



E C S E L – J U

Anton Chichkov
Programme Officer



Consortium Agreement

- **The beneficiaries must have internal arrangements regarding their operation and coordination to ensure that the action is implemented properly.**
- **These internal arrangements must be set out in a written consortium agreement' between the beneficiaries**
- **It may cover:**
 - **internal organisation of the consortium;**
 - **management of access to the electronic exchange system;**
 - **distribution of EU funding;**
 - **additional rules on rights and obligations related to background and results (including whether access rights remain or not, if a beneficiary is in breach of its obligations);**
 - **Mechanism of settlement of internal disputes;**
 - **liability, indemnification and confidentiality arrangements between the beneficiaries.**
 - **The consortium agreement must not contain any provision contrary to the Agreement.**



Consortium Agreement

- **Consortium Agreement is purely internal for the consortium**
- **The ECSEL JU is not party and has NO responsibility for it (nor for any adverse consequences)**
 - **The consortium agreement should complement the GA and must NOT contain any provision contrary to it (or to the Financial Regulation No 966/2012)**
 - **The consortium agreement should in principle be negotiated and concluded before the signature of the GA. Otherwise, there is usually a risk that prolonged disagreement jeopardises the action**
 - **The consortium agreement does not have to remain the same during the lifetime of the action, it can be modified by the consortium**
 - **It may be a simple written agreement or take some other form (e.g. a notarial deed or part of the statutes of a separate legal entity,)**
 - **The ECSEL office does not have a model consortium agreement**
 - **The private members of ECSEL JU the industry associations do provide such model. To be found on the websites of AENEAS, ARTEMIS-IA or EpoSS or ask them for this document. Additional guidance can be found in the H2020 Funding & Tenders Portal Online Manual**



Monitoring & Reporting

- **The consortium should report regularly on the progress of the implementation**
- **The responsible PO should monitor the progress**
 - In the case of ECSEL JU this is done with the help of external experts in a formal review meeting at the end of each period
 - Reporting periods and reviews are the base for the ECSEL JU payments
 - Results of the reviews are communicated to the involved national authorities and are also base for the payment of the national grants for the period
- **The IT tools supporting these processes:**
 - Continuous Reporting Module (for deliverables, milestones)
 - Project Monitoring (PMON) workflow (for project reviews)
 - Reporting and Payment (REPA)



Continuous reporting

- **Submission & approval of Deliverables**
 - **The SyGMA Continuous Reporting module obliges the consortium to report on the most important progress information in real time (deliverables, milestones, critical risks, selected indicators)**
 - They can be approved/rejected by the PO directly in the Continuous Reporting module
 - The PO can also re-open a deliverable with a comment (usually to ask more details or changes)
 - Whenever a deliverable is submitted, rejected or re-opened, the system will send a notification
 - **All beneficiaries can upload deliverables, but only the coordinator can submit them**
 - **Deliverables which consist of a non-written output (prototype, built infrastructure) must be submitted in the form of a short-written description**



Continuous reporting

- **Submission & approval of Deliverables**
 - Deliverables can be added or removed by the consortium in an amendment
 - Late deliverables — If deliverables are still missing when the periodic report is submitted, the delay must be explained, and a new target date must have been agreed
 - If a deliverable is of such poor quality that there is no margin for effectively improving it
 - It will be rejected and either the costs have to be rejected or the grant reduced at the final payment.



Periodic Reporting

- **Periodic reporting is a dedicated process, where progress during the reporting period (In ECSEL JU about 12 months) is reviewed against the planned work and is linked to a payment**
 - **The Periodic Reporting module (REPA) is opened automatically by the system at the end of the reporting period**
 - The system records in the Periodic Reporting a snapshot of the Continuous Reporting module status
 - Any deliverables submitted later will not be part of this periodic report
 - By contrast, the Continuous Reporting module will always show the latest status of deliverables, milestones, critical risks, and other selected indicators



Project Reviews

- **Project reviews aim to assess the project work carried out over one reporting period**
- **They are carried out under Article 22 of the H2020 grant agreements (GAs) at any moment and up until 2 years after the payment of the balance**
- **The reviews concern mainly the technical implementation of the project (i.e. its scientific and technological implementation), but may also cover financial and budgetary aspects or compliance with other obligations under the GA**



