

**THE NATIONAL PLAN FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION  
2022-2027, PNCDI IV**

**5.7 - INNOVATION PARTNERSHIPS PROGRAMME,  
Partnerships for competitiveness subprogramme**

**DEMONSTRATIVE EXPERIMENTAL PROJECT**

**Call Document<sup>1</sup>**

**2024**

---

<sup>1</sup> Unauthorized translation. Only the Romanian version of the package has legal validity

## CONTENT

1. Goal .....	3
2. Objectives.....	3
3. Conditions for application.....	3
4. Budget .....	3
5. Implementation period .....	4
6. Eligibility criteria .....	4
7. Ethic .....	5
8. Gender equality .....	5
9. Types of eligible activities .....	5
10. Categories of eligible costs .....	5
11. Evaluation Process .....	6
12. Research failure.....	10
13. Call timeline.....	11
Annex I - Domains.....	12
Annex II – Funding Application .....	13
Annex III– Evaluation sheet .....	17

## **EXPERIMENTAL DEMONSTRATIVE PROJECT**

**ID: PN-IV-INO-PED-2024 -1**

### **1. Goal**

Designing and testing demonstrative models (functional, experimental) for new products, technologies, methods, systems, or significantly improved ones in national smart specialization areas or addressing challenges from the Strategic Research Agenda.

### **2. Objectives**

- ✓ Use of knowledge generated by basic research for developing a higher level of technological maturity (demonstrator, lab-validated technology);
- ✓ Increase of research organizations capacities to generate lab-validated solutions for new or significantly improved products / technologies services and to provide them to economic agents.

### **3. Conditions for application**

- ✓ Project proposals start at a technological maturity level (TRL) of 2/3 (technology concept/formulated laboratory experimental demonstrator) and reach a technological maturity level of TRL 3/4 (laboratory experimental demonstrator/technology validated in the laboratory);
- ✓ Project proposals can be developed in national intelligent specialization fields (DSIN) or targeting challenges from the Strategic Research Agenda (ASC), grouped in the following main fields and thematic areas, according to Annex I:
  1. Digitalisation, Industry and Space (ASC); Digital Economy and Space Technologies (DSIN); Advanced Functional Materials (DSIN); Advanced Manufacturing (DSIN)
  2. Climate, energy and mobility (ASC); Energy and Mobility (DSIN)
  3. Food, bioeconomy, natural resources, biodiversity, agriculture and environment (ASC); Bioeconomy (DSIN); Environment and Eco-technologies (DSIN)
  4. Health (ASC); Health - prevention, diagnosis and advanced treatment (DSIN)
  5. Culture, creativity and inclusive society (ASC)
  6. Civil security for society (ASC).
- ✓ The project proposal can be submitted by one research organization (public or private), project coordinator, in partnership with one enterprise with research - development as part of their activity.

### **4. Budget**

The competition for Demonstrative Experimental Project, PED, is carried out during the entire period of implementation of the National Research Development and Innovation Plan (PNCDI IV), with annual approval by the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitalisation (MCID).

For a project, the maximum funding provided by national budget is 750.000 lei, comply with the stated aid legislation. The funding from the state budget allocated to a partner may not exceed the amount from the state budget allocated to the coordinator of the project proposal.

The total budget of this call is 53.000.000 lei.

## 5. Implementation period

The projects will be implemented for a minimum period of 12 months and maximum of 24 months.

## 6. Eligibility criteria

Participant institutions (research organisations and enterprises):

