

# Results of the M&E on L&F LUMP-SUM on the Practical Aspects to consider for the proposal phase of the Lump-Sum Actions

**Gonzalo ARÉVALO (ISCIII – Spain)**

NCP-Academy Meet & Exchange Workshop, 13th March 2018, Brussels

# Attendance & Methodology



- ✓ Announced by the end of December
- ✓ Registration closed by the end of January
- ✓ 32 Registered Participants from 16 EU+ 2 Associated Country (just one no-show)
- ✓ From 12:30 to 17:00.
- Soft preparatory work in advance for preparation of the areas
- Three working sessions, one facilitator per session
- Four working groups, rotate on the rapporteur of the WG



VERY DYNAMIC  
APPROACH

Built on Common  
Knowledge



# M&E Main Aim and Output

Debate amongst L&F NCPs on most important issues to be considered at the proposal stage, in particular:

- 1. *Key elements for the elaboration of WPs, considering having efficient timing and cash-flow***, Morten Gylling-Jørgensen, L&F NCP, UFM-DENMARK
- 2. *Specific Legal and financial Issues to be considered for the CA***, Annika Thies, DESCAs representative and Director Helmholtz Office Brussels-GERMANY
- 3. *Contingency and financial plan for managing the grant: partners rights and obligations***, Martin Baumgartner, L&F NCP, FFG-AUSTRIA

# Session 1: Key elements for the elaboration of WPs, efficient timing and cash-flow.

Does the WPs need a different configuration/de

## Main Tips

- Cash flow and reporting
- Alignment of the WPs with Reporting Periods
- Deeper analysis on the needed partners per WP
- Keep independent WPs as much as possible (su compartments)
- Use GAP to negotiate larger prefinancing or def

## KEY ELEMENTS WP, TIMING & CASH FLOW

- x WPs depend on topic.
- x more work during proposal stage
- x level of details is crucial
- x keep number of partners in each WP limited.
- x keep duration of WPs shorter.
- x define a goal for each WP → achieved ✓
- x keep WPs independent of each other
- x quality must relate to activities - not outcome
- x alignment of WPs and reporting periods -
- x keep management and dissemination <sup>separated</sup> not too short
- x use GAP to negotiate pre-financing
- x think about WPs as phases

# Session 1: Key elements for the elaboration of WPs, efficient timing and cash-flow.

**Does the WPs need a different configuration/definition?**

## **Main Tips**

- Cash flow and reporting
- Alignment of the WPs with Reporting Periods
- Deeper analysis on the needed partners per WP and WP size
- Keep independent WPs as much as possible (submarine compartments)
- Use GAP to negotiate larger prefinancing or define phases within WP

# Session 1: Key elements for the elaboration of WPs, efficient timing and cash-flow.

## SOME OPEN QUESTIONS:

- C
  - A
  - D
  - K
  - C
  - Use SW to negotiate target pre-financing or define phases within WP
- What would be approach for horizontal WPs (Coord, Diss, etc)?
  - What are the consequences of a non-accepted WP in the interim report or in the final report?

# Session 2: Issues to be

Do we need special  
Governing, Financial

## Main Tips

- Stricter, Faster
- Define quick
- Checklist on
- Stronger Coordination
- Guarantee Financial
- Pre-proposal

## Consortium Agreement

### Role of Coordinator & WP Lead

- clear & more powerful
- > speedy pre-financing release?
- > hurry up busy partners
- > amendment (takes long time)?
- > main part of pre-financing only paid out on delivery?
- > pre-financing to be paid by WP lead?
- > ↓ motivation for coordination
- ⊕ checklist for proposal preparat<sup>o</sup> on roles & liabilities
- > task modification - price differences
- > pre-proposal agreement?

