EISMEA Application Form Annex B

ETSI Guidelines

# Foreword

The ETSI Secretariat has elaborated these guidelines to help you complete Part B of the EISMEA Application form.

They complement, in some specific parts, the recommendations already provided in the form.

To support your application, ETSI Secretariat has developped some parts in the form related to project management process.

Feel free to reach out to Léa Belloulou(lea.belloulou@etsi.org)/ETSI Head of Funded Activities should you need further information.

# General information :

ETSI Directives Version 48, dated 1st December 2023, are available [here](http://portal.etsi.org/docbox/Board/ETSI_Directives/)

Fill in the boxes

* Page limit: 100 pages
* Minimum font size — Arial 9 points

Annexed document to this Part B:

* Call document including Topics objectives and Evaluation Criteria

ETSI is the unique Beneficiary of the Agreement

# Part B:

## PROJECT SUMMARY

Respect the limitation of characters: 2000 max WITH spaces.

**Control the number of characters**: If you use the application Microsoft Word, to monitor the number of characters, select the text and go to tab **Review**, and click on **Word Count** in the **Proofing** sub-menu.

## RELEVANCE

### 1.2 Needs analysis and specific objectives

To define the project objectives, apply the SMART Principle

* **S**pecific: Make your goals specific and narrow for more effective planning
* **M**easurable: Define what evidence will prove you are making progress and re-evaluate when necessary (including a unit of measurement, baseline value and target value).
* **A**ttainable: Make sure you can reasonably accomplish your goal within a certain timeframe.
* **R**elevant: Your goals should align with values and long-term objectives.
* **T**ime-Based: Set a realistic, ambitious end date for task prioritization and motivation.

### 1.3 Complementarity with other actions and innovation

If you mention another EC funded project please indicate that there is no financial dependence between the projects therefore there is no double funding.

## QUALITY

### 2.3 Project teams, staff and experts

**ETSI secretariat** information already filled, please complete this part with the apropriate information

* **CVs must be provided with the proposal**

Outside resources (subcontracting, seconded staff, etc.)

* Experts are now considered as subcontractors
* ETSI Secretariat has described the recruitment process following ETSI Directives
* You have to indicate the Team structure with the **required skills and technical competence**

### **2.5** Project management, quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation strategy

**ETSI Secretariat** has developed part the project planning/control/monitoring process, including the set-up of milestones during the project life cycle.

Depending on its nature**, describe the deliverable-making process related to WI** for quality control + Drafting rules + review from EditHelp! (see Technical Working Procedures TWP)

### 2.6 Cost effectiveness and financial management:

You need to explain how the costs have been built (e.g. number of days, daily rate, justification of the daily rate, costs of other external services, costs of travels…)

**ETSI Secretariat** has developped:

* the Baseline cost plan approach to explain how the costs have been broken down into tasks
* the Milestone Payment Plan approach to explain how the subcontractors are paid

### 2.7 Risk management:

**Don’t hesitate to use the risks from the Risks\_sample.docx** document as the European Commission already validated those risks and mitigations measures. It is better to have at least 5 risks identified. Some proposals were validated using all the risks attached.

**Problem solving mechanism is very important.**

NB: Every project has low/medium/high risks. For each risk mitigation strategy would be required This table could help you to identify & assess, decide & act and communicate & monitor risks.

**WARNING**: This table does not replace the table requested in the form

|  |
| --- |
| **Risks and mitigation strategies** |
| Risk number # | Risk cause | Risk effect | Likelihood (almost certain, likely, possible, unlikely or rare) | Consequences (negligible, minor, moderate, major, or crucial) | Risk ranking (low, moderate, high, or very high) | Mitigation strategies | Owner of mitigation strategy |
| Example 1 | Delays in the work due to competing work demands for the project team. | Delays in the project schedule and meeting deliverable deadlines. Project team unable to complete tasks in a timely manner due to commitments to other projects.  | Almost certain | Moderate | High | 1. Increase the number of experts.2. Delegate tasks amongst all Project team members. | Project Leader |
| Example 2 | Relevant stakeholders may not be available during data collection and consultation due to other work demands  | Delay in data collection timeline. Information may not be available for the purpose. Project Leader spends a lot of time scheduling stakeholder consultations and following up to secure availability. | Possible | Minor | Moderate | 1. Identify and schedule other possible sources of information if particular stakeholders are unavailable.2. Provide stakeholders with several appointment dates and times.3. Document any limitations in data collection in the Progress Project report. | Project Leader |

### 3.2 Communication, dissemination and visibility

Please also indicate who and how you are going to participate in dissemination activities

For the dissemination of Results, the EC is looking for broader dissemination, like conferences, webinars, websites etc.

### 3.3 Sustainability and continuation

Describe the **deliverable maintenance process as provisioned in the TWP**

### 4.2 Work packages, activities, resources and timing

At least 2 Work packages (WP) should be identified and described, and per WP detail Tasks/Milestones and Deliverables

Example of project breakdown structure

* WP 1 Management and Coordination of the Project
* WP 2 Technical Activities
* WP 3 Dissemination and Communication Activities

Deliverables:

Each WP should have at least **one** Deliverable.

The due date in “Month” is mandatory. (ex: M1 or M10)

The annual Report to the EISMEA (every 12 Months) is systematically a deliverable for the Management and Coordination Workpackage.

The Final Report cannot be a deliverable to the EC as it is a contractual document.

A Stable draft of a TS/TR can be considered as a Deliverable.

Published versions of the TS/TR are considered as Deliverables.

# Annex:

*The award criteria provided in annex to this document may give you useful information about EISMEA expectations in terms of evaluation*

Maximum points: 100 points.

Individual thresholds per criterion: 21/30, 21/30, 21/30 and 7/10 points.

Overall threshold: 70 points.

Proposals that pass the individual thresholds **AND** the overall threshold will be considered for funding — within the limits of the available call budget (i.e. up to the budget threshold). Other proposals will be rejected.

**Award criteria**

The **award criteria** for this call are as follows:

* **Relevance (30 points):** clarity and consistency of project, objectives and planning; extent to which they match the themes and priorities and objectives of the call; contribution to the EU strategic and legislative context; European/trans-national dimension; impact/interest for a number of countries (EU or eligible non-EU countries); possibility to use the results in other countries; potential to develop mutual trust/cross-border cooperation.
* **Quality**:
	+ **Project design and implementation (30 points):** technical quality; logical links between the identified problems, needs and solutions proposed (logical frame concept); methodology for implementing the project (concept and methodology, management, procedures, timetable, risks and risk management, monitoring and evaluation); feasibility of the project within the proposed time frame; cost effectiveness (sufficient/appropriate budget for proper implementation; best value for money).
	+ **Project team and cooperation arrangements (30 points):** quality of the consortium and project teams; appropriate procedures and problem-solving mechanisms for cooperating within the project teams and consortium.
* **Impact (10 points):** ambition and expected long-term impact of results on target groups/general public; appropriate dissemination strategy for ensuring sustainability and long-term impact; sustainability of results after EU funding ends.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Award criteria**  | **Minimum pass score**  | **Maximum score**  |
| Relevance | 21  | 30  |
| Quality — Project design and implementation  | 21  | 30  |
| Quality — Project team and cooperation arrangements  | 21  | 30  |
| Impact  | 7  | 10  |
| **Overall (pass) scores**  | **70**  | **100**  |