- have legal personality and operates in Romania;
- are not declared in the state of payment incapacity, according to law;
- do not have any accounts blocked by a court order;
- they are not "companies in difficulty" and their shareholders do not have companies in difficulty, they are not in a state of bankruptcy or liquidation, they do not have their businesses administered by a syndic judge, they do not have their commercial activities suspended, they are not the subject of an arrangement with creditors or are not in a situation similar to the previous ones, regulated by law;
- have fulfilled their obligations to pay taxes, fees and social security contributions to the component budgets of the general consolidated budget (state budget, special budgets, local budgets), in accordance with the legal provisions in force;
- the legal representative has not been convicted in the last 3 years, by a final decision of a court, for an act that affected professional ethics or for committing a mistake in professional matters;
- are not subject to an unexecuted recovery order following a previous decision by the European Commission, national courts or the competition authority declaring an aid illegal and incompatible with the internal market;
- was not the subject of a recovery order following a previous decision of the European Commission declaring state aid to be illegal and incompatible with the common market or, if they were the subject of such a decision, it has already been executed and the aid was fully recovered, including the related recovery interest;
- did not provide false statements to UEFISCDI within the requested information in the selection of contractors;
- have not break the provisions of another financing agreement previously signed with a contracting authority;

Principal Investigator:

- ✓ is a doctor in science with relevant expertise in the project's field;
- ✓ can submit only one proposal as principal investigator, for this call.
- ✓ It is forbidden to submit projects with activities which already have been funded or will be partial or fully funded from other budgetary sources.
- ✓ Can benefit from state aid, the enterprises that had activity in the last financial year, have a turnover at least equal with the request budget from the state budget and have staff employed in the last financial year.
- ✓ If an enterprise participates in several project proposals, as a partner, the turnover from the last financial year must be at least equal with the request budget from the state budget, for all projects in which it is involved in this competition.

*All the projects that are not comply these criteria will be declared ineligible.*

## 7. Ethic

The principal investigator has the obligation to ensure that the project proposal complies with the rules provided by Law no. 206/2004 on good conduct in scientific research, technological development and innovation, with subsequent amendments and additions, the research integrity standards established in the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity ALLEA<sup>2</sup>, as well as other legislative ethics regulations specific to the research field of the project. Also, in the situation where the scope of the project requires the obtaining of specific approvals and accreditations, the principal investigator will ensure that they are obtained prior to submitting the funding request.

## 8. Gender equality

Equal opportunities, as well as gender equality, will be ensured for all participants, both in the implementation of the program and at the project level, in accordance with national legislation and European practices.

In developing and implementing of the funding application/project, principal investigators must take all measures to promote equal opportunities for men and women. As far as possible, there must be a balance between women and men for all positions provided for in the grant / project application, including at management level (responsible for the partner team).

At the same time, to the extent possible, during the implementation of the project, mechanisms should be provided to try to recognize the types of gender prejudices, the moments in which they appear and the forms they take, and the methods of recognition and prevention. In addition, attention must be paid to how the gender equality dimension is integrated into the content of the research and into all processes, mechanisms or outputs provided for in the funding application.

## 9. Types of eligible activities

- Basic research (max. 10% of the total value of the project allocated from the state budget);
- Industrial research;
- Experimental development;
- Innovation activities (costs of obtaining, validating and protecting patents and other intangible assets).

## 10. Categories of eligible costs<sup>3</sup>

### 10.1 Direct costs

- **Personnel Costs** (researchers, Ph.D. students, postdoctoral researchers<sup>4</sup>, technical staff employed during the research project according to law); these expenses include the legal contributions for the salaries and assimilated incomes<sup>5</sup>;
- **Logistics Costs** that include:
  - capital costs -for entities that involve state aid, if the purchased instruments and equipments have a duration of operation longer than the duration of the research project are eligible only amortization charges of the research project, as calculated on the basis of regulated accounting practices;

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://allea.org/code-of-conduct/>

<sup>3</sup> The categories of eligible expenses are provided in Government Decision no. 134/2011 for the approval of the Methodological Norms regarding the establishment of the categories of expenses for research-development and innovation stimulation activities, financed from the state budget

<sup>4</sup> Researcher having a PhD title obtained no later than 6 years ago from the moment of submission of project proposals.

<sup>5</sup> Personnel costs are submitting to the regulations in force regarding the maximum limit of income achieved by a person for participating in one or more projects according to Annex 2 to GD no. 1188 of September 29, 2022 regarding the approval of the National Research, Development and Innovation Plan 2022-2027.

