to join the PRP meeting as observers.

The decisions of the FG will be taken by consensus; however on national issues there will be veto right for the national representative concerned.

Each country represented in the FG has one vote. For a given proposal in the ranking list, the representatives from the countries of the PI and CO-PIs of that proposal are entitled to a vote. The representatives from the other countries can contribute to the discussions.

A representative may veto a proposal by reason of force majeure, for example if it is impossible for legal reasons to fund the proposal. No other considerations should guide the casting of a veto.

The FG will agree the proposals to be funded (shortlist) following the recommendations of the PRP. Each Party will make the final decision according to their respective regulations and available budgets, but committed to follow the prioritisations made by the FG.

ELIGIBILITY

Joint transnational research proposals may be submitted with respect for the following criteria:

- Only transnational projects will be funded. Each proposal must involve a minimum of three eligible applicants, although preference will be given to four or more from at least three different countries participating in the call. The number of participants and their research contribution should be appropriate for the aims of the transnational research project. Each transnational collaborative project should represent the critical mass to achieve ambitious scientific goals and should clearly demonstrate an added value from working together;
- Depending on national eligibility criteria (see annex 2), eligible partners may include public and private scientific, research, technological and innovation institutions; universities, research active industry; NGOs; private companies; public institutions and other stakeholders;

- Participants not eligible to be funded (e.g. from non-funding countries or not fundable according to national regulations of the participating funding countries) may participate in a project proposal if they are able to secure their own funding. Such participants should state in advance the source of funding for their part in the project;
- However, the majority of participant groups in a consortium and the Principal Investigator must be eligible to be funded by participating countries, according to the national regulations;
- Each consortium must nominate a Principal Investigator (PI) among the project's co-Principal Investigators (co-PI). The PI must be considered an eligible project applicant by one of the funding organisations participating in the call. The PI will represent the consortium externally and towards the Joint Call Secretariat (JCS) and Funding Group¹ (FG), and will be responsible for its internal scientific management (such as controlling, reporting, intellectual property rights (IPR) issues). Each co-PI will be represented by one (and only one) group leader. Each PI will also be the contact person for the relevant national funding organisation.
- Each applicant can submit up to two research proposals as co-PI or only one as PI (e.g. the PI of a proposal cannot be partner in another proposal). Please note that this rule is subject to national regulations, therefore applicants are strongly encouraged to contact their national contact points to check their national eligibility rules before submission.
- Whilst proposals will be submitted jointly by research groups from several countries, individual research groups will be funded by their national funding organisation(s). The applications are therefore subject to eligibility criteria of relevant national funding organisations of the respective country. It is highly recommended that applicants refer to the funding rules and eligibility criteria of the relevant funding organisation. Applicants are strongly advised to contact their relevant funding organisation contact person before submitting an application; please note that for some countries it might be mandatory. Please note that if an applicant is found to be non-eligible by one of the funding organisations after the eligibility check, the entire proposal will be rejected without further review.
- The duration of the projects can be up to three years. Nevertheless, a partner can receive funding for less than three years according to funding organisations eligibility criteria and regulations.

¹ Funding Group: funding organisations' representatives

SUBMISSION OF JOINT PROPOSALS

One joint proposal document (in English) shall be prepared by the partners of a joint transnational proposal, and must be submitted to the online submission system, (administrated by the Joint Call Secretariat) by the project PI. Proposals must include the following information.

