EuroNanoMed III

Joint Transnational Call for Proposals (2017) for "European Innovative Research & Technological Development Projects in Nanomedicine"

Document for governance of the call and evaluation procedure

This working document is a mutual statement of intention among all Parties organizing the joint transnational call who agree to make every reasonable effort to fulfil the intents expressed in the joint transnational call as well as its implementation as described below.

CALL STEERING COMMITTEE (CSC) AND PEER REVIEW PANEL (PRP)

The Call Steering Committee (CSC) is composed of representatives of the EuroNanoMed III Parties and other funding organisations that participate in the joint transnational call as funders. In addition, the Joint Call Secretariat and the EuroNanoMed III Coordination Unit are CSC members. Each funding organisation participating in the joint transnational call has one vote.

CSC members are not allowed to apply to the joint transnational call. The CSC will decide on the text of the joint transnational call documents and the composition of the Peer Review Panel[1] (PRP). Based on the recommendations of the PRP and the available budget, the CSC will recommend the proposals to be funded. Each funding organisation will make the final decision

1 Peer review panel: external, independent and international recognized experts that will review the applications according to their expertise.

according to their respective regulations, but committed to follow the prioritisations made by the CSC.

The CSC members are entitled to join the PRP meeting as observers.

FUNDING RECIPIENTS

Joint transnational research proposals may be submitted by research groups working in universities (or other higher education institutions), non-university public research institutes, hospitals and other health care settings and health organisations, as well as industrial companies, in particular small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs). The participation of Medical Doctors and SMEs is strongly encouraged. The eligibility of the afore-mentioned entities, together with details of eligible costs (personnel, material, consumables, travel money, investments...), are subjected to the individual administrative and legal requirements of each funding organisation and may therefore vary.

Please note that, for some funding organisations, industrial companies are not eligible. Clarification may be obtained from the participating individual funding organisations; to this end, a list of contact details will be added to the call text, and published on the EuroNanoMed III website (www.euronanomed.net).

Only transnational projects will be funded.

Joint research proposals may be submitted by applicants belonging to one of the following categories (according to national/regional regulations, please see "Guidelines for applicants"):

A. **Academia (research teams working in universities, other higher education institutions) or research institutes;**
B. **Clinical/public health sector (research teams working in hospitals/public health and/or other health care settings and health organisations). Participation of Medical Doctors is encouraged;**
C. **Enterprise (private companies of all sizes). Participation of small and medium-size enterprises (SMEs) is encouraged.**

Each application should include partners from at least two of the three categories A, B and C. The number of participants and their research contribution should be appropriate for the aims of the transnational research project and be reasonably balanced in terms of international participation. Each transnational collaborative project should represent the critical mass to achieve ambitious scientific goals and should clearly demonstrate an added value from working together.

Each consortium submitting a proposal must involve a **minimum of three eligible and a maximum of five eligible partners from at least three different countries participating to the call** (see list above). The maximum number of partners can be increased from five to seven

under certain circumstances. No more than two eligible partners from the same country participating in the call will be accepted in one consortium.

Research groups not eligible to be funded by one of the organisations participating in this Joint Transnational Call (e.g. from non-funding countries or not fundable according to national/regional regulations of the participating funding countries) 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 are considered as full project partners. A letter of commitment must be included as an annex to the proposal in the full proposal step summarising the commitment of this partner to the project and demonstrating the source of funding. However, no more than one research group with own funding can be included in a consortium and the coordinator must be eligible to be funded by EuroNanoMed III participating countries/regions (see Annex I). **In any case, the maximum number of participants in a project consortium is seven (including eligible for funding and non-eligible for funding research groups)**.

Applicants are encouraged to include partners from the following participating countries, which are either new in the EuroNanoMed consortium or their community has been under-represented in past EuroNanoMed calls: **Belgium, Estonia, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Taiwan, and Turkey**. If they include such partners, the maximum number of partners can be increased to seven (see table below).