- stocks (materials, supplies and similar products necessary for the project);
  - services costs with third parties. Project activities may be subcontracted but cannot exceed 5% of the budget funds;
  - **Travel Costs** for travel within the country or abroad for the research team members.
- For the entities that involve state aid, travel costs may be settled only from their own sources.

## 10.2 Indirect costs

- **Overheads** (indirect costs) are calculated as max. 25% of direct costs minus subcontracting and equipment costs.
- ✓ During the implementation of the project, can be carried out reallocation of budget funds between the categories of expenses with staff, logistics and travel, up to 15% of the total project budget, with notification to the reporting stage and respecting the provisions of the financing contract with the Contracting Authority.
- ✓ From the project budget, it is forbidden to purchase goods and services from the partner company in the project.

## 11. Evaluation Process

### 11.1 Submission

The submission of projects is made in a single stage, using on-line platform <https://uefiscdi-direct.ro>. The submission of the proposal will be made only from the principal investigator account (data for authentication on the platform must be the same with the one's of the principal investigator).

The Funding Application, **Annex II**, will be written in English and will be uploaded on the platform as an unprotected pdf file format.

### 11.2 Checking eligibility

The proposals are checked by the UEFISCDI staff, in order to assure that all the eligibility conditions are complied with. The result is ELIGIBLE/NONELIGIBLE.

Only the eligible proposals will be evaluated. The list of eligible project proposals will be published on the UEFISCDI website – [www.uefiscdi.gov.ro](http://www.uefiscdi.gov.ro).

The complaints regarding eligibility criteria can be sent by email at [demonstrativ@uefiscdi.ro](mailto:demonstrativ@uefiscdi.ro) or by fax to +40 021/311.59.92, within 3 working days following the publishing results date.

If, during or after the evaluation phase, non-compliance with any of the eligibility criteria is found, the project proposal will be declared ineligible and will be excluded from the competition.

### 11.3 Evaluation

The projects are evaluated by internationally recognized experts. Experts have science PhD (as a must) with proven experience (non-cumulative): scientific articles, patents, industrial and experimental development research projects.

Each evaluator shall declare in writing their impartiality, competence and confidentiality related to the evaluation of the submitted project proposals. If the evaluator concludes, at any time of the evaluation process, that one of these conditions is not satisfied or there is a conflict of interest, will notify UEFISCDI, in writing. If the UEFISCDI finds out or is notified about the existence of a conflict of interest or any other error, it will take all the necessary measures to replace that evaluator.

Evaluations are anonymous, ensuring the confidentiality of expert evaluators.

### **Individual evaluation**

Each eligible project proposal is evaluated, independently, online, by three expert evaluators. They award individual scores for each criterion, according to the Evaluation sheet, *Annex III*. The scores given to each criterion are justified by summative comments, highlighting the strengths and weaknesses.

For a project, after the completion of all individual evaluations, the evaluators will have access to the scores and comments of the other 2 evaluators. If it is necessary, within 3 working days, the evaluators can adjust their scores and comments initially given.

### **Establishment of intermediate consensus**

Each project proposal will have an appointed rapporteur, randomly selected from among the three experts. The role of rapporteur is to prepare the Intermediary Consensus Report, based on individual evaluations and discussions with the other two evaluators, through the 'forum' interface available in the evaluation platform.

The other two reviewers are invited to express their opinion on the Intermediary Consensus Report (vote "agree" or vote "disagree").

If the Intermediary Consensus Report has a unanimous "I agree" vote, consensus is considered to have been reached.

No consensus is considered to have been reached if there is a "disagree" vote.

In this situation, an online meeting of the three experts is organized for discussions and final decision. Following this meeting, for the project proposals for which consensus is not reached, will be evaluated by a fourth evaluator who completes the individual evaluation sheet. After the additional evaluator has individually assessed and given his own score, he will have access to the comments and scores originally given by the first three experts and will be able to adjust own comments and scores given. After the completion of the individual evaluation, the additional evaluator takes over the role of rapporteur and will draw up another Intermediary Consensus Report, following discussions with the other three evaluators. The report will be made available to the principal investigator for the formulation of a point of view.