- Project title
- Acronym (maximum 15 characters)
- Duration of project (months)
- Total project cost and budget requested to be publically funded by the funding organisations
- Type of research group (academia, clinical, industry) and role within the consortium
- Keywords (5 to 7)
- Scientific abstract
- Family names, first names and full affiliations (by this order) of the project PI
- Family names, first names and full affiliations (by this order) of each partner co-PI (one per project partner) and other team members participating in the project.
- Project description including references (aims, methodology, involvement of participants, time plan, work packages, project coordination and management, innovation, added value of the proposed solutions compared to the existing ones)
- Description of how the proposal addresses the requirements of the call
- Financial summary for each project consortium partner provided on the respective table available within the electronic application data sheet
- Details and justifications of requested and total project cost (e.g. own contribution + other sources + requested). Requested costs shall be detailed in categories that are relevant for the funding agencies to whom these are requested. When applicable specifying co-funding from other sources necessary for the project
- Added value of the proposed international collaboration (Please explain the International dimension of the research and the proposed solutions, the necessity for a transnational approach)
- Engagement in Responsible Research and Innovation: potential impact, outreach to stakeholders and exploitation of expected project results, inclusion of the gender dimension and of ethical issues as highlighted in the Call for Proposals text
- Handling of intellectual property rights (e.g. any barriers to sharing materials or results), both within and outside the research consortium;
- Description of ongoing projects related to the present topic indicating funding sources and possible overlaps with proposal

- Brief CVs for each participating project partner Principal Investigator with email and a list of up to five relevant publications within the last five years demonstrating the competence to carry out the project
- When requested by national funding bodies, additional information must be provided
- Research groups not eligible to be funded (e.g. from non-funding countries or not fundable according to national regulations of the participating funding body) may participate in transnational projects if they are able to secure their own funding. Such partners should state in advance the source of funding for their part in the project and a signed statement (Letter of Intent) has to be enclosed to the project declaring in advance they will run the project with their own resources
- Signature of project consortium PI (signed PDF) on behalf of the project partners

A template document structuring the above items will be made available by the JCS. Applicants will fill out this template and upload a signed PDF-version in the electronic submission system.

PEER REVIEW PANEL (PRP)

Each proposal will be evaluated by a minimum of three external independent experts, who will produce a written evaluation report that will be discussed in a Peer Review Panel (PRP) meeting. The experts will evaluate the proposals submitted in response to this joint transnational call according to the aim of the call and the evaluation criteria and scoring in the evaluation form. The total number of reviewers involved will depend upon the number of submitted eligible proposals and the expertise required to review all applications. The reviewers will be chosen (and then contacted) by the JCS from a list of experts that will be recommended by the Advisory Committee of ERANID (AC), and validated by the Funding Group (FG). The reviewers are independent and internationally renowned academics chosen for their scientific or technical expertise in their field. Reviewers from the private sector will also be considered. Reviewers should come from countries which participate in the joint call and from non-participating countries. In order to establish the group of reviewers, the AC members must state whether there are conflicts of interest towards certain applications since they will be suggesting experts for the evaluation. After the decision of the FG, the JCS will contact the experts centrally to request and coordinate their participation. Their potential conflicts of interest will be assessed before providing them with access to the proposals.

There are two steps in this reviewing procedure: remote evaluation and peer review panel meeting:

- **Remote evaluation:** each proposal will be allocated to a minimum of three experts who fit the profile of the application; they shall work anonymously in this written procedure. Then, one reviewer per project will be designated by the JCS as “speaker” to moderate the evaluation per proposal and to participate in the Peer Review Panel meeting (see below). If particular expertise is required, additional experts can be invited. The first step of the peer review procedure will be a written evaluation. All reviewers will be asked for reports and scoring on the proposals according to specific evaluation criteria and a scoring system (see the evaluation procedure below). The JCS will collect the written evaluations and produce a booklet including the complete evaluations, the arithmetic mean of the scoring and a table summarising the ranking proposal.
- **Peer review panel meeting:** All experts defined as “speakers” who participated in the remote evaluation shall be present at the PRP meeting. The meeting will be chaired by the JCS. All proposals will be discussed during the PRP meeting. The chair will moderate the discussion; however, the chair must not express any judgement and has no voting rights. PRP members will not represent the countries nor adopt national considerations. The PRP members will have access to all remote evaluations before the PRP meeting. At the PRP meeting reviewers should identify the proposals recommended for funding and not recommended for funding. At the end of the meeting, the PRP will provide the FG a final ranking list of those proposals recommended for funding based only on the approved evaluation criteria without taking any consideration of national Parties’ funding commitments, and each “speaker” (or nominated deputy) will write an evaluation summary report resulting from the PRP meeting’s discussions. Projects to be funded will be chosen by the FG members following this ranking list and the availability of funding. The ranking list might include a number of proposals ranked equally, should PRP members be unable to differentiate between those proposals.

