How to write proposal section 3: IMPLEMENTATION?
Research Proposal (Part B) - Structure

1. Excellence
2. Impact
3. Implementation
   3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (*tables*)
   3.2 Management structure and procedures
   3.3 Consortium as a whole
   3.4 Resources to be committed
4. Members of the Consortium (*no page limit*)
5. Ethics and Security
Evaluation criteria

- Excellence
- Impact
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Detailed aspects of evaluation depend on the type of action

- 5
- 5
- 5
3. **Implementation**

3.1 **Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (tables)**

3.2 Management structure and procedures

3.3 Consortium as a whole

3.4 Resources to be committed

4. **Members of the Consortium**
Line of Reasoning

Problem

State of the art

Innovation!

Objectives

Work Packages

Deliverables
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

*Expectations of the EC*

- Brief presentation of the overall structure of the work plan
- Timing of the different work packages and their components (*Gantt Chart*)
- Detailed work description
  - A description of each *work package* (table 3.1a)
  - A list of *work packages* (table 3.1b)
  - A list of major *deliverables* (table 3.1c)
- Graphical presentation of the components showing how they inter-relate (*Pert Chart*)
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

**Gantt Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package Name</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1: Co-ordination and Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2: Dissemination and Exploitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3: Assessment and Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP1.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2.1:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2.2:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2.3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2.4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Milestones**

- D01
- M1
- M2
- M3
- M4
- M5
- M6
- M7

**Deliverables**

- D121
- D122
- D123
- D211
- D221
- D231
- D311
- D321
- D331
- D411
- D421
- D431
- D441
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### 3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

**Gantt Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WP 1</td>
<td>Status-quo of partner programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T 1.1</td>
<td>Survey on the national programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WP 2</td>
<td>Knowledge base for RID strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>T 1.2</td>
<td>Hollywood Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>T 2.1</td>
<td>Programmes in Cooperation with Third countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>T 2.2</td>
<td>Forecasts, changes on future challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>T 2.3</td>
<td>Policy-makers workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M 2</td>
<td>Memorandum of Common Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WP 3</td>
<td>Strategic and analytical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>T 3.1</td>
<td>&quot;Call-off&quot; strategy meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>T 3.2</td>
<td>Debrief discussions with high-level experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>T 3.3</td>
<td>Feedback from Scientific Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M 5</td>
<td>European Research Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WP 4</td>
<td>Economic exploitation and job creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>T 4.1</td>
<td>WS industry working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>Innovation strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>T 4.2</td>
<td>Supporting network of innovation partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>T 4.3</td>
<td>Innovation strategy paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WP 5</td>
<td>Support for transnational consortium building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>T 5.1</td>
<td>For bearing Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>T 5.2</td>
<td>Satellite workshop to 2nd PEMS conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WP 6</td>
<td>Human resources, development and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T 6.1</td>
<td>Working Group on training issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M 6</td>
<td>European Training Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T 6.2</td>
<td>Student &amp; scientific exchange and career forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>WP 7</td>
<td>Management concept and tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>T 7.1</td>
<td>Transactional working groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>T 7.2</td>
<td>Workshop for common understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M 7</td>
<td>Legal &amp; Contractual Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>T 7.3</td>
<td>Functional and technical aspects of programme managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WP 8</td>
<td>Implementing transnational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>T 8.1</td>
<td>1st joint call for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>T 8.2</td>
<td>1st transnational evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>T 8.3</td>
<td>1st project selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>T 8.4</td>
<td>Project execution, 1st round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>T 8.5</td>
<td>2nd joint call for proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>T 8.6</td>
<td>2nd round of transnational evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>T 8.7</td>
<td>2nd round of project selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>T 8.8</td>
<td>3rd round of project selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>T 8.9</td>
<td>Contracts, 2nd round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>T 8.10</td>
<td>Contract execution, 2nd round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>WP 9</td>
<td>Science and society issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>T 9.1</td>
<td>Communication information platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>T 9.2</td>
<td>Printed information materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>T 9.3</td>
<td>On-site presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>T 9.4</td>
<td>Strategic supervision with regards to FP 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>WP 10</td>
<td>Consortium management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M 1</td>
<td>Consortium assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>T 10.1</td>
<td>Setup of working infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>T 10.2</td>
<td>Overall coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>MRC Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>EB Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

Table 3.1a: Work package description (For each work package):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>Start Date or Starting Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short name of participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person/months per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objectives
- clear and comprehensible
- realistic and feasible (personnel, technical equipment, financially, in time) (SMART)
- Sub-objectives of main objective (project)

Tasks
- Detailed description of what you want to do to achieve the projects objectives: Result: **Deliverables**

Deliverables
- Results of WP
- Coherent labelling: e.g. D 4.2
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

Objectives

- Obesity causes death in millions of Europeans. The objective of this research project is to study the role of nutritional signals causing bad food habits as a starting point for a possible new therapy.