### **Rebuttal**

After the consensus meeting, the UEFISCDI staff will make available to the principal investigators, in the accounts of the online platform for submitting project proposals, the Intermediary Consensus Report, with the invitation to formulate, in writing, a point of view in relation to the evaluation.

The principal investigator's response, limited to 4,000 characters (including spaces), will be completed using a form available on the online project proposal submission platform, within 3 working days from the date of the initial response request. The rebuttal will be written in English, and will consist strictly of a response to the critical observations of the evaluators, as they appear in the Intermediary Consensus Report, without introducing new elements to the project proposal. The principal investigator's response is not mandatory, and its absence does not affect the project evaluation.

### **Reaching consensus (after Rebuttal)**

The evaluators will automatically receive notification regarding the existence of rebuttal of the principal investigator in the online platform. Through the forum-interface, the evaluators will discuss the principal investigator rebuttal.

Following these discussions, the rapporteur may modify the Intermediary Consensus Report by drafting the Consensus Report. Afterwards, the other evaluators will be asked through the platform

to express their opinion on the Consensus Report (vote "agree" or "disagree"). If the Consensus Report has unanimous "I agree" vote, it is considered that the consensus has been reached, and it becomes the Final Evaluation Report.

The rapporteur, by completing the Consensus Report and submitting it to the vote, implicitly gives a positive vote to the report.

If one of the evaluators votes "disagree" or does not express own vote on the Consensus Report, for the project in question it is considered that consensus has not been reached.

### **Panel meetings**

Projects without consensus are analyzed in panel meetings. At the level of the competition, 6 panels will be constituted, each panel covering a main field, according to Annex I.

The domain panel consists of evaluators and rapporteurs. The size of each panel will be correlated with the number of projects to be discussed in the panel meeting. A panel meeting can take place over one or more days.

Every member of the panel will have access to all project proposals to be discussed at the panel meeting, as well as to the Individual evaluation sheets, Consensus Reports and principal investigator's rebuttal (if any), keeping the confidentiality.

Panel meetings are coordinated by a chair/ co-chair. They are chosen from the call database and will moderate the panel debates, without intervening in decision-making.

At the panel meeting, each project proposal with at least one "disagree" vote or no vote on the Consensus Report is presented and analysed in the panel. For each project, the panel sets the final score and prepares the Final Evaluation Report.

The final score will be decided by the majority opinion of those present in the panel.

For establishing the final score, the notes and comments from the previous evaluation stages and the discussions from the current panel will be taken into account. Major changes in scores will be motivated in detail, on each modified evaluation criterion.

After the completion of the discussions, for each project proposal, a rapporteur will be appointed who will prepare the Final Report in accordance with those established during the panel meeting. The rapporteur who will prepare the Final Report may be the same as the one who prepared the Consensus Report, one of the other initial evaluators or any other expert evaluator present at the panel meeting and will be appointed by the chair / co-chair of the meeting.

The final report may contain elements from the individual assessments or the Consensus Report, agreed at panel level.

### **11.4 Publication of evaluation results**

The list of the project proposals for each of the 6 domains and the score obtained by each of them, in descending order, will be published on UEFISCDI website [www.uefiscdi.gov.ro](http://www.uefiscdi.gov.ro).

Principal investigators are informed about the presence of the Final Evaluation Report in the submission platform, <https://uefiscdi-direct.ro>, by an e-mail notification at the address specified on the application form.

Project proposals scored under 80 points will not be granted for funding.

### **11.5 Complaints**

The Principal Investigators may submit a complaint within 3 workdays after the date of publication of the evaluation results. The complaints may concern exclusively procedural errors which the candidate considers inconsistent with the specifications in the information package. The appeals



cannot be about the evaluators' scores and comments. The complaints may be sent by email to: [demonstrativ@uefiscdi.ro](mailto:demonstrativ@uefiscdi.ro), by fax to +4021/311.59.92.