Number of partners requesting funding (eligible partners)	3	4	5	6 (only with at least one underrepresented)	7 (only with at least 2 underrepresented)
Maximum number of additional partners with own funding	1	1	1	1	0

Each consortium must nominate a **project coordinator** among the project's principal investigators. The coordinator must be an eligible project partner for the national/regional funding organisation participating in the call. The project coordinator will represent the consortium externally and towards the JCS and **Call Steering Committee**[2] **(CSC)**, and will be responsible for its internal scientific management such as controlling, reporting, intellectual property rights (IPR) issues and contact with the JCS.
Each project partner will be represented **by one (and only one) principal investigator**. Within a joint proposal, each project partner's principal investigator will be the contact person for the JCS and the relevant national/regional funding organisation.

[2] Call Steering Committee: funding organisations' representatives.

Each principal investigator can submit only one proposal as project coordinator or up to two research proposals as partner (e.g. the coordinator of a proposal cannot be partner in another proposal). Please note that this rule is subject to national/regional regulations, therefore applicants are strongly encouraged to contact their national/regional contact points to check their national/regional eligibility rules before submission (see also "Guidelines for applicants").

Whilst applications will be submitted jointly by groups from several countries, individual research groups will be funded by the individual EuroNanoMed III funding organisation(s) respective of the country/region from which applicants have applied. Project Partner's applications are therefore subjected to eligibility criteria of individual Parties or funding organisations. Therefore, public documents of this JTC inform applicants that they are **strongly advised to communicate their intention of participating in the call** and confirm their eligibility **with their respective funding organisations** in advance of submitting an application.

SUBMISSION OF JOINT PROPOSALS

There will be a two-stage procedure for applications: pre-proposals and full proposals. The opportunity for revision of the application between these stages will be provided within the parameters indicated below.

For each stage (pre-proposals and full proposals) one joint document (in English) shall be prepared by the partners of a joint transnational consortium, and submitted to the JCS by the coordinator. Submitted pre- and full proposal not using the respective template could be declared non-eligible.

Pre-proposals must be submitted by the coordinator in electronic format no later than 17:00h CET on **January 16th, 2017** via the electronic submission tool. The pre-proposal template will be available on the EuroNanoMed website (www.euronanomed.net). No other means of submission will be accepted.

Full proposals will be accepted only from those applicants explicitly invited by the JCS to submit them. A revision of the overall application is allowed under certain conditions after the pre-proposal stage. In any case, all changes from pre- to full-proposal have to be coordinated with all involved funding organisations by the consortium coordinator.
As some ENM funding organisations do not allow changes, applicants should be advised to check the "Guidelines for Applicants" to see if their national/regional funding organisation allows changes between the pre- and full-proposal stage. The following modifications might be allowed when preparing a full proposal:

- Changing the consortium is normally restricted to one research group applying for funding (i.e. only one research group may be added, removed or exchanged) and in the following cases:
    - where a research group from the pre-proposal has been declared non-eligible by the respective funding agency.
    - where the modification is based on the feedback from the pre-proposal evaluation by the PRP.
- Research groups not applying for funding (external collaborators) may be included, excluded or changed with the limits described in the table above.
- Changes to the work plan should either be based on a recommendation from the pre-proposal evaluation or they must be well justified in the full proposal.
- Changes to the budget of individual research groups are allowed. However, this requires approval by the respective funding organization, the CSC and must be scientifically justified.

Applicants are responsible for ensuring that any changes are in line with the eligibility criteria of the call (see Call text). and national/regional eligibility criteria). Changes that exceed the conditions for revision (see above) or result in full proposals not meeting the eligibility criteria may be rejected without further review. Applicants are strongly advised and expected to consult the JCS and their respective funding organization in advance of submission if modifications of the proposal are considered.

Full proposals must be submitted by the coordinator in electronic format no later than 17:00h CET on **June 9th, 2017**. An application template will be sent to the coordinator by the JCS at the same time as the invitation to submit a full proposal.

