

# Nasveti za pripravo prijavnice

## Ana Klenovšek



Info dan o razpisih LIFE 2025,

21. MAJ 2025

# Content

- Call document
- Application form
- Evaluation process
- General recommendations



# Call document

# Call document structure (1)

## Topics and priorities

0. Introduction

1. Background

What is the LIFE Programme?

Nature and Biodiversity

Circular Economy and Quality of Life

Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation

Clean Energy Transition

**2. Type of action – Objectives – Themes and priorities – Activities that can be funded – Expected impact**

**Type of action**

**Objectives**

**Scope – Activities that can be funded**

**Expected impact**

**Funding rate**

**Additional conditions**

3. Available budget

4. Timetable and deadlines

5. Admissibility and documents

6. Eligibility

Eligible participants (eligible countries)

Consortium composition

Eligible activities

Geographic location (target countries)

7. Financial and operational capacity and exclusion

Financial capacity

Operational capacity

Exclusion

8. Evaluation and award procedure

9. Award criteria



# Call document structure (2)

10. Legal and financial set-up of the Grant Agreements
  - Starting date and project duration
  - Milestones and deliverables
  - Form of grant, funding rate and maximum grant amount
  - Budget categories and cost eligibility rules
  - Reporting and payment arrangements
  - Prefinancing guarantees
  - Certificates
  - Liability regime for recoveries
  - Provisions concerning the project implementation
  - Other specificities
  - Non-compliance and breach of contract
11. How to submit an application
12. Help
13. Important



# Application Forms

# Structure of the proposal

## Structure

- **Part A:** Administrative Forms > generated from your information in the Portal Submission System
- **Part B:** Technical Description > uploaded as pdf (+annexes) in Submission System
- **Part C:** Key Performance Indicators → **NOW: LIFE Project Indicators (LPIs)!**



# Proposal Part A

- Part A: Administrative Forms > generated from your information in the Portal Submission System
  - Description of the action
    - Project summary
    - List of participants
    - List of work packages
    - Staff effort
    - List of deliverables
    - List of milestones
    - List of critical risks
  - Sector



Participant information (key staff, projects/activities, affiliates)

# Proposal Part B

- **Structure of Part B**

Cover page

Table of contents

Project Summary (from Part A)

## **Watch out:**

- **character and page limits!**
- **DO NOT REMOVE INSTRUCTIONS!**



# Proposal Part B (2)

## 1. Relevance

- Background and general objectives
- Specific objectives
- Compliance LIFE and call topic
- Concept and methodology
- Upscaling of other EU projects
- Complementarity with other actions
- Synergies and co-benefits LIFE; and other policies

### Award criterion 1: Relevance (0-20)

- Relevance of the contribution to one or several of the specific objectives of the LIFE programme and the targeted sub-programme;
- Extent to which the project is in line with the description included in the call for proposals, including, where relevant, its specific priorities;
- Soundness of the overall intervention logic;
- Extent to which the project offers co-benefits and promotes synergies with other policy areas relevant for achieving environment and climate policy objectives.



# Proposal Part B (3)

## 2. Impact

- Ambition of the impacts
- Credibility of the impacts
- Sustainability of results
- Exploitation of results
- Catalytic potential – replication and upscaling

### Award criterion 2: Impact (0-20, weighting factor 1.5)

- Ambition and credibility of impacts expected during and/or after the project due to the proposed activities, including potential negative impacts on the other specific objectives of the LIFE programme, including ensuring that no substantial harm is done to those objectives.
- Sustainability of the project results after the end of the project.
- Potential for the project results to be replicated in the same or other sectors or places, or to be up-scaled by public or private actors or through mobilising larger investments or financial resources (catalytic potential).
- Quality of the measures for the exploitation of project results.



# Proposal Part B (4)

## 3. Implementation

- Workplan
- Stakeholder input and engagement
- Work packages and activities
  - Objectives and results
  - Activities and tasks
  - Milestones and deliverables
- Timetable
- Impact monitoring and reporting

Communication, dissemination and visibility



### Award criterion 3: Quality (0-20)

- Clarity, relevance and feasibility of the work plan;
- Appropriate geographic focus of the activities;
- Quality of the plan to monitor and report impacts;
- Identification and mobilisation of the relevant stakeholders;
- Appropriateness and quality of the proposed measures to communicate and disseminate the project and its results to different target groups.

# Proposal Part B (5)

## 4. Resources

- Consortium set-up
- Project management
- Green management
- Budget
- Risk management

### Award criterion 4: Resources (0-20)

- Composition of the project team - of a consortium or of a sole beneficiary - in terms of expertise, skills and responsibilities and appropriateness of the management structure.
- Appropriateness of the budget and resources and their consistency with the proposed work plan.
- Transparency of the budget, i.e. the cost items should be sufficiently described.
- Extent to which the project environmental impact is considered and mitigated, including through the use of green procurement.. The use of recognised methods for the calculation of the project environmental footprint (e.g. PEF or OEF methods or similar ones) or environmental management systems (e.g. EMAS) would be an asset;
- Value-for-money of the proposed project.