EVALUATION FEES

Reviewers will be remunerated for their efforts during the evaluation procedure. The PRP members will also be reimbursed for the travel and accommodation expenses or allowance incurred for their attendance at PRP meetings.

ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The booklet containing the evaluation reports of the remote evaluation stage and the summary report resulting from the PRP discussions will be provided to the applicants by request, according to national rules. The experts will enter into a confidentiality agreement before undertaking the evaluation process. National funding organisations will have access to evaluation reports, together with names of the PRP members. The

names of the members of the PRP will be made public after the decision on funding has been made.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Experts must declare any conflict of interest and refrain from reviewing an application or from discussion of a proposal if they stand to profit professionally, financially or personally from approval or rejection of the application. They should also refrain from reviewing if they have published together with the applicant or the co-workers within the last three years, if they are currently cooperating or if professional or family dependencies exist. Each expert will sign a confidentiality and non-conflict of interest statement (CCoI) in which s/he declares not to be involved in any proposal currently under evaluation or submitted for evaluation (see Annex 3).

EVALUATION PROCEDURE

STEP 1 - FORMAL CRITERIA CHECK OF PROPOSALS

The Joint Call Secretariat will check all proposals to ensure that they meet the call's formal criteria:

- Date of submission
- Submission through the electronic submission system
- Composition of the consortium
- Inclusion of all necessary information in English
- Appropriate limits on duration of the project

In parallel, the JCS will forward the proposals to the national funding organisations, which will perform a formal check for compliance to national rules. Proposals not meeting the formal criteria will be declined without further review. Proposals passing both checks (JCS and national) will be forwarded to the Peer Review Panel (PRP) for evaluation.

STEP 2 - SELECTION OF PROPOSALS BY THE PRP

PRP members will complete a common Evaluation Form using the following evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance and clarity of objectives** in relation to the aims of the call
- **Scientific quality of the proposal** (scientific excellence of the proposal, in terms of innovative approach, originality and advancement, availability and quality of preliminary data, international competitiveness)

- **Quality and diversity of the project consortium** (international competitiveness of participants in the field(s), previous work and expertise of the participants, previous level of collaborative interaction between the participants, added value of the transnational collaboration, capacity building, commitment to equality and diversity of workforce)
- **Feasibility of project plan** (relation of work packages to proposal themes and aims, quality of work plan and time schedule, balanced participation of project partners, quality and efficiency of the coordination and management, scientific justification and adequateness of the requested budget and risk assessment)
- **Potential impact** (response to actual needs, providing evidence for policy makers and practitioners; early integration of relevant stakeholders, ensuring long-term societal relevance).

A scoring system will be used to evaluate the overall proposal's quality and the quality of each evaluation criterion:

- 1: **Poor.** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2: **Fair.** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
- 3: **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
- 4: **Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
- 5: **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

The experts will score each criterion using this scoring system and will provide comments to justify each score. They will also provide an overall score to the proposal. Any proposal receiving an average rating less than *very good* (i.e. less than 4) across all reviewers, for one or more of the criteria, will not be eligible for funding. Each proposal will be reviewed by three reviewers. All reviewers will complete the evaluation form.

Written reports of all proposals will be compiled by the JCS and provided to the PRP members and the FG members in a booklet for the PRP meeting. The PRP members will meet and discuss the proposals based on the scoring in the written reports and they will identify threshold and the top-quality proposals recommended for funding and set up a ranking list. The “speaker” will write an evaluation report based on the evaluations and the panel discussions, which will be sent (anonymously) by the JCS to the proposal consortium PI.

FG members can participate in the PRP meetings as observers.