Preparation for the Periodic Reporting

- **Establish good management structure and procedures**
 - Regular project level meetings/calls to follow progress of the WP
 - Regular WP level meetings/calls to follow progress of Tasks
 - Procedure for a internal review and acceptance of deliverables and reports
 - Method and schedule for review of risk analyses and mitigation actions
 - Establish a base line for each objective.
 - Put in place method to evaluate progress towards the objectives in relation to the base line
 - If there are demonstrators make very clear link between demonstrators and objectives. Which demonstrator demonstrates which objective. When not finalized what is the impact on objectives
 - Put a summary of the state of the art, competitive situation and market potential if any
 - Have a body or person to review and update it during the project



Project Reviews

- **Reviews consist in an in-depth examination of the progress of the project:**
 - the degree to which the work plan has been carried out and whether all deliverables were completed
 - whether the objectives are still relevant and provide scientific or industrial breakthrough potential
 - how resources were planned and used in relation to the achieved progress, and if their use respected the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness
 - the management procedures and methods of the project
 - the beneficiaries' contributions and integration within the project
 - the expected potential scientific, technological, economic, competitive and social impact, and plans for using and disseminating results
 - compliance with other GA obligations



Project Reviews

- **The review is based on all relevant documents and information** *(including checking the actual functionality and usability of the outputs/demonstrators, if appropriate)*
- **The documents to be reviewed include the following:**
 - **Latest DoW Annex 1 of the GA**
 - The description of work against which the assessment will be made. All intended amendments should be submitted before the review.
 - **The technical periodic reports and due deliverables for the period under review**
 - All beneficiaries can upload deliverables, but only the coordinator can submit them.
Draft and final deliverables (status should be clear to the experts)
 - **Any additional information provided at the review meeting.**
- **All documents should be available on the portal at latest 2 weeks before the review. Documents submitted later will not be considered in this review !!!**



Before the Review

- **Agree with the PO date and venue**
- **Confirm the experts**
- **Sent to the PO agenda proposal**
- **Make sure all relevant people are invited**
 - At least the Coordinator and all WP leaders should be present
 - Invite task leaders or important contributors to support the presentations
 - All partners should be present in the final review
 - Impact - Each partner should present in 5 min who they are who their competitors are what is their contribution in the project and what are the main innovations/benefits/exploitation that they achieved (for very big consortia can be arranged differently ...)
- **Make a rehearsal meeting and time the presentations**
 - Experts are technical people do not make very high-level political presentations
 - Experts are not always from the narrow field of a Task of even WP so introduce shortly the specific task and its link to the project objectives so people can follow
 - Explain abbreviations when used



At the Review

- **Make a template for presentation to be used by all WP leaders**
 - **Mention main objectives of the project and of the period under review**
 - **State the specific WP/task objectives for the period. Make a clear link between this and the main project objectives**
 - **Do not only narrate the work done. Highlight achievements and difficulties (High lights and low lights)**
 - **Refer to the state of the art**
 - **Mention failures (negative results are also results in research project)**
 - **Have a slide on risk evaluation and management**
 - **Have a slide on resource usage planned and actual. Any deviation bigger than 10% needs to be explained**
 - **Clearly explain how did you address remarks from the previous review (if any)**
 - **Successful partners or consortia participating/having more than one project (running or finalized) need to present very clearly what is developed in which project**
- **Avoid repeating the DoW in the presentations**



After the Review

- **The intermediate reviews carried out during the project implementation may also recommend re-orientations to the project**
- **If the review shows improper implementation of the project, inappropriate costs or violation of other obligations under the GA,**
 - **Chapter 6 measures may be applied e.g. suspension, termination, cost rejections, grant reduction and, if necessary, recovery (see GA articles 42-44, 47-50)**
- **At the end of the review, report is prepared and send to the consortium and the relevant NFAs**
- **A contradictory procedure starts automatically**
 - **Use this procedure only to disagree with the findings**