### **11.6 Competition results**

- ✓ The list of project proposals with the final scores after the settling complaints, is published on UEFISCDI site, for each of the 6 domains.
- ✓ The proposals will be ranking according to the final scores, for each of the 6 domain of research and will be proposed for funding, within the funds of the call. The success rate applicable to each domain is related to the success rate of the call (the ratio between the number of projects may be financed, according to the call budget, and the number of eligible projects).
- ✓ In case that two or more proposals receive the final score, their separation will be made according to the score of each evaluation criterion, in the order of the final evaluation report.
- ✓ The list of project proposals accepted for funding, as well as the list of reserve projects will be approved by the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitalization.
- ✓ After the call will be completed, UEFISCDI will publish the list of experts used in the evaluation process on the website [www.uefiscdi.gov.ro](http://www.uefiscdi.gov.ro).

### **11.7 Negotiation of the budget and contracting projects**

For the proposal accepted for funding, a financing contract is concluded between the two parts: Contracting Authority – UEFISCDI and Contractor – The Project Coordinator. The financing contract will also include a Consortium agreement between the participants in the project.

The principal investigators will negotiate with UEFISCDI the amount and structure of the requested budget. The discussions are based on observations from the final evaluation report regarding the correlation between the proposed objectives and the requested budget. The negotiated budget cannot exceed the budget initially requested in the Funding Application. The financing contract is signed after the negotiation process.

In case there are available funds, as a result of not contracting or decreasing of the budget for projects accepted for funding, or as a result of supplementing the budget initially allocated to the call, will be initiated the negotiation and contracting of the projects included in the Reserve List, in order of score, according to the approved budget.

### **11.8 Main obligations of the parties**

#### ***Coordinating Institution / Principal Investigator and Project Partners:***

- Are responsible for the implementation of the project, respecting the stipulated deadlines and the allocated budgets;
- Prepare and submit to the Contracting Authority reports of scientific progress during the project and a final report, at the time and in the format established in the financing contract by CCCDI / UEFISCDI. The deadlines of intermediary reports are proposed by the principal investigator, according to the work plan from funding application;
- Communicate the activities and announce the vacancies in the research project (including on the websites [www.jobs.research.gov.ro](http://www.jobs.research.gov.ro) and [www.euraxess.ro](http://www.euraxess.ro) );
- Ensure that the staff involved in the project has created and updated the scientific profile in the <https://brainmap.ro> platform;
- Provides up-to-date information on the progress of the project (at least the abstract of the project, team members and the results obtained in the project) on a web page;

- The project partners ensure the access of the project team to the existing research infrastructure and support the implementation of the project;
- The project partners establish, by agreement, the intellectual property rights resulting from the project.

#### **UEFISCDI:**

- Ensures the funding and monitoring of the project, according to the financing contract provisions in accordance with the law.
- Processes personal data in accordance with the provisions of Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR 2018) and Law 190/2018 on the protection of natural persons regarding the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data, (<https://uefiscdi.ro/protectia-datelor-cu-caracter-personal> ).

## **12. Research failure**

The failure in research occurs if, after a proper conduct of activities specified in a research project to submit deliverables assumed under the contract, results obtained are not the same with the preliminary work (working hypotheses outlined in the project proposal are not confirmed, preliminary functionality in the project proposal is not validated).

During the implementation of a project, failure in research can be identified by an evaluation and monitoring committee constituted for this purpose by the Contracting Authority (according to Art. 87 of Ordinance no. 57/2002 with subsequent amendments and art. 13 of Government Decision no. 583/2015 and art. 1 pt. 17 of Annex Government Decision no. 583/2015).

During the evaluation and monitoring, the committee will decide whether:

- the research team followed the financing contract, carrying out activities in good faith, even if the results are not the expected ones. This case falls within research risk;
- the research team conducted inadequately project activities under the grant agreement or have not achieved them, without notifying the Contracting Authority of the reasons which led to this situation. In these circumstances, the lack of achievements is attributable to the Contractor and the Contracting Authority may require to return the funds improperly used.

