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1. **OVERVIEW**

1.1. **Title**

VACCINE PREVENTABLE DISEASE MODELLING IN THE EUROPEAN UNION AND EEA/EFTA COUNTRIES: FORECASTING THE EFFECTS OF INTRODUCING A NEW VACCINE IN A NATIONAL / REGIONAL PROGRAM

1.2. **Introduction**

The European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) was established by the European Parliament and Council Regulation 851/2004 of 21 April 2004 to identify, assess and communicate current and emerging threats to human health from communicable diseases.

The ECDC funding Regulation 851/2004 specifically mention the role of the Centre in vaccination issues:

The Centre […] should foster the exchange of best practices and experience with regard to vaccination programmes (Preamble, point 8)

The Centre shall coordinate collection, validation, analysis and dissemination of data at Community level, including on vaccination strategies. […] For these purposes the Centre shall carry out technical and scientific evaluation of prevention and control measures at Community level. (Article 11.1)

Therefore, according to its founding regulation, ECDC has a specific mandate to deal with vaccination programmes based on knowledge and best practices sharing, but also on evaluation – at Community level – of prevention measures.

Implementing vaccination programmes is exclusive competence of national authorities. At EU level, it is in the ECDC’s mission and mandate to support Member States (MS), the European Commission (EC) and other EU Agencies in improving prevention and control of communicable diseases, including vaccine preventable diseases (VPD).

1.3. **Background information**

Introduction of new vaccines into national or regional vaccination programs as part of public health interventions for children, adolescents, adults or elderly ought to be proceeded by an assessment of burden of disease and the socioeconomic impact of the disease in the area. Today, this is not always feasible and developing models facilitating this process in Member States may be of value. The number of vaccine-preventable diseases continues to grow, while economic resources are scarce for public health interventions and Member States may be forced to choose between interventions.

Vaccines that currently are available on the European market for children and adolescents, and not included in all programs recommended for children and adolescents, are aimed at protecting against hepatitis A, hepatitis B, rotavirus, varicella, invasive pneumococcal disease, invasive meningococcal disease, influenza and human papillomavirus infection. Vaccines that are currently available for adults and elderly are
directed against influenza, invasive pneumococcal disease and herpes zoster. New vaccines for all age groups are under development.

The vaccine directed at protecting against varicella, a latent virus, is of specific interest since it may have an impact on development of herpes zoster later in life. The vaccine contains a live, attenuated varicella strain (Oka) and after vaccination the virus strain becomes latent just as the wild-type varicella virus strains after natural varicella disease. Current data on the impact of e.g. vaccination coverage on the age for development of acute varicella disease and the age of development of herpes zoster are conflicting. Several mathematical models have been developed, but with better European surveillance data, and more realistic social mixing data, more realistic models, both in terms of parameter values and model assumptions, may be built. Acute varicella may be complicated by meningitis, encephalitis, bacterial skin infections, septicemia, cerebellitis and vasculitis. Development of herpes zoster in individuals older than 50 years may be complicated by post herpetic neuralgia lasting for months to years. Epidemiological data may be obtained from different sources. Burden of disease for severe acute varicella and severe herpes zoster may be obtained through hospitalization data, available in a number of Member States. Surveillance data for varicella is available through the EUVAC.net. In addition, sero- epidemiological data from a number of Member states has been published.

Development of a mathematical model for assessing the impact of introduction of varicella vaccination should be viewed as an example of a new vaccine that need several assessments, both on the burden of disease of acute varicella and herpes zoster. In developing a model for the varicella vaccine the applicant should consider the usefulness of the same model for other vaccines. The aim of the model should be to facilitate for Member States to assess the epidemiology of both acute varicella disease and herpes zoster. The model should also provide tools to estimate costs for the disease and establish whether introduction of a vaccine will be cost-effective or cost-saving. The model should provide the possibility of using existing or a new childhood vaccination schedule in Member States.