Again, adhering to this template is a requirement. Any changes introduced in the revision phase (see above) should be described and justified in the full proposal for which a separate section will be provided. Suggestions, questions, or comments from the reviewers should also be responded to by the applicants. JCS will provide funding organisations with copies of the full proposals.

ELIGIBILITY OF JOINT PROPOSALS

For both steps, the Joint Call Secretariat will check all proposals to ensure that they meet the call's formal criteria (date of submission; number of participating countries; category of partners; inclusion of all necessary information in English; appropriate limits on length). In parallel, the JCS will forward the proposals to the national funding organisations, which will perform a formal check for compliance to their respective rules. Solutions will be first explored by each CSC member to keep proposals eligible for minor eligibility issues. If no solution could be found, proposals not meeting the formal conditions will be rejected without further review. Proposals passing both checks (general and national) will be forwarded to the PRP for

evaluation. Please note that if a proposal includes one non-eligible partner the whole proposal will be rejected (for a definition of eligible partners see "Guidelines for applicants" and national regulations).

SCIENTIFIC PEER REVIEW PANEL (PRP) & EVALUATION PROCEDURES

For both step, each proposal will be evaluated by at least three experts, who will produce a written evaluation report. The PRP members will be asked to assess if the projects are within the scope of the call and evaluate the proposals submitted in response to this joint transnational call according to the aim of the call and the evaluation form. The PRP members will be explicitly asked for their consent that the JCS will forward their anonymous written evaluations to the applicants (both in case of approval and rejection).

PRP members will carry out the evaluation using a common Evaluation Form according to specific evaluation criteria:

1. Excellence:
    a. Scientific & technological quality of the proposal;
    b. Novelty; innovation potential; methodology; degree of technological maturity;
    c. Nanovalue of the proposed approach;
    d. Quality 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, participation of junior researchers.
2. Impact
    a. Unmet medical need addressed and potential impact in clinics;
    b. Translatability and marketability of the proposed approach;
    c. Added value of the transnational collaboration;
    d. **Innovation applied research projects**: potential impact of expected results in different domains of nanomedicine or cross-KET applications, marketability potential;
    e. **Projects with high potential of applicability at short/medium term**: expected time for market/transfer to patient towards clinical/public health applications, pharmaceutical/health device applications, other industrial applications including market and end-user's scenario, quality of dissemination plan and business plan.
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation
    a. Quality of project plan;
    b. Adequateness of the work package structure and work plan (tasks, matching events, time schedule);

c. Balanced participation of project partners and integration of workload in the different work packages, quality and efficiency of the coordination and management;
d. Scientific justification and adequateness of the requested budget;
e. Risk assessment, safety, regulatory and ethics issues properly addressed (when necessary).

A scoring system will be used to evaluate the proposal's performance:

Score	Category	Definition
0	Failure	The proposal fails to address the criterion in question, or cannot be judged because of missing or incomplete information
1	Poor	The proposal shows serious weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question
2	Fair	The proposal generally addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses that need corrections
3	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion in question well but certain improvements are necessary
4	Very good	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but small improvements are possible
5	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all aspects of the criterion in question

The reviewers will score each criterion and will provide comments to justify each score.

A total number of about 20 reviewers will be involved (depending upon the number of submitted eligible proposals and the expertise required to review all applications). The reviewers will be chosen from a list of experts that will be recommended by the External Advisory Board (EAB) members and by the CSC members, and validated by the CSC. The reviewers from academic and clinical background are internationally recognised scientists chosen for their scientific or technical expertise in the field of nanomedicine. Reviewers from the industrial background are recognised for their expertise in the field of nanomedicine. Reviewers should come not only from partner countries but also from non-participating countries to the call. The reviewers must state whether there are conflicts of interest towards certain applications since they will be appointing experts for the evaluation. After the decision of the CSC, the JCS will contact the experts centrally to request and coordinate their participation. Their potential conflicts of interest will be assessed before providing them access to the proposals. In order to avoid any conflict of interest, the reviewers will be informed immediately (prior to their decision whether or not to participate) that if they accept to be part of the PRP, they should not apply to this joint transnational call. If necessary,

additional reviews may be requested from external experts in particular cases, who will also sign confidentiality and absence of conflict of interest agreements.