# Proposal Part B (6)

## 5. Other

- Ethics
- Security

## 6. **Declarations** (funding rate, double funding, third parties)

## Annexes

- Detailed budget table
- Annual activity reports (optional for some calls)
- List of previous projects
- other



# Annex: detailed budget table

1. Staff costs
2. Subcontracting
3. Other direct costs
  - Travel
  - Equipment
  - Other goods
  - Infrastructure
  - Third parties
  - Land purchase



Detailed Budget Table								
LIFE XXX								
<b>Important:</b> You may address but no additional take. This may result in your proposal being considered inadmissible. Please ensure that the file can be printed as a format of 1 page wide (number of pages depending on the number of participants). Please make sure that the figures in this table are consistent with the total budget provided in part A section 3 of the application. In case of inconsistency, part A will prevail.								
<b>Staff effort allocation</b> Fill in the effort per work package and Beneficiary/Affiliated Entity. Please indicate the number of person-months over the whole duration of the planned work. Adapt the columns to the number of work packages in your proposal. Identify the work package leader for each work package by having the relevant person-month figure in bold.								
Participant Number/Short Name	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WPx	Total
1. Bidibi	61.66	9.06	41.09	18.54	17.08	19.06		<b>166</b>
2. Badibi	5.356	5.15	5.15	25.749	18.539	5.356		<b>65.3</b>
3. Boom	0.76	0.76	0	8.84	0	0.29		<b>10.7</b>
4. &Co.			0	7.3	0			<b>7.3</b>
<b>Total person-months</b>	<b>67.8</b>	<b>14.97</b>	<b>46.2</b>	<b>60.4</b>	<b>35.6</b>	<b>24.7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>
<b>Personnel costs</b> Present your estimated "Personnel costs" split into 2 categories as per the table below. If you do not have any personnel costs falling under "A.4 SME owner and natural person beneficiary" or "A.5 Volunteers", all personnel costs should be budgeted under "A1. Employee (or equivalent)"; A2: Natural person under direct contract and A3: Seconded Person".  For A.4 SME owner and natural person beneficiary, please note that as per Annex 2 of the LIFE General Model Grant Agreement (MGA), a unit cost is applied to this cost category. The unit is the days spent working on the action (rounded up to the nearest half-day) and the amount per unit (daily rate) is calculated according to the following formula: (EURES 6000) 16 days - EUR 262,22 per day) multiplied by (country specific correction coefficient of the country where the beneficiary is established) Note that the country specific correction coefficient to use is the one applied for the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions (MSCA). Yearly rates are published in the Horizon Europe Work Programme - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions under the funding and tender portal Reference Document (work programme and call documents section), available at <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/applicants/participants-and-support-entities/european-council/program-calls-horizon">http://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/applicants/participants-and-support-entities/european-council/program-calls-horizon</a> .								
Participant Number/Short Name	Country	Number of person months (staff effort per beneficiary)	Average monthly salary rate	A1. Employee (or equivalent); A2. Natural person under direct contract	A.4 SME owner and natural person beneficiary (Unit cost in I)	Subtotal personnel costs without volunteers (A1+A2+A3+A4) - must be the same as in part A section 3	A.5 Volunteers (Unit cost) must be the same as in part A section 3	Total Personnel cost
1. Bidibi	Iland	166.49	6,374.16 I	1,061,234 I		<b>1,061,234 I</b>		<b>1,061,234 I</b>
2. Badibi	Ilan	65.30	4,717 I	308,000 I		<b>308,000 I</b>		<b>308,000 I</b>
3. Boom	Zland	10.65	7,324 I	78,000 I		<b>78,000 I</b>		<b>78,000 I</b>
4. &Co.	Maan	7.30	5,752 I	42,000 I		<b>42,000 I</b>		<b>42,000 I</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>249.74 I</b>		<b>1,489,234 I</b>	<b>0 I</b>	<b>1,489,234 I</b>	<b>0 I</b>	<b>1,489,234 I</b>
<b>Subcontracting</b> Give details on subcontracted action tasks (if any) and explain the reasons why (as opposed to direct implementation by the participants). Subcontracting - Subcontracting means the implementation of action tasks, i.e. specific tasks which are part of the action and are described in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement. Note: Subcontracting concerns the outsourcing of a part of the action to a party outside the Consortium. It is not simply about purchasing goods or services. We normally expect the participants to have sufficient operational capacity to implement the project activities themselves. Sub-contracting should therefore be exceptional. Include only subcontract that comply with the rules (i.e. best value for money and no conflict of interest; coordinator tasks can normally not be subcontracted).								
Participant Number/Short Name	Subcontract Description	Cost (I)	WP	Justification (Why is subcontracting necessary?)				
1. Bidibi	Support from expert civil engineering party @ I XXXX + workshop on how to translate the purifying ecotape concept into the final design of the demonstration project by an expert party @ I XXXX.		2	Expert input required for optimal project design in T.2.1.				
2. Badibi	Expert support geohydrological modelling + processing input from R&D into project design.		2	Expert input required for optimal project design in T.2.1-T.2.2.				