2. IMPLEMENTATION OBJECT OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

2.1. Objective of the call for proposals

Research on developing a mathematical model to predict epidemiological changes in the following diseases, when introducing vaccines against them and their related mathematical model for assessing the cost-benefit:

- acute varicella and herpes zoster
- other vaccine preventable disease that can be requested

2.2. Deliverables of the call for proposals

The work to be carried out under the agreement to be awarded is organised in four main Work Packages (WPs) and the related deliverables:

WP1. Gathering of epidemiological and social mixing data, peer-reviewed publication;

WP2. Development of a mathematical model for estimating effects of varicella and herpes zoster vaccinations;
WP3. Optimal fit of the mathematical model to data, delivery of the model, cost-benefit analysis, peer-reviewed publication;

WP4. Development of mathematical models for other vaccine preventable diseases;

2.3. Main actors of the management and communication

Here below are outlined some details regarding the main actors of the project:

**Coordinator – the Lead Institute** - the host organisation with overall responsibility for the project. It consists of the **Project Leader**, who will be the chairman of the team, the **Project Manager** (see below), senior representatives from the host organisation and other relevant project staff. The Project Leader is the key contact person for liaising with ECDC and with Associate Partners.

**Project Manager** - the individual with overall responsibility for day-to-day project coordination and management. The Project Leader and Project Manager should both be employed by the Coordinator.

**Associate Partners** are the consortium members. They are responsible for coordinating and conducting part of the work plan at a regional or national level, are expected to contribute technical expertise, and play a key role in obtaining relevant data for the project as appropriate.

**Management Team** – consists of 3-5 people including the Project Leader and selected representatives from Associated Partners. The Management Team is expected to meet with the Steering Committee regularly throughout the project duration and not less than once every 6 months.

**Steering Committee** – will be established to oversee project activities and to ensure the quality and relevance for the European added value of the project. The Steering Committee will be formed by the ECDC, in consultation with the beneficiary of the partnership agreement. The Steering Committee will include the successful Applicant, ECDC, and 2 - 3 VPD experts appointed by ECDC.

2.4. Characteristics of the agreement object of the call of proposals

ECDC wishes to conclude a framework partnership agreement with one applicant or a consortium of partners. The duration of this agreement is planned to be four years. After the first two years implementation, further implementation is subject to the outcomes of the first two years. The last two years will be renewable annually. The framework partnership agreement establishes the framework of the deliverables and requires an additional step to make the actual implementation. This is in the form of a specific grant agreement specifying the details for each particular implementation, based on the previously signed framework partnership agreement, and specifying the resources used.

Due to calendar planning and in order to group processes, the submission of the first specific grant agreement is already requested with this application (see Section 3.1 concerning year 1). The specific agreements after the first renewal will be subject to budget availability confirmation.

The successful Applicant shall organize a consortium with other Institutions in at least other two selected countries in order to facilitate the project. The successful Applicant must submit the details of institutions involved. A consortium arrangement between partners will ensure pooling of existing European knowledge and expertise in this area.
The signature of the agreements shall be by one Lead Institute, the Coordinator of the consortium. Partner institutions give mandate to the Lead Institute for the performance of the agreement. A consortium arrangement between partners will ensure pooling of existing European knowledge and expertise in this area.

The coordinator shall ensure that consortium partners complete the formalities for them to accede to the contractual agreement. (see Article I.2 of the model Framework Grant Agreement in Annex II), including the duly completed and signed originals of Form A (set out in Annex III).

Under each item of the description of the work packages below it is specified what should be done during the first year specific grant agreement.

2.5. Work Packages and related activities

The applicant should develop and submit an outline of the project with comprehensive description of WP1-2 to ECDC, for the specific grant agreements to be initiated in 2009.

Further activities for all the other Work Packages (n. 3 to 4) should be outlined in the Management and Communication Plan described in section 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview of activities included in Work Package:</th>
<th>Description of the activity</th>
<th>Expected duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP1 (to start in 2009)</td>
<td>Collection of epidemiological and social mixing data. (see details below)</td>
<td>Month 1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP2 (to start in 2009)</td>
<td>Development of a mathematical model for estimating effects of varicella and herpes zoster vaccinations. (see details below)</td>
<td>Month 1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP3</td>
<td>Optimal fit of the mathematical model to data, delivery of the model, cost-benefit analysis, peer-reviewed publication. (see details below)</td>
<td>Month 13-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP4</td>
<td>Development of mathematical models for vaccine preventable diseases. (see details below)</td>
<td>Month 25-48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected duration of the whole set of activities 48 months

Estimated Budget 400,000 Euros
2.6. Overview of activities for the first specific grant agreement

Ensure compliance of the implementation with data protection requirements (EU Directives 95/46/EC).

