



Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking
Rules for submission, evaluation, selection,
award and review procedures of
Calls for Core Partners

Disclaimer: The copyright of this document is of the *Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking*. The document and its content shall not be reproduced without the prior written consent of its author.

July 2014

Contents

I.	Introduction.....	3
1.	Purpose of the document.....	3
2.	Definitions and abbreviations	3
II.	Submission of applications	5
1.	Draft applications.....	6
2.	Checklist for submission.....	6
3.	Access by the CSJU to the applications.....	6
4.	Submission of applications	6
5.	Complementary activities	8
6.	Additional activities	9
7.	Multiple applications	9
8.	Withdrawing an application.....	9
9.	Q&A after the publication of the call	10
10.	Admissibility check.....	10
11.	Rejection of inadmissible applications.....	10
12.	How to file a complaint.....	10
III.	From evaluation to accession to the Grant Agreement for Members	11
1.	Eligibility and admissibility check.....	11
2.	Rejection of applications.....	11
3.	Evaluation by experts.....	12
4.	Involvement of CSJU Leaders	13
5.	Evaluation of applications and operational capacity check.....	14
6.	CSJU ranked list	17
7.	Information on the outcome of the evaluation.....	17
8.	Reserve list.....	17
9.	How to file a complaint.....	18
10.	Negotiation	18
11.	Termination of negotiation.....	20
12.	Accession to the Statutes.....	20
13.	Accession to the GAM	21

I. Introduction

On 6th of May 2014, the European Council adopted Council Regulation (EU) No 558/2014 establishing the Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking ('CSJU') with the objective to contribute to improving the environmental impact of aeronautical technologies and globally competitive aeronautical industry and supply chain in Europe. The Clean Sky 2 Initiative will build on the achievements and benefits of the Clean Sky Programme by going a step further and addressing integrated technology demonstrations at large system level, including new configurations and new vehicle demonstrations at the integrated vehicle level.

The Clean Sky 2 Programme is structured around 3 platforms Integrated Technology Demonstrators (ITDs) accommodating the main relevant technology streams for all air vehicle applications and 3 Innovative Aircraft Demonstrator Platforms (IADPs) involving demonstrations and simulations of several systems jointly at the full vehicle level. They will be complemented by Transverse Activities for small air transport (SAT), life-cycle assessment (ECO) and technology assessment (TE).

As a Public-Private Partnership, Clean Sky 2 is build on a membership involving the European Commission representing the Union, Aeronautics Industry Leaders committed to achieve the full research and demonstrator activity of the Programme and Core Partners with a substantial long-term commitment towards the Programme. The activities are completed by the Clean Sky 2 Partners, which are not Members of the CSJU but participate in specific topics and projects in the scope of a well-defined limited commitment and over a defined period of time in the course of the Programme.

In accordance with the CSJU Regulation, Core Partners will be chosen through open and competitive calls, guaranteeing a transparent selection of the best membership and strategic participation. In addition, Partners will be invited to participate in specific topics and projects in the scope of a well-defined limited commitment. These Partners will be selected as a result of open Calls for Proposals.

1. Purpose of the document

The present document **lays down the process related to the submission, evaluation, selection, award and review procedure of Core Partners' applications in the meaning of Articles 3 and 4.2 of the Annex I of the CSJU Regulation¹**. It does not lay down the rules applicable to the Calls for Proposals related to the selection of Partners.

2. Definitions and abbreviations

<i>CSJU</i>	Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking
<i>CSJU Regulation</i>	Council Regulation (EU) No 558/2014 establishing the Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking published on the OJ n° L 169/77 7.6.2014

¹ The Members of the Clean Sky 2 Joint Undertaking shall be, upon acceptance of the Statutes by means of a letter of endorsement, the Leaders and the Associates as listed in Annex II to the Regulation, and the Core Partners to be selected through an open, non-discriminatory and competitive call and subject to an independent evaluation.