✓ **EVALUATION OF PRE-PROPOSALS**

The reviewing procedure of pre-proposals will consist in two steps.

- **Remote evaluation**: each proposal will be evaluated according to the procedure described above.
- **Decision for invitation to full-proposal**: The JCS will collect the written evaluations and produce a booklet that will be provided to the CSC members. The CSC members will meet physically in order to elaborate a recommendation list. According to this ranking list and the requested budget, the CSC will decide the cut-off threshold that will divide the ranking list in two parts. Applicants in the top part of the list (the total budget of these proposals should not exceed the budget of the call by more than two/three times AND should ensure a reasonable balance of requested and available national/regional budgets of the participating countries/regions) will be explicitly invited to submit a full proposal. Pre-proposals in the bottom part of the list will be rejected. The JCS will forward the final decision to the coordinators of each proposal together with a summarised evaluation feedback. The coordinators will be instructed to communicate the decisions to their project partners. German applicants will need to submit a national application in parallel. The German organisation will undergo a thorough eligibility check of the German applicant at the pre-proposal stage. Pre-proposals which are not passing this administrative assessment will not be considered for full proposal stage.

✓ **EVALUATION OF FULL-PROPOSALS**

The reviewing procedure of full-proposals will consist in three steps.

- **Remote evaluation**: each proposal will be allocated to at least three PRP members who fit the profile of the application and as far as possible, who already evaluated the corresponding pre-proposals. The reviewing procedure will be the same as for the pre-proposals (see above).
- **Rebuttal stage**: each proposal coordinator is provided with the opportunity of studying the assessments and commenting on the arguments and evaluations of the reviewers, which remain anonymous. The applicants will have up to one week for this optional response to the reviewers' comments. This stage allows applicants to comment on factual errors or misunderstandings that may have been committed by the referees while assessing their proposal and to reply to reviewers' questions. However, issues which are not related with reviewers' comments or questions cannot be addressed and the work plan cannot be modified at this stage. Instructions will be provided to the PRP members as any researchers' comments which are not related with reviewers' comments or questions should be discarded and not taken into consideration during the PRP meeting. The PRP

members and funding organisations will have access to all the evaluations and rebuttal letters before the PRP meeting, and the JCS will provide contact details of the PRP members in case they need to discuss a particular proposal before the PRP meeting. The reviewers will be also encouraged to read all the proposals to be reviewed before the PRP meeting.

- **Peer review panel meeting**: All PRP members who participated in the remote evaluation shall be present at the PRP meeting. One chair (and if needed one vice chair) will be identified among the PRP members, they should come from a different country from the Parties. CSC members can participate in the PRP meetings as observers. All proposals above a given threshold on the overall score will be discussed during the PRP meeting. For each proposal, three members of the PRP will act as reviewers, one of them will act as "proposer", i.e. he/she will present the proposal that will be discussed in the PRP meeting. As a result of the discussion the previous scores may be modified. The PRP chair (and vice chair) will not act as introducing member for a specific proposal but will be asked to have an overview over all research proposals and, in case of voting decisions, will have equal voting rights as the other PRP members. PRP members will not represent neither the research groups, the partner countries nor adopt national considerations. After this meeting, the PRP will provide the CSC a final ranking list of the proposals recommended for funding based only on the approved evaluation criteria, and each proposer will write an evaluation summary report resulting from the three written evaluations, the rebuttal letter and the PRP meeting's discussions, in agreement with the other two reviewers. Projects to be funded will be selected by the CSC members following this ranking list and the availability of funding.