# Evaluation process

# Parties involved in the evaluation

- External experts + Coordinator
  - Each proposals assessed by 2 independent experts and each expert fill one Individual Assessment per proposal
  - Third evaluation in case of disagreement
  - Coordinator writes one Evaluation Summary Report per proposal
- CINEA Project Advisers
  - Quality control process
  - Moderate the panel meetings
  - Prepare for Evaluation Committee (CINEA + DG)
  - Propose overall ranking across all panels / topics
- CINEA is Granting Authority:
  - Takes final Award Decision
  - Head of Unit signs Grant Agreements



# Award criteria SAP

## 1. Relevance =

Policy+Project macro approach

## 2. Impact =

Impact+Sustainability, Exploitation & Replication

## 3. Quality =

Clarity+Feasibility+Appropriateness few specific aspects

## 4. Resources =

Project team+Budget+Project env. footprint

## 5. Bonus points (0 or 2) =

LIFE synergies+Outermost Regions+Result of EU projects+Catalytic potential+Transnationality



Award criteria	Minimum pass score	Maximum score	Weighting
Relevance	10	20	1
Impact	10	20	1.5
Quality	10	20	1
Resources	10	20	1
<b>Overall weighted (pass) score (without bonus)</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>90</b>	N/A
Bonus 1	N/A	2	1
Bonus 2	N/A	2	1
Bonus 3	N/A	2	1
Bonus 4	N/A	2	1
Bonus 5	N/A	2	1
<b>Overall weighted (pass) scores (with bonus)</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>90 to 100</b>	N/A

# Bonus 1 Synergies

The proposal offers exceptional synergies and promotes significant co-benefits between **LIFE sub-programmes**. (2 points).

Synergies need to be exceptional, clearly described, well developed, justified in the proposal including in the project tasks. The project needs to **bring substantial concrete benefits to those other areas** (contribute to the priorities/objectives of the other sub-programmes). These benefits need to be quantified (i.e. through KPI indicators) and their monitoring should be foreseen

Requirements:

- They are clearly described, well developed, justified in the proposal
- The project brings substantial concrete benefits to those other areas (contribute to the priorities/objectives of the other sub-programmes)
- These **benefits are quantified (i.e. through indicators) and monitoring is foreseen**
- [The data eventually collected is further used to inform...]



## Bonus 2 ORs

The proposal is primarily implemented in the Outermost Regions. Where specific regional features are relevant to the needs addressed in the call for proposals, e.g. islands for waste, coal-intensive regions for clean energy, etc., the bonus could be extended to other geographical areas with specific needs and vulnerabilities (2 points).

The European Union (EU) counts nine outermost regions. These are: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Reunion Island and Saint-Martin (France), Azores and Madeira (Portugal), and the Canary Islands (Spain).

Focus on 'primary implementation' in the described territories



# Bonus 3 Uptake

The proposal substantially builds on or up-scales the results of other EU funded projects. (2 points).

The use of the concrete results of other projects needs to be **clearly demonstrated in the intervention logic/actions and necessary to achieve project objectives**. The proposal must be clear about how the results of other EU projects will be used. The mere transfer of best practices and experiences, while welcomed and encouraged in LIFE projects, is not sufficient to obtain this bonus point.

Best practice: methodology/procedure widely applied to solve the problem addressed, a standard practice that you can find in any other project addressing the same issue

Focus on term “**substantially builds on**”



# Bonus 4 Exceptional catalytic potential

**The proposal offers an exceptional catalytic potential. (2 points).**

It is “exceptional” when the strategy in place leads to a **significant multiplication of the impact** of the project itself. The extent of replication is such that it triggers an effect that amplifies the project outcome on a wide scale i.e. in other sectors or cities, at regional or country level, in other countries, etc..

An exceptional catalytic potential entails a wider approach (intentional) capable of generating a substantial effect at a significant scale. The project could include, for example, coordination and cooperation with a substantial number of relevant actors at EU, national, regional and/or local level, develop a business case that triggers opportunities for further financing, etc.

Example: LIFE SAFELINES FOR BIRDS: Concrete and ambitious objectives for replication (e.g. replication in at least three countries; deploying similar measures in all new breeding sites of G. barbatus, A. monachus and N. percnopterus; involvement of at least 5 NGOs and 5 new grid operators); planned concrete activities with stakeholders from other sector (railways); obtained letters confirming their interest



## Bonus 5 Transnationality

The proposal envisages a transnational cooperation among Member States essential to guarantee the achievement of the project objectives. (2 points).

Implementation of the project activities in two or more countries is a precondition to receive bonus points. The cooperation must be essential to reach the objectives. In addition, the proposal should convincingly describe the environmental / climate benefit of the activities implemented in each of the countries.



# Scoring

Score	Meaning
18-20	<b>Excellent</b> - The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.
14-17	<b>Very good</b> - The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
10-13	<b>Good</b> - The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
6-9	<b>Fair</b> - The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
1-5	<b>Poor</b> - The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
0	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information



# Recommendations

- Start early!
- Read the relevant information (Call document)
- Limit your objectives and build a credible intervention logic
- Build a relevant consortium
- Link the budget to activities – check value for money
- Follow the template and instructions





**Hvala za pozornost!**