<i>Statutes</i>	Annex I to the CSJU Regulation
<i>IADP</i>	Innovative Aircraft Demonstrator Platform
<i>ITD</i>	Integrated Technology Demonstrator
<i>TA</i>	Transversal Activity (SAT, ECO, TE)
<i>Leaders</i>	The 16 Leaders of the CSJU listed in Annex II of the CSJU Regulation
<i>Core Partners</i>	A legal entity as defined in Article 1 and 3 of the Statutes participating in an ITD or IADP or in TAs that has been selected following a call as set out in Article 4.2 of the Statutes and has accepted the Statutes by signing a letter of endorsement
<i>Partners</i>	A participant selected by a Call for Proposals which is not a Member of the CSJU as defined in Article 3 of the Statutes
<i>GAM</i>	Grant Agreement for Members

II. Submission of applications

Summary

This section explains how the applicant can submit an application to become a **Core Partner of the CSJU**.

Key points

- The CSJU will treat all applications **confidentially**, as well as any related information, data, and documents it receives from the applicants.

The CSJU will ensure that the process of handling and evaluating applications is carried out in a confidential manner.

Experts are also bound by an obligation of confidentiality. The applicants should avoid taking any actions that could jeopardise confidentiality. They must not attempt to discuss their applications with persons who they believe may act as expert evaluators.

- Applications are archived under **secure** conditions at all times. After the evaluation and signature of any subsequent grant agreement, all copies are destroyed except those required for archiving or auditing purposes.
- The CSJU will process **personal data** in accordance with Regulation No 45/2001² and according to the ‘notifications of the processing operations’ to the Data Protection Officer (DPO) of the CSJU (publicly accessible in the [DPO register](#)).
- Once the applicant has submitted the application, he/she will not hear from the CSJU until the application has been evaluated, unless:
 - CSJU needs to contact the applicant to clarify matters such as eligibility or to request additional information;
 - CSJU needs more information, or supporting documents, e.g for legal entity validation, financial capacity check;
 - the applicant has made an enquiry or a complaint (see below); or
 - the evaluation process involves hearings (see below).
- For details on the calls, please see the call topic information.
- There is a help desk available to deal with issues relating to the electronic submission of applications.

² Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data.

For information on how to register, concerns or enquiries, please look on the [Participant Portal](#).

To **contact the CSJU** please use only the electronic exchange system in the 'My Area' section of the [Participant Portal](#).

1. Draft applications

The applicants can enter draft applications in the 'Electronic Submission Service' of the Participant Portal, using the forms and templates provided there.

2. Checklist for submission

Before the applicant officially submits the application, it should be checked that:

- the application fulfils the conditions set out in the call;
- the application (both the administrative forms and technical annex) is complete, readable, accessible and printable;
- the requested declarations have been made; and
- all Consortium members (where applicable) have:
 - obtained access to the electronic exchange system ('My Area' section of the Participant Portal);
 - registered in the Beneficiary Register.

3. Access by the CSJU to the applications

The CSJU has no access to the applications before the call deadline. However, so that the CSJU can plan the evaluation process and meet the deadline for informing the applicants of the outcome, it will ask the applicants' consent to access certain information before the call deadline:

- the call title and the topic for which the application is submitted,
- the title of the application, summary information, keywords, and
- the identity codes of the organisation(s),

 A disclaimer will inform the applicants that the CSJU will be accessing this information. The applicants will be given the opportunity to refuse access.

4. Submission of applications

Applications must be submitted **on-line** via the 'Electronic Submission Service' of the Participant Portal and before the call deadline.

The topic will define the key capabilities and capacity required from the applicants to implement the Programme in the relevant IADP/ITD area and the scope, goals and objectives of the activities of the topic.

The description of the Clean Sky 2 Programme is the “Joint Technical Programme³” which may be regarded by the applicants to clarify the context of the topics within the overall strategic objectives of the Programme and the relevant IADP/ITD area.

Applicants shall indicate in the application their expertise and skills, capabilities and track records.

Applicants shall submit separate applications for each topic of interest. Applications shall satisfy the scope and demonstrate technical and organizational compliance with the objectives of the topic.

Applicants shall provide in each application a detailed description of the proposed work breakdown, financial contribution, and capabilities (both technical and managerial).

Joint applications by legal entities

Different legal entities may apply jointly as Consortia to become Core Partners and to perform technical work. In this case, Consortium members are all requested individually to become Members of the CSJU and sign individually the GAM. By so doing, they all become beneficiaries to the GAM and are bound directly by its provisions.