Carry out 3 co-ordination meetings for WP1:

- WP1: 2 persons x 1 day x 3 times

WP1 Deliverable: Collection of epidemiological and social mixing data

Collect epidemiological data necessary for mathematical modelling. Analyze available varicella and herpes-zoster surveillance data including severe case hospitalisation, the data is supplied by an expert group identified by ECDC.

Collect and summarize different social (for example age divided) mixing data from the following sources:

Anderson and May, WAIFW (Who Acquires Infection From Whom) matrix [1]
Wallinga et al. [2]
Contact data collected by POLYMOD project [3]
Time use data [4]

Produce a manuscript for a peer-reviewed journal about available epidemiological and social mixing data and how these can be used for modelling purposes.

WP2 Deliverable: Development of a mathematical model for estimating effects of varicella and herpes zoster vaccinations

In parallel with WP1, start developing a mathematical model for the effects of varicella and herpes zoster vaccination. It should be able to forecast:

1. if and when herd immunity for varicella can be reached
2. impact of varicella and herpes zoster vaccination on development of herpes zoster in all age groups
3. effects of giving the vaccines at different ages
4. effects of waning immunity

At least three different social mixing contact structures need to be developed, aiming to model the situation more properly in different countries. This will follow from the work done in WP1.

The model needs to be able to demonstrate effects of different vaccination coverages.

The model needs to take into account the effects of giving different number of vaccine doses (both for varicella and herpes zoster) which can be given at different times. In addition the effect of catch-up vaccination needs to be addressed.
Herd immunity has to be described with the population structure used in the model.

Explain in much detail the numerical accuracy for performing the calculations. Even if exact mathematical expressions, might be able to be derived. When performing calculations, depending on the calculation method, some errors are produced due to the numerical method applied. If the model includes solving differential equations and the Euler method is applied, a more accurate numerical method has to be used as well.

**WP3 Deliverable: Optimal fit of the mathematical model to data, delivery of the model, cost-benefit analysis, peer-reviewed publication**

Apply data fitting of the model from WP2. The program needs also be able to provide a cost-benefit analysis. Provide model documentation. Produce a paper for a peer-reviewed journal about the model including the cost-benefit methodology.

The cost-benefit calculations have to specifically address the variation in the result, depending on the sensitivity of the model assumptions, uncertainties in parameters and the estimation of different costs.

Carry out a number of different methods to measure data fitting. Provide sensitivity analysis on the assumptions in the models. Receive input from public health expertise. The model has to be stable, not only for a stable population in terms of population size, but also allowing for immigration and emigration situations (both movement within Europe and from outside Europe). If a long period is necessary for herd immunity, the natural growing rate on the population size has to be considered. It has to be shown that the obtained solutions are the optimal and stable solutions.

Sensitivity analysis, on the results has to be made rigorously. Not only aiming at varying the parameter values, but also the sensitivity to different model types (statistic, deterministic and dynamical respectively). For parameter sensitivity at least the Latin Hypercube Sampling Method [5] has to be applied, with both flat and non flat prior distributions in the parameter space. Also the sensitivity of dividing the population, into age categories with different cut off points, should be addressed.

The model has to have at least three different mixing assumptions to simulate / represent different kind of populations. For all of these an expression for the basic reproductive number has to be calculated. This in order to describe at what level herd immunity is achieved.

For vaccination strategies, different basic strategies will be given by ECDC, but these have to be able to be changed in the final model. The vaccination modelling should also have a component to adjust for existing country specific vaccine schemes.

Additional output: Mathematical model to be delivered to ECDC including documentation of the model.

**WP4 Deliverable: Development of mathematical models for vaccine preventable diseases**

Depending on ECDC needs and satisfactory performance in WP1-WP3, additional work on a vaccine preventable disease might be requested.
2.7. References


2.8. Amount available for financial support and provisions about the results

The estimated grant for the first two year period of the project (covering all activities in WP1-WP3) is 200,000 EUR. This is however subject to budget availability. The maximum grant amount will be determined time by time, contingent on the available budget and on the work plan of ECDC. Funding available for years three and four is 100,000€ / year, subject to budget availability and the performance on work packages WP1-WP3.

For the activities of the first specific grant agreement, expected to commence in 2009, maximum funding available from ECDC is 100,000 EUR.

The ECDC will contribute 90% of the total eligible costs and the successful applicant will co-finance the remaining 10% of the total eligible costs.

Applicants must apply the Rules on eligibility of costs (see Annex VI of this Call).