STEP 3 - PROJECT APPROVAL AND COMMUNICATION OF DECISION

The FG will identify the projects to be funded according to the scientific ranking list provided by the PRP. The ranking list might include a number of proposals ranked equally, should PRP members be unable to differentiate between those proposals. If the cost of funding the successful proposals is less than the total funding available, only part of the funds may be used for this call. If the cost of funding the successful proposals is higher for certain partners than their budget can support, the FG will discuss the potential funding of the respective proposals.

The funding organisations will be informed of the final funding recommendations via the respective funding organisation’s representative in the FG. Each national funding organisation will implement the funding recommendations applying to its country.

The information about project approval will be issued to the PIs of the consortia through the JCS by e-mail, and will include a summary of the evaluation results and any remaining conditions that need to be fulfilled in order for funding to be confirmed by the respective funding organisation. The JCS will also inform the PIs of rejected proposals about the evaluation results via e-mail in a formal letter, which will include an anonymised summary of the evaluation results and the reasons for the rejection of the application.

FUNDING PROCEDURE, RESPONSIBILITY AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Projects can be funded for a maximum period of three years.

Partners of successful collaborative projects will be funded directly by their respective national funding organisation. Funding will be administered according to the terms and

conditions of the national funding organisations, taking into account all other applicable national regulations and legal frameworks.

The internal management of each project will be the responsibility of the designated project PI, who will represent the consortium. In addition to bearing the overall scientific responsibility for the project, s/he is fully responsible for the research outcome towards the respective funding agency/ organisation of the country from which he or she has applied.

Consortium members of projects selected for funding must sign a project consortium agreement fixing decision making, intellectual property rights (IPR) and a common project start date, which would be the reference date for yearly and final reports and potential extensions, and explicitly excluding financial matters that are part of the project partner-relevant funding body bilateral relationship. This common project start date must appear in the Consortium Agreement.

It will be the responsibility of the project PI to draw up a Consortium Agreement (CA) suitable to their own group in order to manage the delivery of the project activities, intellectual property rights (IPR) and to avoid disputes which might be detrimental to the completion of the project. This consortium agreement will be made available to the concerned funding organisations. The project consortium is strongly encouraged to sign this CA before the official project start date, and in any case the CA has to be signed no later than three months after the official project start date. Further instructions will be provided by the JCS to the PI of the projects selected for funding.

The project PI will be required to submit to the funding agency a brief annual and final scientific progress report of the project, on behalf of the research project consortium. If problems of any nature appear, the project consortium PI should immediately inform the funding agency and project partners.

National funding agencies will inform at once each other of any abnormality detected in the periodic and final project partner report in order to take actions as appropriate.

If a funding agency encounters or identifies a major administrative or funding problem in a project, it will inform any respective national agencies involved in the co-funding of the project. They will manage the situation so that all the parties identify a solution through an agreed multilateral process.

ANNEX 1 - PROPOSED TIMETABLE

DATE	ACTIVITY
6th June 2016	Call Pre-Announcement
28th June 2016 12.00 CET	Launch of the Call
28th June 2016 12.00 CET	Submission tool open
July 2016 onwards	Send invitations to experts, communicating dates of PRP, and check willingness to act as rapporteur if expertise is needed
18th October 2016 12.00 CET	Closure of the submission
18th to 31st October 2016	Matching reviewers/ proposals
28th October 2016	Deadline for national eligibility check
27th to 28th October 2016	NSC and Funders meeting
31st October 2016	JCS send all the documentation and forms to the peer reviewers
21st November 2016	Deadline for return of individual evaluation reports
22nd November to 6th December 2016	Evaluation reports sent to rapporteurs along with the consensus form. Completed consensus forms to be returned to JCS by the 6th December
7th to 9th December	JCS makes records of proposals/reviews/consensus forms for NSC/funders/PRP members
14th December 2016	Peer Review Panel meeting in Lisbon
15th December 2016	Preparation for Funders meeting
16th December 2016	FG meeting to decide projects to be funded
No later than 5 days after the FG meeting	JCS communicates to applicants (PI of successful and fundable project proposals must inform each project partner of these consortia). Applicants should contact the relevant funding