✓ **PROJECT APPROVAL AND DECISION COMMUNICATION**

The CSC will identify the projects to be funded in compliance with EU Cofund regulations, according to the scientific ranking list provided by the PRP and the available budget. If there are PRP scores proposals with the same score, and if necessary, the CSC will determine a priority order of proposals selected for funding. The following approach will be applied for the last group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation according to agreed criteria: 1. availability of national funding, and 2. maximisation of the use of national funding. If the number of high priority proposals, as judged by the PRP, is smaller than what the budget can support, only part of the funds may be used for this call. If the number of high priority proposals, as judged by the PRP, is higher for certain partners than what the budget can support, the CSC will discuss the potential funding of the respective proposals.

The funding agencies will be informed of the final funding recommendations by the respective funding organisation's representative in the CSC. Each national funding organisation will make the final decision according to their respective regulations, however, the ranking list established by the PRP shall be respected as long as EC funds are used for project funding. Once the EC funds are exhausted the ranking list shall be followed as far as possible.

The information about project approval will be issued to the coordinators of the consortia through the JCS by e-mail in a formal letter that includes a summary of the evaluation results and possible remaining conditions that have to be fulfilled for being funded by the respective funding organisation. In addition, the project partners will be informed by the coordinator and by the respective funding organisation by e-mail or phone. The JCS will also inform the coordinators of rejected proposals about the evaluation results by e-mail in a formal letter, which will include a summary of the evaluation results and the reasons for the rejection of the application. These coordinators will be instructed to communicate the decisions to their project partners.

The CSC aims at taking the final decision by beginning of October 2017.

EVALUATION FEES

Reviewers will not be remunerated for their efforts during the evaluation procedure. The PRP members will be reimbursed of the travel and accommodation expenses or allowance incurred for their attendance to PRP meeting.

ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The composition of the PRP will be published on the EuroNanoMed III website after the funding decision is communicated but it will not be revealed which individual evaluated a specific proposal. Written evaluation reports will be provided to the applicants. The reviewers will enter into a confidentiality agreement before undertaking the evaluation process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Reviewers 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.

See Annex III.

FUNDING PROCEDURE / RESPONSIBILITY / REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Projects can be granted for funding for a maximum period of three years. Funding decisions are expected by October 2017.

Partners of successful collaborative projects will be funded directly by their respective national funding organisations who will also meet the necessary administration and management costs. Funding will be administered according to the terms and conditions of the

national/regional funding organisations responsible, taking into account all other applicable national/regional regulations and legal frameworks.

The internal management of each project will be the responsibility of the designated project coordinator, who will represent the consortium towards the ERA-NET EuroNanoMed III and externally. Although he or she bears the overall scientific responsibility for the project towards EuroNanoMed III, each principal investigator of a project partner is fully responsible for the research outcome towards the respective EuroNanoMed III Party (funding organisation) of the country/region from which he or she has applied.

Consortium members of projects selected for funding must fix a common project start date in accordance with their national/regional funding organisation, which would be the reference date for yearly and final reports and potential extensions (up to one year). This common project start date must appear in the Consortium Agreement.

It will be the responsibility of the project coordinators to draw up a Consortium Agreement (CA) suitable to their own group in order to manage the delivery of the project activities, finances, intellectual property rights (IPR) and to avoid disputes which might be detrimental to the completion of the project. This CA has to be signed no later than six months after the official project start date, although national requirements should prevail.

The project coordinator will be required to submit to the JCS a brief annual and final scientific progress report of the project in English (by filling out a template provided by the JCS), on behalf of the research project consortium. These reports will be collected by the JCS and be provided to the CSC no later than 2 months after the according deadlines. It may also be necessary for project partner leaders to submit reports individually to their national funding agency/body. In addition, project coordinators will be asked to present the project results during EuroNanoMed III meetings (Review Seminars coupled to Training Workshops for funded researchers). Accordingly, travel expenses to attend these meetings should be included in the proposal budget plans. If problems of any nature appear, the project consortium coordinator should immediately inform the JCS and project partners.