The process of identification and certification of situations which fall within the research risk involves examining:

- ✓ the way of activities was implemented according to the application form, which is annex to the grant agreement (in terms of content and timing);
- ✓ the way in which the results were obtained (theoretical or experimental), including deliverables associated with objectives/activities, even though these are different from those provided in the funding application
- ✓ the communication with the Contracting Authority regarding inconsistencies appeared between the results obtained during the implementation of the project and those from funding application.

Financing a project is discontinued and the share of funding allocated from the Programme budget shall be returned to the Contracting Authority if the evaluation and monitoring committees note that on his own fault, the Contractor, have not made steps / activities and objectives specified in the implementation plan for which received the funding. Also, the contractor returns to the Contracting Authority the funds spent improperly.

Based on the reports of the evaluation and monitoring commissions, the Contracting Authority accepts the failure in the research, without the obligation to recover the state budget funds.

If the evaluation and monitoring commissions find that the financed stages/activities and objectives provided in the implementation plan have not been achieved, by the Contractor's own fault, the project will be interrupted and the funding allocated from the program budget will be returns to the Contracting Authority.

**13. Call timeline**

<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>DEADLINE</b>
<b>Call launch</b>	<b>03 January 2024</b>
<b>Proposal submission</b>	<b>15 February 2024, hour 16:00</b>
<b>Evaluation process</b>	<b>February – July</b>
<b>Final results</b>	<b>July 2024</b>

## Annex I - Domains

No. domain/ Thematic area	Name of domain/thematic area
<b>1</b>	<b>Digitilisation, Industry and Space (ASC); Digital Economy and Space Technologies (DSIN); Advanced Functional Materials (DSIN); Advanced Manufacturing (DSIN)</b>
1.1	Open strategic autonomy in digital and emerging technologies with a Human-Centric Focus
1.2	An Attractive, Secure, Dynamic, Data-Agile, Regional and Global Economy
1.3	Clean industry, circular economy, and guaranteed supply of raw materials
1.4	Strategic autonomy in the development, deployment and use of global space infrastructures, services, applications, and data
<b>2</b>	<b>Climate, energy and mobility (ASC); Energy and Mobility (DSIN)</b>
2.1	Transition of the energy sector towards climate neutrality and resilience
2.2	Accessibility, supply and efficient use of energy
2.3	Towards a neutral, climate-resilient and environment friendly mobility
2.4	Systems for smart mobility
2.5	Behavioral transformations to reduce climate footprint
<b>3</b>	<b>Food, bioeconomy, natural resources, biodiversity, agriculture and environment (ASC); Bioeconomy (DSIN); Environment and Eco-technologies (DSIN)</b>
3.1	Increasing the relevance of forests in reducing pollution
3.2	Agriculture's contribution to climate neutrality and resilience
3.3	Biodiversity recovery, conservation and sustainable restoration of ecosystems and ecosystem services
3.4	Circular bioeconomy
3.5	Water resource management and sustainable development of fisheries and aquaculture
3.6	Food and nutritional security
3.7	Sustainable, balanced and inclusive development of urban, rural and coastal areas
3.8	Innovative governance models that foster sustainability and resilience
<b>4</b>	<b>Health (ASC); Health - prevention, diagnosis, and advanced treatment (DSIN)</b>
4.1	A healthy life in a rapidly changing society
4.2	Living and working in a health-promoting environment
4.3	Managing disease and reducing its burden
4.4	Access to innovative, sustainable and high-quality healthcare
4.5	New tools, technologies and digital solutions for a healthy society
4.6	Developing an innovative, sustainable and competitive healthcare industry
<b>5</b>	<b>Culture, creativity, and inclusive society (ASC)</b>
5.1	Consolidated democratic governance
5.2	Development of cultural heritage, arts and cultural and creative sectors
5.3	Social and economic resilience
5.4	Inclusive growth and reducing vulnerabilities
<b>6</b>	<b>Civil security for society (ASC)</b>
6.1	Reducing losses caused by natural, accidental and man-made calamities
6.2	Facilitating the mobility of passengers and the legal transport of goods, as well as the prevention of illicit trade, piracy and other criminal acts
6.3	Managing crime and terrorism more effectively and improving the resilience and autonomy of physical and digital infrastructures
6.4	Increasing cyber security and maintaining a safer online environment