DATE	ACTIVITY
	agency to start national /regional negotiations and administrative procedures
No later than 5 days after the FG meeting	JCS communicates to the coordinators of unsuccessful project proposals and each PI must inform the partners of the relevant project consortium. The PI will also receive an anonymised summary of the project evaluation report.
Brussels Conference	March 2017
As soon as possible but approximately May/June 2017	Expected start time of funded projects
No later than three months after the official project start date	Inter partners Project Consortium Agreements signed by project partners

ANNEX 2 - NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA
Belgium

Funding Organisation	Federal Public Planning Service Science Policy (BELSPO)
Initial funding commitment	€500,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	<p>Aziz Naji – Programma manager, BELSPO</p> <p>Aziz.naji@belspo.be</p>
Eligible institutions	<p>Not for profit institutions with the pursuit of scientific research stated in the official statutes of the organisations (e.g. university, high school, public research centre...)</p> <p>Access the full list of not-for profit research centres recognised by the federal government on: http://www.beslpo.be/belspo/fisc/wi_list_fr.stm</p>
Additional eligibility criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Eligible Belgian promoter in a given proposal can be a physical person or the appointed leader of a group of researchers from the <u>same</u> organisation; • Belgian promoters from different Belgian eligible research institutions can enter a given transnational network of applicants; • Requested budget per Belgian participation in a proposal (as a Belgian promoter or as a Belgian Network) shall not exceed €250,000; • Rules concerning eligible costs (see below) are respected; • Belgian applicants must contact BELSPO before entering a consortium/ submitting a proposal.

Eligible costs	BELSPO adopts a full cost model comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personnel costs (preferably around 60% of total requested budget) - Operation costs (lump sum of 10% of personnel costs) - Equipment costs - Subcontracting costs (not to exceed 25% of total costs for Belgian partners and only for non-core activities to the project (e.g. specific scientific expertise, non-scientific tasks such as organising meetings...)) - Overheads (max. 5% of Personnel and Operation costs)

Funding Organisation	Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek Vlaanderen (FWO)
Initial funding commitment	€200,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	Olivier Boehme Senior Science Administrator Tel. +32 2 550 15 45 Toon Monbaliu Advisor Research Affairs Tel. +32 2 550 15 70 E-mail: eranet@fwo.be Fonds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek - Vlaanderen (FWO) Egmontstraat 5 1000 Brussel
Eligible institutions	Art. 9 of the FWO-regulation on the regular research projects is applicable. In this article is stated who can apply as a Principal Investigator for a research project: <p>§1. The supervisor who is also the responsible spokesperson towards the FWO shall have a remunerated appointment of at least 10% at the relevant host institution, and additionally meet one of the following</p>

conditions:

1° an Independent Academic Staff member with an appointment of at least 10% at a Flemish university;

2° an Independent Academic Staff member of at least 10% with an appointment at the Evangelical Protestant Faculty in Leuven and the Faculty for Protestant Theology in Brussels, for research related to religious studies or theology;

3° a research director of FWO;

4° a designated beneficiary of an ERC Grant with a Flemish university or the Evangelical Protestant Faculty in Leuven, the Faculty for Protestant Theology in Brussels, the Hogere Zeevaartschool, the Vlerick Management School, the Antwerp Management School or the Institute of Tropical Medicine as host institution;

5° a designated beneficiary of an Odysseus II grant with a Flemish university as host institution;

6° an (associated) professor or (full) professor of at least 10% affiliated to the Hogere Zeevaartschool and holder of a PhD, if the application is related to research in nautical sciences;

7° an (associated) professor or (full) professor of at least 10% (or appointed in a position with an equivalent English title) at the Vlerick Management School and holder of a PhD, if the application is related to research in management sciences;

8° an (associated) professor or (full) professor of at least 10% affiliated to the Antwerp Management School and holder of a PhD, if the application is related to research in management sciences;

9° an (associated) professor or (full) professor of at least 10% at the Institute of Tropical Medicine and holder of a PhD;