## CA II

- ⊕ guarantee funds for newcomers?
- ⊕ stricter, faster decision making procedures needed
- ⊕ flow of information in consortium more important
- obligat<sup>o</sup> to inform early in case of delay
- ⊕ partners dropping out - how to deal



# Session 2: Specific Legal and financial Issues to be considered for the CA

**Do we need specific terms for the DESCAs model? General Issues, Governing, Financial, IPR**

## **Main Tips**

- Stricter, Faster and Smarter decision process
- Define quick mechanism for dropping-off partners
- Checklist on proposal phase: roles and Liabilities
- Stronger Coord and WP leaders
- **Guarantee Fund for newcomers**
- **Pre-proposal Agreement**

# Session 2: Specific Legal and financial Issues to be considered for the CA

Do we need specific terms for the DESCAs model? General Issues,  
Governance

Main

## SOME OPEN QUESTIONS:

- Str
  - De
  - Ch
  - Str
  - Gu
  - Pre-proposal Agreement
- Approach for partners that can not deliver due to technical issues
  - How to speed up governing processes to assure delivering on time

# Group A

## CONTINGENCY + Financial Plan

- PROACTIVE approach
- RISK ASSESSMENT
- CONSORTIUM INTERNAL GUARANTEE FUND
- AGREED PROCESSES FOR (MOST COMMON) SITUATIONS  
→ REQUIRES TIME IN PREP.

# Group B

## CONTINGENCY + Financial Plan

- internal guarantee fund → ESCA
- underperformance → Y/Red card → NO MONEY AT ALL
- shadow-partners (back-up) redistribution
- ↑ risk ⇒ ↓ WP
- closer monitoring
- pre-financing redistributed in parts, timeslots according to perf.

# Group C

## CONTINGENCY + Financial Plan

- Flagging in different risk categories  
WP (red, yellow, green)  
BUT: Things go wrong we don't foresee
- Pre-financing buffer
- Ultra short reports for the initial phase (1 year) of the project, opt for more monitoring and prevention measures
- Confidence ↔ risky partners = risky project  
↳ model for payments applied for all CA partners if risky partners are on board
- Increase overall budget in the proposal  
↳ Fund for contingencies (→ state aid rules)

# Group D

## CONTINGENCY + Financial Plan

- PRE-DESCA (ambitious) for coordinators
- PRE-FINANCING → ONLY PRESSURE
- % pre-financing KPI - interim payments
- RESEARCHERS → MORE OPEN FOR INTERIM SCIENTIFIC CONTRACTS
- NO REAL SOLUTIONS FOR PAYING BAC (good ones)

- More Proactive approach
- Yellow/Red Cards of Balance
- Agreed procedures for substitution, amendments

conditions: partners

# Session 3: Contingency and financial plan for managing the grant

**What alternatives against risks can be implemented?**

## **Main Tips**

- Consortium Internal Guarantee Fund and Financial Adaptive Buffer (To be considered in DESCAs?)
- Define ultra-short reports for P1 and Closer Monitoring
- More Proactive approach on identifying risks
- Yellow/Red Cards of Back-up Partners
- Agreed procedures for (most common) situations: partners substitution, amendments, not paying back...

# Session 3: Contingency and financial plan for managing the grant

What alternatives against risks can be implemented?

Main

## SOME OPEN QUESTIONS:

- Co... tive Buffer (T
  - be
  - De
  - Mo
  - Yel
  - Agreed procedures for (most common) situations: partners substitution, amendments, not paying back...
- How to manage different risky WPs and Partners
  - Replacement of partners with different costs

# Next Steps

Prepare a short report document with tips that thematic NCPs, EC POs and/or potential participants could have as a guide when preparing a proposal for a topic that foresees the use of Lump-sums.

To be disseminated to NCPs, National Coordinators and ???

Additionally... let's think on:

- To which extent should we give different advise to our Clients on the proposal preparation? Are specific workshops needed?
- Should the DESCAs Model include specific features for this funding scheme?
- Any other means to reduce participants uncertainties?

Many Thanks...



In particular to Morten, Annika and Martin!

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No. 633563.