- The objective is to provide a new therapy for obesity based on bioactive compounds.
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

Table 3.1b: List of Work packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package No</th>
<th>Work Package Title</th>
<th>Lead Participant No</th>
<th>Lead Participant Short Name</th>
<th>Person-Months</th>
<th>Start Month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example:

WP1: Project Management
WP2: Biomarkers
WP3: Clinical Trial
WP4: Dissemination
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

**Definition: Deliverable**

- Distinct output / concrete result of the project
- Necessary to complete a task / WP
- Meaningful in terms of the project’s overall objectives
- Constituted by a report, a document, a technical diagram, software etc
- Every deliverable has to be delivered
### 3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

**Table 3.1c: List of deliverables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable (number)</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>Short name of lead participant</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Delivery date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 2.1</td>
<td>Report on validated Biomarkers</td>
<td>WP 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>M 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Deliverable numbers**: in order of deliverable dates (e.g. D 4.2)
- **Type**: R, DEM, DEC, OTHER
- **Dissemination level**: PU, CO, CI
- **Deliverable Date**: in Months from project start date (e.g. M6)
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

**PERT diagram**

INMiND project ([www.uni-muenster.de/InMind/](http://www.uni-muenster.de/InMind/))
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Implementation - Evaluation Criteria

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management
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Reviewer’s comments

- There are only weak links between the objectives and the workplan. In some cases it does not become clear how the objectives will be addressed in each of the work packages.

- WPs are structured more as a single partners effort rather than a consortium effort.

- The budget is disproportionately distributed among partners.
3. Implementation

3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (*tables*)

3.2 Management structure and procedures

3.3 Consortium as a whole

3.4 Resources to be committed

4. Members of the Consortium
3.2 Management structure and procedures

Expectations of the EC

- Describe any organizational structure and the decision-making (including a list of milestones)
  - Clearly define: Who is responsible for what?
  - Who will decide what, how and when?
  - How effective will the innovation management be addressed in the management structure and work plan?
  - What will happen in case of conflict?
  - What will happen, if there won’t be any agreement on something? Who will decide then? Veto right?
3.2 Management structure and procedures

**Governance**

- **European Commission**
  - **Coordinator**
  - **Project Office**
  - **General Assembly** (all partners)
    - Risk management Advice
    - IPR Team

**Work packages**

- WP1
  - Task 1.1
- WP2
  - Task 2.1
- WP3
  - Task 3.1
- WP4
  - Task 4.1
- WP5
  - Task 5.1
- WP6
  - Task 6.1
- WP7
  - Task 7.1

**Management Structure**

**Scientific Advisory Board**

**Ethics Advisory Board**
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3.2 Management structure and procedures

Table 3.2a: List of milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone number</th>
<th>Milestone name</th>
<th>Related work package(s)</th>
<th>Estimated date</th>
<th>Means of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**

**Estimated date**
*Measured in months from the project start date (month 1)*

**Means of verification**
*Show how you will confirm that the milestone has been attained. Refer to indicators if appropriate. For example: a laboratory prototype that is ‘up and running’; software released and validated by a user group; field survey complete and data quality validated.*
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3.2 Management structure and procedures

**Definition: Milestones**

- Structure project into **important periods** or **interim goals**
- Control points in project, help to chart progress
  - Status of the project?
  - Aims achieved so far?
  - Need for change of direction?
- May correspond to completion of key deliverable
- Mark critical decision point / turning points
3.2 Management structure and procedures

Expectations of the EC

- Describe any critical risks, relating to project implementation, that the stated project's objectives may not be achieved. Detail any risk mitigation measures. Please provide a table with critical risks identified and mitigating actions (table 3.2b)

Table 3.2b: Critical risks for implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of risk</th>
<th>Work package(s) involved</th>
<th>Proposed risk-mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implementation - Evaluation Criteria

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

Reviewer’s comments

- Aspects of decision-making processes and conflict resolution mechanisms are not clear.
- The structure would be strengthened by an external independent input (external advisory board) for the decisions.
- A risk management section has been included into the proposal; however, it appears to have limited detail to address the potential problems that could occur.
3. Implementation

3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (*tables*)

3.2 Management structure and procedures

3.3 Consortium as a whole

3.4 Resources to be committed

4. Members of the Consortium
3.3 Consortium as a whole

Describe

- how the consortium **as a whole** will achieve the project aims
- why the very partners are necessary to achieve the project aims
- the partner‘s special skills relevant to the project
- How the partners complement each other
- Involvement of SME/industry partners: tasks, budget
- how the (commercial) exploitation of results will be ensured (if relevant)
- why partners from other industrial countries need to be involved (if relevant)
- the balance of the consortium
Implementation - Evaluation Criteria

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

Reviewer’s comments

• The roles of partners 6 and 8 appear overlapping

• More representatives from industry, regulatory authorities and patent groups would be desirable