10° an Independent Academic Staff member with a remunerated appointment of 5% at a Flemish university and with an appointment

	<p>as (assistant) clinical head or an equal function in a university hospital;</p> <p>§2. All co-supervisors have to be researchers of at least postdoctoral level. Co-supervisors have a remunerated appointment at a host institution that can act as a main host institution as referred to in art. 3 or at an academic programme of a Flemish School of Arts, or at another Flemish research institution or at a federal scientific institution, where the co-supervisor belongs to the Dutch-speaking community.</p> <p>§3. If the project involves several institutions that can act as main host institution as referred to in art. 3, at least the supervisor or one co-supervisor of each of these institutions shall meet the requirements set out in §1 of this article, and moreover hold an appointment that fully covers the duration of the research project applied for.</p> <p>§ 4. If the requirements set out in §1 are not met at the time of the application, the applicant needs to prove that this will be the case at the start of the agreement.</p>
Additional eligibility criteria	See above
Eligible costs	<p>Funding money can be used for staff, consumables and infrastructure. The minimal and maximal amounts of money allowed per cost category, as applicable for the regular FWO-projects, are not applicable for the projects funded by FWO in ERA-NET. Moreover, FWO pays the host institutions of a project 6% overhead on top of the funding amount.</p> <p>Funding cannot be used for training activities, apart from the opportunity for a researcher appointed within the project to obtain a PhD on the basis of the results from his/her project research.</p>

France

Funding Organisation	Mission Interministérielle de Lutte contre les Drogues et les Conduites addictives - MILDECA, France
-----------------------------	---

Initial funding commitment	€300,000 is the max that can be allocated over the period 2016/2017/2018 to French research groups selected in this call
National Contact Point for the 1st call	Florence Lafay-Dufour, Research Advisor MILDECA Florence.lafay-dufour@pm.gouv.fr
Eligible institutions	Non for profit institutions with the pursuit of scientific research stated in the official statutes of the organisations (e.g. university, high school, public research centre...)
Additional eligibility criteria	Requested budget per French participation in a proposal shall not exceed €150,000
Eligible costs	For further details, please contact national French contact point.

Italy

Funding Organisation	Dipartimento per la Politiche antidroga, Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri, ITALY
Initial funding commitment	€500,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	Patrizia De Rose eranidnetworkdpa@governo.it
Eligible institutions	Institutions with the pursuit of scientific research stated in the official statutes of the organisations (e.g. public university and private recognised universities, high school, public and private research centre...) also in partnership with enterprises; NGOs, Central and local administrations.

Additional eligibility criteria	Requested budget per Italian participation in a proposal shall not exceed €100,000
Eligible costs	For further details, please contact national Italian contact point.

Portugal

Funding Organisation	Serviço de Intervenção nos Comportamentos Aditivos e nas Dependências (SICAD)
Initial funding commitment	€200,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	<p>Manuel Cardoso – Deputy General-Director, SICAD (manuel.cardoso@sicad.min-saude.pt)</p> <p>Deputy: Mário Castro – Director of the Monitoring and Information Department, SICAD (mario.castro@sicad.min-saude.pt)</p>
Eligible institutions	Universities and associated labs, high schools, research centres, NGO's and non-profit research institutions.
Additional eligibility criteria	Maximum per national project: €50,000
Eligible costs	Personnel costs, operation costs, equipment costs, travel costs,

	consultants and subcontracting costs, copyright costs.
--	--

The Netherlands

Funding Organisation	The Netherlands Organisation for Health Research and Development (ZonMw)
Initial funding commitment	€700,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	Simone Korff de Gidts, Co-ordinator eranid@zonmw.nl
Eligible institutions	Public law or private law entities with registered offices in the Netherlands can apply (article 7 of General Terms and Conditions)
Additional eligibility criteria	The General term and Conditions Governing Grants of ZonMw will be applicable. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requested budget per Dutch participation in a proposal shall not exceed €175,000 Link to General Terms and Conditions Governing Grants of ZonMw
Eligible costs	ZonMw adopts a full cost model comprising : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personnel costs • Material costs • Equipment costs • Implementation costs • Other costs

The United Kingdom (Scotland)

Funding Organisation	The Scottish Government (SG)
Initial funding commitment	£25,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	Fiona Fraser Fiona.Fraser@gov.scot
Eligible institutions	For further details, please contact the national contact point.
Additional eligibility criteria	For further details, please contact the national contact point.
Eligible costs	For further details, please contact the national contact point.