**FUNDING APPLICATION**

*This document uses Times New Roman, 11 point, 1 interline space and 2 cm margins. Any changes to these parameters (except tables, figures or legends) are prohibited.*

*Excess pages will not be considered by the experts in the evaluation process.*

*This document must be uploaded imperatively as an unprotected PDF file (document generated from a word processor file to a PDF, no scanned document), on the submission platform.*

*The Funding application is the only document sent to evaluators. The evaluators have no access to the information completed in the platform.*

*In each section of the application, the explicative text will be maintained.*

*Please, make sure that the funding application contains all the required information.*

**A. Identification information (will be completed into the platform)**

**A.1. Coordinator-(Research Organization)**

Name					
Legal representative					
Position					
Legal form		CUI			
Address		Town / District			
Registration Year					
Web site					
Principal investigator					
First name		Last name		CNP	
UEF –ID (identification number <a href="http://www.brainmap.ro">www.brainmap.ro</a> )		Position			
Tel.		Email			

**A.2. Partner (Enterprise)**

Name					
Legal representative					
Position					
Registration Year		CUI			
No. Trade register					
Main CAEN code		Research CAEN code			
Address		Town / District			
Enterprise type (micro, small, medium or big enterprise)					
Registration Year					
Year of the last financial year					
Average annual number of employees					
Net annual turnover					
Total Assets					
Website					
Partner leader					
First name		Last name		CNP	
UEF –ID (identification number <a href="http://www.brainmap.ro">www.brainmap.ro</a> )		Position			
Tel.		Email			

## **B. Project Proposal**

### **B.1. Project information** (will be completed into the platform)

- Project title;
- Summary;
- Acronym;
- Area of research;
- Key words.

**B.2 Scientific description** (will be uploaded into the platform) – max. 10 pages applied to all sections of B.2, except the project budget section. *Excess pages will not be considered by the experts in the evaluation process.*

*In this section the principal investigator will detail the scientific context, the scope and objectives, the approach to these objectives, and the required material and human resources.*

### **B. 2.1 Project Scope and Objectives**

- *Presentation of the project scope, describing explicitly the demonstration model (product, technology, method, system or service) to be developed and tested / validated;*
- *Point out the degree of novelty and relevance of the preliminary (already available) results related to the project in relation to national and international state of the art;*
- *Presentation of project objectives, their correlation with the outcome of the project, arguing the feasibility of the project;*

### **B.2.2 Presentation of the concept of technology / product** or existing model which constitutes the starting point of the project

- *Clear presentation and argumentation of TRL (Technology Readiness Level) value at the beginning of the project, and the level reached after project implementation.*
- *Presentation of preliminary results (e.g. theoretical developments, numerical simulations, experimental results) available prior the project application, with explicit indication of publications, patents and research projects that led to the basic concept of the project;*

### **B.2.3 Method of project implementation**

- *Description of the activities required to meet the project goals, with explicit contribution of the research team members from the coordinator and partner;*
- *Gantt Chart with planned activities during the project;*
- *Deliverables associated with each activity;*
- *Briefly describe the expertise of experienced researchers and postdoctoral researchers nominated in the project team; provide the necessary elements to assess their qualification / contribution to the project.*
- *Dissemination of results and intellectual property rights;*
- *Presentation of the research infrastructure available for the project (indicating link to <https://eertis.eu>) and its development during the project (if applicable);*
- *Structure of research teams and justification of salary expenses;*
- *Presentation of the risks associated with project implementation activities and ways of treating them (consider the likelihood of risks and the impact on project execution).*