If a given funding agency encounters or identifies a major administrative or funding problem in a project, it will inform the call secretariat and the respective national agencies involved in the co-funding of the project. The JCS will manage the situation so that all the parties try to find a solution (funding agencies that are co-funding the project, the project coordinator and the EuroNanoMed III coordinator).

ANNEX I. SUMMARY OF THE EURONANOMED III JTC 2017 PARTICIPANTS INDICATIVE FUNDING COMMITMENTS AND ELIGIBILITY

Participant organisation name	Country / Region	Funding academic or clinical/ academic partners	Funding academic or clinical partners with private partners (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Funding private partners only (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Tentative initial funding commitment (Euros)	Envisaged number of teams potentially funded with the tentative initial funding commitment
Fund for Scientific Research (FRS-FNRS)	BELGIUM	YES	NO	NO	200,000	1
Fonds de rercherche du Québec (FRQS)	CANADA	YES	YES	NO	360,000	1-2
Estonian Research Council (ETAg)	ESTONIA	YES	YES	NO	100,000	1
Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR)	FRANCE	YES	YES	YES	1,500,000	3-7
VDI Technologie-zentrum GmbH (VDI)	GERMANY	Academic and clinical partners (universities, public research institutes or hospitals) are funded in cooperation with German companies (large or SME)			1,500,000	3-7
The General Secretariat for Research and Technology (GSRT)	GREECE	YES	YES	YES	500,000	5
Scientific Fondation of Ireland (SFI)	IRELAND	Only Academic partners in eligible Research Bodies can receive funding from SFI			500,000	2-3
Chief Scientist Office, Ministry Of Health (CSO-MOH)	ISRAEL	YES	NO	NO	240,000	2
Italian Ministry of Education, Universities and Research (MIUR)	ITALY	YES	YES	YES	400,000	2-3
Italian Ministry of Health (IMH)	ITALY	YES	NO	NO	800,000	3-4

Participant organisation name	Country / Region	Funding academic or clinical/ academic partners	Funding academic or clinical partners with private partners (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Funding private partners only (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Tentative initial funding commitment (Euros)	Envisaged number of teams potentially funded with the tentative initial funding commitment
Valsts izglītības attīstības aģentūra (SEDA/VIAA)	LATVIA	YES	YES	YES	300,000	1-2
Lietuvos mokslo taryba (RCL)	LITHUANIA	YES	YES	NO	100,000	1
The Research Council of Norway (RCN)	NORWAY	YES: Norwegian Universities, University colleges, Institutes and Public Sector	YES	YES: Industry (40%)	1,500,000	3-4
National Centre for Research and Development (NCBR)	POLAND	Academic and clinical partners (universities, public research institutes or hospitals) are funded in cooperation with Polish companies (large or SME)			700,000	3-4
Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding (UEFISCDI)	ROMANIA	YES	YES	YES	500,000	1-2
Slovak Academy of Sciences (SAS)	SLOVAKIA	YES	NO	NO	120,000	1
National Institute of Health Carlos III (ISCIII)	SPAIN	YES	YES	NO	500,000	3-5

Participant organisation name	Country / Region	Funding academic or clinical/ academic partners	Funding academic or clinical partners with private partners (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Funding private partners only (please specify if is private for profit or non for profit)	Tentative initial funding commitment (Euros)	Envisaged number of teams potentially funded with the tentative initial funding commitment
Centro Tecnológico Industrial (CDTI)	SPAIN	Only companies can be funded as beneficiaries. Other type of entities can participate as subcontractors of companies.			800,000	3-5
Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness - State Agency for Research (MINECO-AEI) for Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness State Agency for Research.	SPAIN	Yes (1)	Yes, non-profit (1)	No	500,000	3-5
Technology Foundation (STW)	THE NETHERLANDS	YES	NO	NO	1,000,000	4
Ministry of Science and Technology (MoST)	TAIWAN	YES	YES	NO	1,000,000	3-4
The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK)	TURKEY	YES	YES	YES	750,000	3-4