The United Kingdom (England)

Funding Organisation	The Department of Health, England (DH)
Initial funding commitment	£250,000
National Contact Point for the 1st call	<p>For all financial and contractual questions go to the website in the section below in the first instance. If your query cannot be answered please contact:</p> <p>Farheen.Shafiq@prp-ccf.org.uk</p> <p>Natalie Owen – Research Programme Manager, DH</p> <p>natalie.owen@dh.gsi.gov.uk</p>
Eligible institutions	All institutions/organisations within the United Kingdom are eligible to apply for PRP funding. However, applicants must be able to justify

	how they will inform English policy-making.
Additional eligibility criteria	<p>The DH Policy Research Programme would like to focus all funding on applications which relate to the second question contained in the call:</p> <p>2) Importance of the social environment in pathways to recovery and socioeconomic reintegration.</p> <p>A separate information document will be prepared detailing the financial and contractual regulations for UK applicants. This will be available at the following address:</p> <p>http://prp-ccf.org.uk/</p> <p>We are looking to fund of 1-2 proposals.</p>
Eligible costs	<p>Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)</p> <p>Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) should determine the Full Economic Cost (FEC) of their research using the Transparent Approach to Costing (TRAC) methodology. For HEIs, <u>up to 100%</u> of FEC will be paid, provided that TRAC methodology has been used.</p> <p>NHS bodies and other providers of NHS services in England</p> <p>For applications where the contractor is an NHS body or provider of NHS services in England, up to 100% of direct costs will be paid. Where an NHS body or provider of NHS services is collaborating with another type of organisation, the leader must be the NHS partner which will be the contracting organisation.</p> <p>Commercial Organisations</p> <p>If you are a commercial organisation/consultancy, please fill in direct costs and commercial indirect costs. Indirect costs should be charged in proportion to the amount of staff effort requested on the funding application form. Up to 100% of costs will be paid.</p> <p>Other Partner Organisations</p> <p>If you are another partner organisation (e.g. charity or NGO), please fill in direct costs and other partner organisations indirect costs. Indirect costs should be charged in proportion to the amount of research staff effort requested on the funding application form. Up to 100% of costs will be paid.</p>

ANNEX 3 - CCI DECLARATION SIGNED BY THE REVIEWERS

Declarations

Declaration of no conflict of interest

I hereby declare that I have no conflict of interest² with any proposal that I am asked to evaluate. I will inform the Joint Call secretariat immediately if I discover any such conflict of interest. In particular, I declare that I have not submitted, nor am I, to the best of my knowledge, involved in any proposal currently under evaluation or submitted for evaluation, under the above call.

Declaration of confidentiality

I hereby declare that I will not disclose any detail of the evaluation process and its outcomes or of any proposal submitted for evaluation. I understand that I have to maintain the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent and to return, erase or destroy all confidential documents or files upon completing the evaluation, unless otherwise instructed.

Name: _____

Place/Date: _____

Signature: _____

²Circumstances in which a conflict of interest exists:

- was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted
- has a close family relationship (up to first degree in the previous 3 years) with any person representing an applicant organisation in the proposal
- is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organisation **or** involved in a contract or research collaboration with an applicant organisation, or had been so in the previous three years
- is employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal **or** was employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal within the previous three years
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially or in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

Abbreviations

- AC: Advisory Committee
- FG: Funding Group
- JCS: Joint Call Secretariat
- JTC: Joint Transnational Call
- MG: Management Group
- MoU: Memorandum of Understanding
- NSC: Network Steering Committee
- PRP: Peer Review Panel
- SRA: Strategic Research Agenda