The ultimate aim is an active cooperation between ECDC and the successful Applicant/Consortium for the duration of the project.

Ownership of the outcomes obtained during and from the project implementation (action, work packages), including industrial and intellectual property rights, and of the reports and other documents relating to it shall be vested in the ECDC.

Without prejudice to the previous paragraph, the ECDC grants the partner the right to make free use, subject to prior written consent of ECDC, of the results of the project (action) as it deems fit, provided it does not thereby breach its confidentiality obligations or existing industrial and intellectual property rights.
ECDC should be acknowledged / mentioned as provider of funding on all communications meaning the ECDC logo and a disclaimer will be put on all reports, website, bulletins, etc.

All activities and products will be transferred to ECDC after the completion of the agreement. During the project period, a detailed transition plan will be developed in close collaboration with the Coordinator so that at the end of this agreement subsequent activities will be coordinated by ECDC.

2.9. Reporting requirements

The following reports are requested to be submitted:

The reports related to the deliverables of the call for proposal, in particular:

WP1 Deliverable:
Report for a peer-reviewed journal

WP2 Deliverable:
The model (with documentation) to ECDC

WP3 Deliverable:
Report for a peer-reviewed journal on the models developed.
The model (with documentation) to ECDC

WP4 Deliverable:
Report for a peer-reviewed journal

The model (with documentation) to ECDC

The reports related to the financial management of the implementation:

- A financial statement supporting the request for payment: The costs here declared by the partner shall be real, accurately recorded and eligible, in accordance with the framework agreement and the specific agreement. The supporting documents are not requested to be submitted and are kept by the partners, according to their accounting and internal auditing procedures. They must permit direct reconciliation of the costs and revenue declared for the implementation with the corresponding accounting statements and supporting documents, in compliance with Article II.22 - Checks and Audits of the agreement.

- A comprehensive condensed technical report on the implementation

- Relevant written correspondence, including ECDC’s approval on any item mentioned above
2.10. Payments

Payments for the year 1 Specific Grant Agreement will be performed as follows:

- 40% pre-financing upon receipt of a request for pre-financing that can also be submitted together with the agreement for signature.
- 60% interim payment (40% covered by the previous pre-financing) upon receipt of drafts ready for ECDC comments for finalisation, for WP1 and WP2.
- 40% final payment upon receipt and approval of a final invoice, final financial and technical report, the related supporting documents, all the deliverables and scientific paper ready for submission.

For specific grants agreements for the successive years, the payment schedule will be established when there is the request for resources allocation and budget.

2.11. Indicative time frame 1st year

Propose a detailed work plan and timeline (i.e. Gantt chart) for the implementation of year 1, considering that the major part of the implementation is expected by mid November 2009, and the finalization by the first half of 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>WP n (title of work package)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>(name of activity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12. Implementation of the Work Packages in years 2 to 4

By the end of each October, the successful applicant is requested to present a detailed description of each of all the Work Packages, for the deliverables concerning each next year, including the relative budgets and workplan, with timeline, approach and list of milestones and deliverables.

3. CONTENT OF THE APPLICATION

3.1. THE DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION IS 5 MAY 2009

3.2. The proposal to submit to ECDC should include:

- An outline of the whole project.
- A detailed description of the planned work for collection of requested data (WP1) and model development (WP2), together with a detailed list of the
countries/institutions that are planned to be part of the consortium, with an explanation of the allocation and carrying out of the contributions of the consortium partners.

- An outline of further activities to be conducted under WP3.

- An outline for further modelling on other vaccine-preventable diseases, WP4, which will be indicated by ECDC during the previous phrases implementation. WP4 can be repeated eventually more than once.

The detailed description of activities and deliverables for WP3-4 activities will only be discussed and negotiated afterwards, based on an invitation by ECDC to submit a proposal in accordance with Article I.4 of the framework partnership agreement and taking into account the budgetary context at that time.

The proposal from an Applicant should include a technical and budget proposal per Work Package.

3.3. Management and Communication Plan

A preliminary project Management plan should be designed and submitted as part of the proposal for this grant.

The Management plan should clearly describe members of this consortium (Associate Partners) and delineate responsibilities. It should describe the project organisation i.e. a Coordinator, Project Leader, Project Manager, Associate Partners. The Management Plan should also include a Communication Plan (see below). Description of project organisation should also include the interaction with the Steering Committee. A project organigram showing links between participating partners should be included.