 A Cluster can apply only if it constitutes a single legal entity. In this case, it will become an individual Member of the CSJU and will sign the GAM. If the Cluster is not a legal entity, its members may apply jointly in the form of a Consortium. The application shall indicate the contribution of the Cluster members and the activities they will perform and provide evidence of the matching with their available skills, capabilities, resources required under the topic.

Consortia should appoint at application stage a "Consortium Leader" who shall be authorised to act as single point of contact vis-à-vis the CSJU and the Leaders. The Consortium Leader shall have specific responsibilities in the ITD/AIDP Consortium Agreement and shall perform the following tasks:

- ensure on behalf of the Consortium that the work is delivered and manage all operational aspects with its members related to the implementation of the Programme;
- ensure central coordination of reports and deliverables of the Consortium as a whole;
- centralize and receive the payments from the ITD/IADP Technical Coordinator of the GAM for the whole Consortium according to the terms laid down in the ITD/IADP Consortia Agreements;
- execute the payments to the respective members of the Consortium, collect and provide any financial information;
- centralize and execute the payment of the administrative costs to the CSJU for the Consortium as a whole.

³ Published on the CSJU website www.cleansky.eu

The Programme is the “Joint Technical Programme” which will be implemented and updated across the duration of the CSJU in the form of a “Development Plan”. Either the “Joint Technical Programme” or, when available, the “Development Plan” will be referred to in the Grant Agreements for Members.

Special conditions

As set out in the Work Plan, applicants shall express in the application a declaration stating their unequivocal commitment to endorse the Statutes and to invest and bring the relevant level of in-kind contributions in accordance with the CSJU Regulation. The official endorsement of the Statutes will be formalized as part of the negotiation stage (see section III.10).

CSJU will record the date and time of the submission of the applications, and immediately send a confirmation e-mail to the applicants.

 If the applicant has not received this e-mail, it is because the application has not been submitted.

 If the applicant misses the call deadline, the application will be disregarded by the system and the CSJU will not consider it as submitted.

The system carries out basic verification checks for completeness of the applications, internal data consistency, virus infection file types, size limitations, etc.

 The system will check page limits in specific parts of the application and, if necessary, suggest that the applicant shorten it. After the deadline, unless otherwise indicated in the call, any excess pages will be overprinted with a ‘watermark’, indicating to evaluators that these pages must be disregarded.

Before the call deadline, the applicant may replace the already submitted application with new application. The CSJU will only keep for evaluation the most recent version submitted.

After the call deadline, changes or additions are no longer possible, unless the CSJU asks the applicant to clarify any obvious clerical errors on his/her part.

After the call deadline (or intermediate or final closure date for continuous submission schemes), the system will issue an e-receipt which will be available to all applicants via the Participant Portal. It will contain:

- the full application, including application title, acronym and unique application identifier (application number);
- the name of the relevant Programme part and call identifier; and
- the date and time of receipt (i.e. by the call deadline).

 If during the final days of possible submission there is a fault in the system, the CSJU may decide to extend the call deadline accordingly.

5. Complementary activities

If an applicant considers that it has different applications, different technologies or innovative solutions to propose in relationship to one topic, he/she should present them in the same single application as “complementary activities”. The submission forms will include a specific section where the applicant should detail the description and budget of any complementary activity.

If applicants indicate complementary activities within the general topic area related to the topic for which they are applying and within the scope of the IADP/ITD, they should demonstrate that these activities would:

- be in line with Clean Sky 2 Programme key goals and objectives,
- represent an enhancement or improvement of the content of an IADP/ITD, and
- lead to a demonstrable additional move beyond the state of the art in the topic's general area.

Where applicable and where indicated in the evaluation criteria laid down in the Work Plan, complementary activities may be evaluated by the independent experts in the framework of the topic evaluation process. However, the inclusion of these complementary activities in any subsequent grant will be subject to a CSJU Governing Board approval and CSJU funding availability.

Applicants **to more than one topic** should indicate, where applicable, any links between these topics, demonstrating and highlighting any additional value that a common approach could bring, both for their application and for the IADP/ITD concerned or the Clean Sky 2 Programme as a whole.

Applicants submitting applications for different topics may highlight benefits brought by their activities that flow logically from an IADP/ITD towards another IADP/ITD but separate applications are needed for each participation per topic.

6. Additional activities

The Members of the CSJU have an obligation to bring at least EUR 2.193,75 Million to the Clean Sky 2 Programme (Article 4 of the CSJU Regulation). Any further contribution from Core Partners to this target will be adding to this amount.