(1): subject to National Eligibility Criteria (see Guidelines for Applicants)

ANNEX II. TIME SCHEDULE

Date	Activity	Remarks
16 September 2016	Pre-final draft of MoU and other call documents to all ENM partners	
26 September	Formal final draft of MoU and other call documents by all partners	
26 September – 28 October	Signature of MoU by all partners	
09 October	Pre-announcement of the call	
28 October	**MoU signed**	
14 November	**Publication of the joint call**	***Call text, Guidelines and Proposal form on ENM website and partner's websites***
16 November – 9 December	CSC members send names of reviewers to be invited by the JCS	
November 28th	Opening of the submission web tool	
13 December	**Invitations sent to experts for PRP**	
16 January 2017 (CET 17:00)	**Deadline for submission of pre-proposals**	
16 January - 20 January	Preparation of documents for the eligibility check and the allocation	***Excel sheet with analysis (title, acronym, consortium, area, duration) & access to all proposals online (for Parties) + Booklet with abstracts of all proposals***
23 January	**Proposals are sent by JCS to CSC for their eligibility check**	
23 January – 10 February	Eligibility check by JCS	***For central criteria (length, consortium composition…)***
	Parties´ eligibility check (national/regional regulations)	
	Allocation of pre-proposals to PRP (proposers & readers)	
13 – 15 February	Approval of allocation and eligibility by the CSC	
16 February	**Pre-Proposals sent to reviewers**	
17 February – 31 March	Reviewers work	
24 March	**Deadline for submission of written evaluation**	
7 April	Evaluation booklet sent to CSC	
18 April	**CSC meeting and decision for invitation to full-proposal step.**	
21 April	**JCS send reviewers comments to coordinators and invitations to second step**	
9 June (CET 17:00)	**Deadline for submission of full-proposals**	
12 June - 14 June	Preparation of documents for the eligibility check and the allocation	***Excel sheet with analysis (title, acronym, consortium, area, duration) & access to all***

Date	Activity	Remarks
		proposals online (for Parties) + Booklet with abstracts of all proposals
15 June	**Proposals are sent by JCS to CSC for their eligibility check**	
15 June – 27 June	Eligibility check by JCS	***For central criteria (length, consortium composition…)***
	Parties´ eligibility check (national/regional regulations)	
	Allocation of full-proposals to PRP (proposers & readers)	
28 June	**Full-Proposals sent to reviewers**	
29 June – 15 August	Reviewers work	
15 August	**Deadline for submission of written evaluation**	
15 August – 22 August	**JCS prepare documents for Rebuttal step**	
24 August	**Rebuttal**	***Evaluations are sent to applicants for rebuttal step***
31 August	**Deadline for coordinators to send their rebuttal letters**	
7 September	**Evaluation booklet (including rebuttal letters) sent to PRP and CSC**	
11-13 September	**PRP Meeting and CSC meeting for recommendation for funding following the ranking list**	
September	Final funding decision at national/regional level	
September – October	National/regional administrative procedures	
January 2018	**Expected start of funded projects**	
January 2018 – July 2018	Inter partners Project Consortium agreements are signed by project partners	

Abbreviations:

- **CSC**: Call Steering Committee
- **JCS**: Joint Call Secretariat
- **MoU:** Memorandum of Understanding
- **PRP:** Peer Review Panel

ANNEX III. DECLARATION SIGNED BY THE REVIEWERS

Please send the scanned copy by email to
ENMCalls@anr.fr
and the original signed copy to the EuroNanoMed Joint Call Secretariat to:

EuroNanoMed JCS
Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR)
Amélie Vergne

50 avenue Daumesnil, 75012 Paris, FRANCE

EuroNanoMed-III Joint Transnational Call 2017

Declarations

Declaration of no conflict of interest

I hereby declare that I have no conflict of interest[3] 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

---

[3]**Circumstances 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 (including publications) 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.

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: _____