The Communication Plan should outline both internal and external communication.

(a) The internal component of the Communication Plan should include organising, conducting and chairing meetings of the Management Team.

(b) The external component of the Communication Plan relates to the dissemination of the final results and should be further detailed.

4. EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSALS

After having verified the compliance with all the submission requirements (see 4.1), ECDC selects the admissible proposals through a procedure that involves 4 types of evaluation criteria in this order:

(1) eligibility criteria (see 4.2),
(2) exclusion criteria (see 4.3),
(3) selection criteria (see 4.4),
(4) award criteria (see 4.5).
If the submission requirements are not met, the proposal is not passed to the next step of the evaluation criteria. If one of the evaluation criteria is not met, the proposal is not passed to the next steps of the evaluation criteria. It is therefore essential to complete the proposal in full and provide all the supporting documents requested. The proposal proposed for award is the one, among those evaluated with the award criteria, which has the best score.

An Evaluation Committee will be established in accordance with article 116 of the Financial Regulation and article 178 of its Implementing Rules in order to evaluate the submitted proposals. ECDC intends to finalise the evaluation of proposals within one month since the final deadline for submission of proposals. In compliance with article 116 (3) of the Financial Regulation, the applicant will be informed in writing of the decision on their proposal. Please note that ECDC has the right not to award a grant and to cancel the procedure at any time before the signature of the agreement without any compensation to be paid to the applicants.

General principles:
In compliance with the Financial Regulation and its Implementing Rules, the proposals must comply with the following principles:
• **Co-financing rule**: external co-financing from a source other than EU budget is required as indicated in part 2.7.
• **Non-profit rule**: the grant may not have the purpose or effect of producing a profit for any of the applicants;
• **Non-retroactivity rule**: the costs eligible for financing must be incurred after the starting date stipulated in the agreement;
• **Non-cumulative rule**: only a single EU grant may be awarded for a specific project carried out by a given beneficiary in one financial year.

4.1. Verification of submission requirements

The following will be assessed:

• **The final deadline for submission of proposals**: If this deadline has not been respected the proposal will automatically be rejected.
• **The proposal is duly signed** by the duly authorized representative of the consortium. If the proposal is not signed then it may be rejected on that sole basis.
• **The proposal is complete, including all supporting documents and in accordance with the model structure (Annex I)**. If any of the requested information/documents is missing or is not complete the proposal may be rejected on that sole basis.

The proposal which meets all the submission requirements will be considered admissible and will pass to the next stage of evaluation process – verification of eligibility criteria.

4.2. Eligibility criteria

Consortia consisting of at least two partners (natural/legal persons, private or public), these partners being established in different ECDC member countries (the 27 EU Member States and EEA/EFTA counties which are Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway), are eligible.
A **LEGAL ENTITY FORM** has to be completed and signed separately by the applicant (each partner of the consortium). This legal entity form should be returned together with a copy of the public legal act establishing the entity in question or failing that, any other official document attesting to the establishment of the entity, clearly indicating it pursues public interest objectives. ECDC provides a template to be used – Annex V.

### 4.3. Exclusion criteria

Article 114(2) of the Financial Regulation states that “Grants may not be awarded to applicants who are, at the time of a grant award procedure, in one of the situations referred to in Articles 93 and 94”. Accordingly, applicant and possible partners must certify that they are not in one of the following exclusion situations:

(a) they are bankrupt or being wound up, are having their affairs administered by the courts, have entered into an arrangement with creditors, have suspended business activities, are the subject of proceedings concerning those matters, or are in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure provided for in national legislation or regulations;

(b) they have been convicted of an offence concerning their professional conduct by a judgment which has the force of *res judicata*;

(c) they have been guilty of grave professional misconduct proven by any means which the contracting authority can justify;

(d) they have not fulfilled obligations relating to the payment of social security contributions or the payment of taxes in accordance with the legal provisions of the country in which they are established or with those of the country of the contracting authority or those of the country where the implementation is to be performed;

(e) they have been the subject of a judgment which has the force of *res judicata* for fraud, corruption, involvement in a criminal organisation or any other illegal activity detrimental to the Communities' financial interests;

(f) following another procurement procedure or grant award procedure financed by the Community budget, they have been declared to be in serious breach of contract for failure to comply with their contractual obligations.