Where applicable and requested in the Work Plan, any proposed additional activity in the meaning of Article 4.2 of the CSJU Regulation may be valued within the evaluation process under one of the evaluation criteria laid down in the Work Plan.

-  The performance of additional activities as defined under Article 4.2 of the CSJU Regulation must not be mistaken with the complementary activities.

7. Multiple applications

The applicants may submit only one application for each topic, as published in the call, for which they intend to apply.

Multiple applications submitted by the same applicant related to the same topic will be rejected.

Applicants shall submit at all times separate applications for each topic, enabling evaluation per topic.

8. Withdrawing an application

The applicants can subsequently withdraw their applications. The guidance documents on the Participant Portal will explain how to do this.

9. Q&A after the publication of the call

After the opening of any call, the CSJU will manage a dedicated call mailbox where any technical or legal questions may be addressed exclusively to the CSJU by the applicants. Answers will be managed by the CSJU in cooperation with the responsible Leaders. In order to ensure equal access to information and treatment of all applicants, the answers will be published in a publicly accessible Q&A section on the CSJU website and **shall be monitored and considered by all applicants** as possible clarification of the technical description of the strategic topics. Any direct contact between the applicants and the Leaders and vice-versa is strictly forbidden. The CSJU reserves its right to disqualify any applicant who is not complying with this requirement.

The call mailbox will be open for questions until one month before the call deadline.

10. Admissibility check

The CSJU will check the applications for admissibility against the general conditions set out in the Work Plan (General Annexes).

In order to be considered admissible against the general admissibility conditions, the application must be:

- submitted in the 'Electronic Submission Service' before the deadline given in the call;
- readable, accessible and printable.

Incomplete applications may be considered inadmissible. This includes the requested administrative data, the application description, the requested declarations on honour and any supporting documents specified in the call. The Work Plan lists the necessary supporting documents.

In case of an 'obvious clerical error' (*e.g. omission to submit evidence or information on a non-substantial element of the application*), the CSJU may first ask the applicant to provide the missing information or supporting documents.

 If the missing information or document would substantially change the application, it will not be taken into account.

11. Rejection of inadmissible applications

If the application is inadmissible, the CSJU will inform the applicant (via the electronic exchange system in the 'My Area' section of the Participant Portal).

12. How to file a complaint

If the applicant believes that submission failed due to a fault in the Electronic Submission System, he/she should immediately file a complaint via the [IT help desk](#), explaining the circumstances and attaching a copy of the application.

The method of filing a complaint over other aspects of submission will be explained in the information provided in the electronic exchange system (see 'My Area' section of the Participant Portal).

III. From evaluation to accession to the Grant Agreement for Members

Eligibility and admissibility check

Summary

This section explains how and why the CSJU:

- checks eligibility and admissibility of the applicants.

1. Eligibility and admissibility check

The CSJU will check the applicants for eligibility against the eligibility criteria set out in the Work Plan (**General Annexes, Section C**).

The CSJU will check if the applicants are complying with all the specific admissibility conditions and requirements related to the call as set out in the Work Plan (**General Annexes, Section B**).

 The applications must also correspond in whole or in part to the topic description of the call.

2. Rejection of applications

If the applicant is not meeting the eligibility or admissibility criteria and special conditions set out on the Work Plan, the CSJU will send the applicant an application rejection letter, together with the reasons of the rejection and how to appeal.

Summary

This section explains how the CSJU:

- chooses its experts
- evaluates the applicants' operational capacity
- evaluates the applications
- establishes its ranked list as a result of the evaluation

Key points

- CSJU will evaluate the applications with the help of independent external experts.
- CSJU will be guided by the following:
 - Key capabilities, skills and competences of the applicants: the applicants must demonstrate and provide evidences of the capabilities required to become a Core Partner and perform the technical activities in response to the topic description.
 - Excellence: Applicants must demonstrate in the proposal high quality in relation to the topics and selection and award criteria set out in the calls.
 - Transparency: Decisions must be based on clearly described rules and procedures, and applicants should receive adequate feedback on the outcome of the evaluation.
 - Fairness and impartiality: All applications submitted in response to a call are treated equally and evaluated impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants.
 - Efficiency and speed: Evaluation should be done as quickly as possible without compromising quality or neglecting the rules.