**Project Budget:**

*Justify the estimation of the total costs for each line of the budget, excepting personal costs and indirect costs.*

<b>Allocated budget / costs (Lei/Euro) 1 EUR = 5 RON</b>											
		<b>Personal costs</b>		<b>Logistics<sup>6</sup></b>		<b>Travel<sup>7</sup></b>		<b>Indirect costs<sup>8</sup></b>		<b>Total</b>	
		<b>Lei</b>	<b>Euro</b>	<b>Lei</b>	<b>Euro</b>	<b>Lei</b>	<b>Euro</b>	<b>Lei</b>	<b>Euro</b>	<b>Lei</b>	<b>Euro</b>
<b>Coordinator (CO)</b>	<b>Public budget</b>										
<b>Partner</b>	<b>Public budget</b>										
	<b>Own contribution</b>										
	<b>Total</b>										
<b>Total budget</b>	<b>Public budget</b>										
	<b>Own contribution</b>										

*Note:*

*The table is mandatory and the budget values must be the same with the ones completed on the platform (<https://uefiscdi-direct.ro>).*

*The Project Budget section is not included in the 10 pages of B2 Section.*

**C. Bibliography (max. 1 page)**

<sup>6</sup> Subcontracting – no more than 5% of the project's public budget

<sup>7</sup> For institutions under the state aid scheme, costs for travel will be made from their own contribution

<sup>8</sup> Max. 25% of direct costs minus subcontracting and equipment costs.



**Evaluation Criteria for Experimental Demonstrative Projects**  
(PED 2024)

<b>Criterion 1: Project objectives and scope</b> <i>(see section B2.1 of funding application)</i>	<b>(30%)</b>
--	--------------

To what extent:

- *The project scope is clearly presented, describing explicitly the demonstration model (product, technology, method, system or service) to be developed and tested/ validated?*
- *Are the results innovative and relevant in relation to the national and international state of the art?*
- *Are the project objectives correlated with the outcome of the project?*

<b>Criterion 2: Presentation of the technology / product concept or of the existing lab product</b> <i>(see section B2.2 of funding application)</i>	<b>(30%)</b>
---	--------------

To what extent:

- *Is the TRL level clearly argued at beginning of the project, and is the level reached after project implementation well determined on the TRL scale?*
- *Are the preliminary results significant on the date of submitting the proposal: publications, patents and research projects that led to basic concept of the project?*

<b>Criterion 3: Project implementation</b> <i>(see section B2.3 of funding application)</i>	<b>(40%)</b>
--	--------------

To what extent:

- *Is the expertise level of experienced researchers and postdoctoral researchers nominated in the project team at high quality? Are their expertise and results well-correlated with their contribution in the project and appropriate for the project implementation?*
- *Are the proposed activities and deliverables well structured? Are the deliverables well-correlated to the proposed activities?*
- *Is the budget and timetable of the project well justified (resources / time / results)?*
- *Is the research infrastructure adequate for the project implementation?*
- *Is each team member's role and team project partner well described?*
- *Is the impact and dissemination of project results well described? Is the sharing of project intellectual property rights between partners clearly addressed?*
- *Are the risks associated with project implementation activities identified and their mitigation measures well described?*
- *Is the project plan effective in reaching the TRL level required at the end of the project?*

- **Legend:**

1. Grades will be given only after written comments in accordance with the meaning of each score, as below table.
2. The comments must be accurate, complete and consistent, highlighting strengths and weaknesses.
3. Each criterion will be scored from 0 to 5. Scores with a resolution of decimal place may be awarded.

0	INSUFFICIENT	The proposal does not address this criterion thus it cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	POOR	Addressing criterion is done improperly, or there are serious weaknesses.
2	FAIR	The proposal broadly addresses the criterion but there are significant weaknesses.
3	GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
4	VERY GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
5	EXCELLENT	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor appeared.

*Note: The final score will be calculated as a sum of the marks for each of the three criteria multiplied by the appropriate percentage and multiplied by 20 (the final score is between 0 and 100).*