In addition, grants may not be awarded to applicants who, at the time of the selection procedure:

(a) are subject to a conflict of interest;

(b) are guilty of misrepresentation in supplying the information required by ECDC as a condition of participation in the award procedure or fail to supply this information.

(c) find themselves in one of the situations of exclusion listed above.

Applicants must certify that they are not in one of the situations listed above by signing the attached Declaration on Honour (Annex IV). The Declaration on honour is to be completed and signed separately by each consortium partner.
The *consortium with which the partnership agreement will be signed* must provide evidence confirming the declaration referred to in the previous point.

### 4.4. Selection criteria

#### Financial capacity:

Evidence of the *consortium’s* economic and financial capacity shall be furnished by the following documents:

- Commitment to provide the necessary financial coverage for the project implementation cash flows and for the 10% co-finance requirement, in order to maintain the consortium’s activity throughout the 4 year partnership period;
- for private partners: profit and loss accounts, balance sheet for the last financial year for which the accounts were closed (and audit reports by an approved external auditor certifying the accounts for the last available financial year).

If, for any valid reason, the service provider is unable to provide the references requested by the contracting authority, he may prove his economic and financial standing by any other document which the contracting authority considers appropriate.

#### Technical and professional capacity:

Evidence of the *consortium’s* technical and professional capacity to carry out the envisaged project shall be furnished on the basis of the following documents:

1. Detailed CVs (indicating the level of English language skills) as well as letters of intent of the core staff and key experts of all consortium partners assigned proposed for the project, proving that the *consortium* as a whole has sufficient technical, scientific and management (including financial) experience to implement the project. One of the applicants must have experience in mathematical modelling of infectious diseases (minimum one year fulltime). Having participated in a short course but not applied the methodology does not count as experience in the field.
2. Examples of work done in the areas covered by this call for proposals in the past three years; clearly indicating the role of the contributors.
3. The 10%-rule of minimum co-financing is applied towards the consortium as a whole. To what extent partners contribute to this co-financing is an internal consortium matter. Before awarding any grant through Specific Agreements (SAs) based on Framework Partnership Agreements (FPA(s)), (the) consortium(a) must furnish proof of the amount of co-financing to be provided (Article I.6.2 FPA).
4. A presentation of the organisation of consortium and its internal organisation. Proposals must specify the role, qualifications and experience of each of the members of the consortium.
5. Every consortium submitting a proposal shall nominate a Coordinator who will alone interface with the Centre.
6. Letters of intent of all consortium partners to participate to the project and to provide co-financing to the project for at least 10% of the total eligible costs of the work packages.

7. Language abilities: statement of the candidate’s language abilities. Most of the work will be performed in English. The core staff/key experts must demonstrate a strong ability to draft and operate in this language and provide references to previous work.

4.5. Award criteria

The framework agreement will be awarded to the proposal which will obtain the highest score, taking into account the following criteria; no award criteria and sub criteria others than these will be used to evaluate the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criterion 1: Technical implementation</th>
<th>20 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Understanding of the context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Degree to which the proposed implementation responds in a credible way to the call for proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) How the deliverables are apt be disseminated and have an impact (The above aspects are of the same relative value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criterion 2: Methodology</th>
<th>35 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Soundness of the proposed analytical basis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Soundness of the proposed methodology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Use of the appropriate tools for carrying out the planned tasks (The above aspects are of the same relative value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criterion 3: Project team and management</th>
<th>25 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Allocation and management of resources and expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Coordination and mobilization of the team and possible subcontractors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Realistic time deadlines for completion of tasks and work plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) A group of relevant partners who work together as a multi-disciplinary team (The above aspects are of the same relative value)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award criterion 4: Cost effectiveness</th>
<th>20 points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The extent to which the estimated budget is cost-effective (comparison between estimated cost and anticipated achievement of objectives/results).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minimum attainment per award criterion

Proposals scoring less than 60% for any award criterion will be deemed to be of insufficient quality and eliminated from further consideration.

Minimum attainment overall
Proposals scoring less than 60% after the evaluation process will be considered to be of insufficient quality and eliminated from the following phase.

5. ANNEXES

I. Model proposal (structure)
II. Model of Framework Partnership agreement
III. Form A – Form B – Model of Specific grant agreement
IV. Declaration on honour on exclusion criteria
V. Financial identification and legal entity forms
VI. Rules on eligibility of costs
VII. List of previous/current EU grants
VIII. Estimated Budget