3. Evaluation by experts

In order to ensure that only applications of the highest quality are selected, the CSJU relies on **independent experts** for the evaluation of applications ('evaluators').

How are the evaluators selected? The CSJU appoints independent evaluators for each call from the H2020 database of experts. When selecting evaluators, the CSJU looks for:

- high level of skill, experience and knowledge with a majority of them having expertise in aeronautics. Other experts may be selected on the basis of their expertise in operational areas of aviation/air transport, sustainability or business and international programme expertise and other relevant areas;

provided the above condition can be satisfied, a balance in terms of:

- skills, experience and knowledge;
- geographical diversity;
- gender;
- where appropriate, from the private and public sectors.

In principle, the application will be examined initially by at least three experts (in many cases five or more).

Additional experts may be appointed for the ethics review.

In addition, the evaluation process may be followed by one or more **independent observers**:

- to observe the practical workings of the evaluation process;
- to give independent advice on:
 - the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions;
 - the application of the award criteria;
 - ways in which the procedures could be improved, but

Observers do not express views on the applications or the other experts' opinions.

 Experts that have a conflict of interests will be excluded.

The CSJU considers that a conflict of interest exists, if an expert:

- was involved in the preparation of an application;
- benefits directly or indirectly if an application is accepted;
- has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant;
- is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant or by a Leader organisation, affiliate or related third party;

- is employed or contracted by one of the applicants or any named subcontractors;
- is a member of an advisory group of the CSJU;
- is a National Contact Point or is directly working for the Enterprise Europe Network.

The CSJU decides whether a conflict of interest exists — taking account of the objective circumstances, available information and related risks — when an expert:

- was employed by one of the applicants in the last three years;
- is involved in a contract or grant agreement, grant decision, membership of management structures (*e.g. member of management or advisory board, etc.*) or research collaboration with an applicant or a fellow researcher, or had been so in the last three years;
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on their ability to participate in the evaluation of the application impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

The CSJU will publish on its internet site at least once a year the list of experts who have assisted the evaluation procedure together with their area of expertise.

4. Involvement of CSJU Leaders

The evaluation process may be attended by representatives of the Leaders⁴ under which the topic is aligned in the Work Plan.

The representatives of the Leaders will sign a declaration of confidentiality and will perform the following tasks:

Before the evaluation

- may brief the independent evaluators before the start of the evaluation on the technical goals of the topic (key needs, key capabilities/skills/competences and key risks), the technical context, the level of compliance and impact requested.

At evaluation stage:

- may assist in any query and provide any additional technical information or clarification upon request by evaluators or by the moderator (see below);
- may be granted access to the applications and any supporting documents subject to strict confidentiality requirements (in case when this is needed to answer questions raised by the panel members; applicants will be requested in the submission forms to agree in granting access to their application to the representatives of the Leaders under the above mentioned confidentiality requirements);
- shall not be entitled to attribute in any way scores/weighting to applications.

⁴ Referred to in the Work Plan as the “Work Area Leaders”

At consensus meetings stage:

- may be requested to participate in the consensus meetings and provide technical advice when appropriate;
- shall not be entitled to attribute in any way scores/weighting to applications.

5. Evaluation of applications and operational capacity check

Selection criteria

Selection criteria, as set out in the Work Plan (**General Annexes, Section F**), will make it possible to assess the applicant's capabilities, competences, track record and the ability to perform the proposed work. The necessary capability and ability of the applicant will be assessed under both aspects, financial and operational.

To evaluate the applicant's capability, the experts will give an opinion on the applicant's **operational capacity** to implement the Programme, based on the information provided in the application against the selection criteria and inputs, set out in the Work Plan.

When an application is submitted by a Cluster (as single legal entity) or by a Consortium, if on the basis of the documents submitted, the CSJU considers that the financial capacity is not satisfactory, it may take appropriate measures and require, where appropriate, a joint and several financial liability of the entities applying jointly.