• There is no partner with strong competence in XXX

• The coordinator seems to play a predominant role and the scientific integration of other partners in the proposal is not sufficiently demonstrated
3. Implementation

3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (*tables*)

3.2 Management structure and procedures

3.3 Consortium as a whole

3.4 Resources to be committed

4. Members of the Consortium
3.4 Resources to be committed

- Information needs to match budget table (section 3 of administrative forms) and person months in WP form
- Provide requested person months (table 3.4a)
- Provide “other direct costs" (table 3.4b) for participants where these costs exceed 15% of the personnel costs (acc. to budget table in admin forms)

Although not requested: provide a detailed financial plan here
### 3.4 Resources to be committed

#### Table 3.4a: Summary of staff effort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number/Short Name</th>
<th>WPn</th>
<th>WPn+1</th>
<th>WPn+2</th>
<th>Total Person/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Number/Short Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.4b: 'Other direct cost’ items (travel, equipment, other goods and services, large research infrastructure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number/Short Name</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other goods and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Number/Short Name</th>
<th>Cost (€)</th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large research infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Implementation

3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables and milestones (*tables*)

3.2 Management structure and procedures

3.3 Consortium as a whole

3.4 Resources to be committed

4. **Members of the Consortium**
4. Members of the consortium

- 4.1 Participants

- 4.2 Third parties involved in the project (including use of third party resources)
4. Members of the consortium

4.1 Participants (applicants)

Expectations of the Commission

- a description of the legal entity and its main tasks, with an explanation of how its profile matches the tasks in the proposal (include partner number)
- a curriculum vitae or description of the profile of the people, including their gender, who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the proposed research and/or innovation activities;
- a list of up to 5 relevant publications, and/or products, services (including widely-used datasets or software), or other achievements relevant to the call content;
- a list of up to 5 relevant previous projects or activities, connected to the subject of this proposal;
- a description of any significant infrastructure and/or any major items of technical equipment, relevant to the proposed work;
4. Members of the consortium

4.2 Third parties

- Beneficiaries: appropriate resources to implement the action

- Third Parties – legal entity not signing the grant agreement
  - Making available resources by means of contributions in kind
  - By carrying out part of the work itself (should not be core tasks of research)
4. Members of the consortium

*Third parties*

- Contracts to purchase goods, works and services *(Art. 10)*
- Use of in-kind contributions provided by third parties against payment *(Art. 11)*
- Use of in-kind contributions provided by third parties free of charge *(Art. 12)*
- Subcontracting *(Art. 13)*
- Linked third parties *(Art. 14)*
Thank you!

Christiane Kummer | PT-Juelich
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Disclaimer: The "Fit for Health2.0" project partners do not assume any legal liability or responsibilities for the information provided in this document.
Reviewer comments FP7
The consortium itself identified several patents not held within the consortium itself, necessitating the negotiation of licences to carry out the work planned. A negotiation of licences thus needs to be commenced very soon.
The proposal describes a management structure that itself is complex and not that easy to follow.
The staff allocation versus justification of costs needs clarification.
It was also pointed out by the reviewers that IPR management could have been described in more detail.
The panel noted that not all the partners are represented in the steering committee. An appropriate representation of all the partners in a decision making body should be sought.
The gender aspect should have been better addressed, and should be considered in the negotiation phase.
However the management structure is somewhat too briefly mentioned in the proposal and a standard graphical representation and definitions of decisive positions including concrete names would have been useful.
The plan for managing Intellectual Property and innovation-related activities arising from the project is fairly addressed. Whilst an IP manager has been appointed, new IP will be submitted to the General Assembly, where only industrial partners have voting rights.
There is a significant weakness regarding the co-ordinating partner track record (recently founded) and as to whether they have the experience, capacity, capability and the necessary expertise to carry out their tasks and to act as project leader.
The industrial participant plays a specific technical role, but should also be encouraged to play a stronger role in the strategic planning of the project.
The sub-contracting costs appear high as they represent 20% of the project costs and should be better justified.
The panel expressed some concern whether sufficient funds were allocated to the management of IP strategy.
Involvement of patient advocacy groups in the proposed research is limited.
The resources for XXX are high in relation to the other partners and the rationale for this was lacking.
The time estimated for the computational part output seems significantly underestimated.
According to the panel opinion, the conflict resolution scheme was not sufficiently addressed.
The consortium as a whole is composed of a wide set of suitable partners. However, some topic related expertise - as an example science of physical activity - is not fully evident from the proposal.
The budget allocation appears unbalanced.
Milestones and deliverables in some cases overlap.
A very complex management structure has been proposed and described with abundance of details. However, the concern is that the related complexity will have a negative impact on the timely flow of the project.
The SMEs focus on very specific tasks with little relation to the other work packages.
The management structure is not described in all relevant details.
The experience of the coordinator to lead international projects could have been better documented.
The external expert advisory board is limited to two members. It was felt it could have comprised some additional key stakeholders not included as partners in the consortium.