Award criteria — Scoring — Thresholds

The application will be evaluated against the following **award criteria**:

- excellence,
- impact and
- quality and efficiency of implementation

as set set out in the Work Plan (**General Annexes, section F**). For each criterion, the application will be given scores of 0 to 5 (half marks are possible), as follows:

- 0 — The application fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information (unless the result of an 'obvious clerical error');
- 1 — Poor: the criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses;
- 2 — Fair: the application broadly addresses the criterion but there are significant weaknesses;
- 3 — Good: the application addresses the criterion well but with a number of shortcomings;
- 4 — Very good: the application addresses the criterion very well but with a small number of shortcomings;

- 5 — Excellent: the application successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; any shortcomings are minor.

The maximum overall score is therefore 15.

Exception: If the Work Plan/Call provides for a weighting factor.

 Applications will be evaluated on their own merit, and not their potential should certain changes be made. Applications with an inflated budget are likely to receive a lower score.

In order to be considered for funding, the application must score above a certain threshold for each criterion, and above an overall threshold.

Thresholds may vary according to the Work Plan.

Evaluation process

If the application is admissible, eligible and meets the special conditions set out in the Work Plan (or if admissibility and/or eligibility cannot immediately be determined), it will be evaluated by the independent experts.

The **experts are briefed** on:

- the evaluation procedure (including selection and award criteria);
- the content of the topics under consideration;
- the terms of their contract (*e.g. confidentiality, impartiality, conflicts of interest, completing tasks and approving reports, penalties for non-compliance*);
- the need to evaluate applications in their current state, rather than their potential should certain changes be made.

The evaluation process has **three phases**:

Phase 1 — Individual evaluation

Phase 2 — Consensus group

Phase 3 — Panel review and consistency check across the call or parts of the call⁵

Phase 1 — Individual evaluation

Each expert carries out an evaluation and prepares an ‘**individual evaluation report**’ (IER) with comments and scores for each criterion.

They also indicate if the application:

- falls entirely outside the scope of the part of the call which they are evaluating, or
- involves security issues that will need further scrutiny.

⁵ At ITD/IADP or topics area level

Phase 2 — Consensus group

The individual experts then form a ‘consensus group’ to come to a common view and agree on comments and scores (in a ‘**consensus report**’).

The group has an impartial ‘moderator’ (normally a CSJU staff member), who:

- seeks a consensus and
- ensures that applications are evaluated fairly, in line with the criteria.

If a consensus group cannot reach a common view, the consensus report will set out both the majority view and the dissenting views.

 In some cases the CSJU may ask additional experts to examine the application, to establish whether a clear majority view exists.

Phase 3 — Panel review

Finally, a panel will review all the applications within a call, or part of a call, to:

- make sure that the consensus groups have been consistent in their evaluations;
- if necessary, propose a new set of marks or comments; and
- resolve cases where a minority view was recorded in the consensus report.

It may be possible to arrange for all the consensus group experts to examine all the applications, and carry out their final review at the same time as they prepare the consensus reports. These experts are thus considered to constitute the panel.

The panel review is moderated by a ‘panel chairperson’ (normally a CSJU staff member) who must ensure fair and equal treatment of the applications. A rapporteur will be appointed to record the panel's conclusions.

As part of the panel deliberations, the CSJU may organise as a consequence of the panel’s findings at this stage as well as during the consensus meetings **hearings with the applicants** to:

- clarify the applications and help the panel establish their final assessment and scores,
or
- improve the experts’ understanding of the application.

The objective of the hearing shall be to allow the experts and the CSJU to request additional technical explanations/clarifications and to allow the applicant to provide in a dedicated session any appropriate input and clarification.

As a result of the hearing and based on this outcome, to be reported in the hearing report, the CSJU shall take the following steps in view of establishing the final ranked list (including a reserve list) to be notified for acceptance to the Governing Board of the CSJU before the start of the negotiations:

I. In case open issues persist, the CSJU shall call for a final consensus meeting with the independent experts to establish the final ranked list;

II. In case the hearing has provided all the necessary clarifications, the CSJU shall adopt the preliminary ranked list as a final list.

 Hearings may not be used to modify applications.

Applicants may only provide explanations and clarifications in response to questions submitted in advance.

 Applicants may choose not to attend the hearing and to reply only in writing.

Hearings are usually held in Brussels, but may also be conducted by a written procedure, via telephone, or by video-conference.

The ‘**panel report**’ includes the ‘**evaluation summary report**’ (ESR) for each application (based on the consensus report, including comments and scores, and taking into account the panel’s deliberations and any new scores or comments considered necessary), with explanations and a list of applications passing all thresholds, along with a final score, (‘**panel ranked list**’) and, where necessary, the panel’s recommendations for priority order in the event of equal scores.

6. CSJU ranked list

For each topic the panel ranked list will show the order of scoring of the applicants as an outcome of the admissibility, eligibility, evaluation, consensus and panel review phases as described above. The Core Partners will be selected based on this ranked list subject to the **acceptance by the Governing Board** of the CSJU and the available CSJU budget.

7. Information on the outcome of the evaluation

If an application is successfully evaluated and is included in the ranked list, officially accepted by the Governing Board, the CSJU will send electronically an ‘**evaluation information letter**’ to the applicant, to inform him/her of the results of the evaluation and to invite him/her to take part in the negotiation phase.

 This is not a commitment that the CSJU will accept the applicant as Core Partner and will fund the activities proposed under the topic.

The selected applicants included in the ranked list will negotiate with the CSJU their accession to the GAM (by signing an accession form) which will be already signed, where appropriate, between the CSJU and the Leaders of the relevant IADP/ITD/TA.

If an application has not been retained on the ranked list as accepted by the Governing Board, the CSJU will send electronically to the applicant an **application rejection letter**, together with the reasons why and how to appeal.

8. Reserve list

The CSJU may keep a number of applications in the reserve list in case of e.g. withdrawal of applications, failure of negotiations and subject to budget availability.

If an application is put on the reserve list, the CSJU will inform the applicant of any subsequent changes.

9. How to file a complaint

If the applicant considers that the CSJU unduly rejected his/her application, he/she may file a **complaint** in the 'My Personal Area' section of the [Participant Portal](#) ('formal notifications box').

If the complaint is justified, the CSJU will continue to evaluate the application and inform the applicant.

If the complaint is not justified, the CSJU will inform the applicant, together with the reasons why.

For complaints concerning the **evaluation of the application**, the applicant may — within **30 days** of receiving the application rejection letter — file a **request for an evaluation review**, using the on-line forms referred to in the application rejection letter.

 The review covers only the procedural aspects of the evaluation, not the merits of the application.

If the complaint is justified, the CSJU will arrange for a re-evaluation and inform the applicant.

If the complaint is not justified, the CSJU will inform the applicant, together with the reasons why.

10. Negotiation

Prior to the start of the negotiations, the CSJU verifies the existence and legal status of the selected applicants⁶ and performs, where appropriate, any additional operational and financial capacity check (including in case of Clusters applying as a single legal entity or Consortia). The applicants may be requested to provide further administrative, legal, technical or financial information.

Selected applicants will be invited by the CSJU by dispatch of a negotiation mandate and will enter negotiations jointly. The staff of the CSJU, the selected applicants and the relevant IADP/ITD Leader representatives will participate as parties in the negotiation. Additional experts or specialists from the IADP/ITD may participate in case the negotiation should require such expertise. The confidentiality rules shall apply to any additional expert.

The negotiation will deal with the following aspects:

- detailed definition of the activities across the first years (deliverables, milestones, technical description of work packages);
- definition of roles/contributions;
- inclusion of the activities into the overall Annexes I and II of the GAM;
- IP aspects and accession to the GAM;

⁶ http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/grants_manual/lev/h2020-guide-lev_en.pdf

- set-up of the management structure within the IADP/ITD and other aspects;
- negotiation and accession to the IADP/ITD Consortium Agreement;
- accession to the Statutes of the CSJU by signature of an official letter of endorsement and other aspects related to the membership as Core Partner of the CSJU under the CSJU Regulation.

The negotiation and accession stage will include the integration of the proposed work packages and technical activities of the successful applicant into the Annexes I and II (Description of Work and Estimated Budget) of the relevant IADP/ITD/TA GAM. The Annexes I and II will be subject to updates and revisions based on the multi-annual grant agreements framework in line with the multi-annual commitments and the programme management decision-making rules and governance framework under the CSJU Regulation.

The CSJU may request changes, including modifications to the budget, in line with the negotiation mandate mentioned above. The CSJU will motivate all requested changes. Changes to the managerial and scientific aspects would cover, in particular, revisions of the proposed work as established in the negotiation mandate.

Such information may not be used to cancel the negotiations.

Grants may not be awarded to potential applicants who are, at the time of the grant award procedure, in one of the situations referred to in Articles 106 and 107 of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the EU (relating, for example, to bankruptcy, convictions, grave professional misconduct, social security obligations, other illegal activities, administrative penalty imposed in case of previous serious breach of contract or misrepresentation, conflicts of interest, misrepresentation).

Any application that contravenes fundamental ethical principles or which does not fulfil the conditions set out in the Work Plan or in the call shall not be selected. In no circumstances shall the same costs be financed twice by the Union budget.

The legal aspects of the negotiations will cover, in particular, the review of any optional clause in the model GAM or conditions required under the Work Plan, and aspects related to the accession by the selected applicant to the GAM, date of accession, consolidation of his/hers description of work into the IADP/ITD Annexes I and II to the GAM, etc.

The financial aspects of the negotiations will relate to the establishment of the CSJU contribution, the estimated break down of the budget, the CSJU financial contribution per activity and per beneficiary, etc.

The selected applicant and the relevant Leader of the IADP/ITD shall make arrangements to ensure adequate internal organization and management structure for the implementation of the GAM. The terms of the accession of the Core Partners to the IADP/ITD Consortium Agreement will be also discussed during this stage. For transparency reasons and in order to facilitate the negotiation stage, the IADP/ITDs shall make available the internal Consortium Agreement by the launch of the call or at the latest by the negotiation stage.

Any arrangements for merging activities and actions are also dealt with in this phase, and ethical issues are clarified and addressed, if necessary.

11. Termination of negotiation

If it proves impossible to reach agreement with the applicant, within the deadline set in the negotiation mandate, the CSJU may exceptionally agree in extending the term of the negotiation.

Negotiations may be terminated and the application rejected by CSJU decision.

The CSJU may terminate negotiations if the applicant proposes to modify the action in terms of its objectives, scientific and technological content, Consortium composition (if applicable) or other aspects, to the extent that it becomes significantly different from the application that was evaluated, or in a manner that is not in line with the negotiation mandate.

If the conditions indicated above are not satisfied or an agreement cannot be reached by the parties the negotiation will be terminated within a deadline set by the CSJU and a new negotiation process shall be initiated with the next applicant in the ranked list.

The negotiating parties may agree on the failure/termination of the negotiation. The above shall be formally acknowledged and reported by the CSJU in the official letter terminating the negotiation which will acknowledge the failure of the negotiation. In such a case, the negotiation shall start over with the next applicant in the ranked list.

In case one of the negotiating parties does not agree on the termination of the negotiation, the parties must submit their positions on the disagreement in writing to the Executive Director who is responsible to act in an independent way on the “oversight of the calls” (Article 10.5 of the CSJU Regulation). The Executive Director may act to reconcile the parties based on an assessment of the CSJU and in so doing he will seek input from the parties and from the earlier stages, including the evaluation. The Executive Director may call, when appropriate, a **consensus session** under the supervision of the CSJU.

In case an agreement cannot be finally reached, the CSJU shall take the initiative to terminate the negotiation after having acknowledged the disagreement of the parties on substantial terms of the negotiation and according to the terms of the negotiation mandate and its deadline.

12. Accession to the Statutes

If the technical, financial and legal aspects of the negotiation, as described above, are successful, the selected applicant shall formally accede to the Statutes of the CSJU via an official letter of endorsement of the Statutes. The letter must be signed by the legal authorized representative of the applicant in order to become Core Partner, and as such a Member of the CSJU, enjoy its entitlements and be subject to its obligations under the CSJU Regulation.

As a consequence of its accession as a Member, the Core Partner shall also sign a funding agreement with the CSJU where its contribution to the administrative costs of the CSJU (Article 15.2 of the Statutes) will be set out based on its level of participation and funding in the Programme.

The accession of the selected applicant to the Statutes of the CSJU is a necessary condition for the accession to the GAM and to become a Core Partner. The signature of the letter of endorsement to the Statutes will ratify the end of the negotiation stage.

The accession to the Statutes as Member of the CSJU will be communicated to the Governing Board.

13. Accession to the GAM

The CSJU will complete its internal financial and legal procedures related to the finalization and signature of the negotiation report which shall be signed by the CSJU and the selected applicant and of any other legal and financial documents and may officially invite the selected applicant to formally accede to the GAM by signing the accession form.