



Life
Cyclamen

Οικονομικά στοιχεία Προτάσεων LIFE

Μαριλένα Παπασταύρου
Εθνικό Σημείο Επαφής
mpapastavrou@environment.moa.gov.cy

Εργαστήριο Συγγραφής Προτάσεων 7 Μαΐου, 2019



Life
Cyclamen



General remarks

- Budget must include costs in accordance to Article II.19 of the GC of the Model of Grant Agreement
- All costs are rounded down to the next integer
- beneficiaries cannot act as subcontractors
- internal voicing not permitted
- all contracts should respect conflict of interest
- VAT is eligible
- “Affiliates” should be indicated where appropriate

Criterion for Financial coherence and quality

The following points should be taken into account:

1. Is the budget justified and coherent & are costs adequate to the actions and means proposed?
2. Is the proposed approach cost-effective? Is the project cost-efficient and does it represent value for money?
3. Are costs of all cost categories reasonable, sufficiently described, correctly allocated and compliant with the relevant rules and principles?

Criterion for Financial coherence and quality

- 4. Is the co-financing foreseen compliant with maximum co-financing % and is the budget allocation among beneficiaries justified? EC contribution requested <10 % increase from CN?
- 5. Specific points:
 - 5.1. Direct personnel cost: In cases of civil servant salary costs, has the "+2%" rule been observed?
 - 5.2. External assistance costs: if exceeding 35% of the total project budget, is there a coherent explanation to justify this high level?

Financial Elements for CN stage 1

Proposal status: Draft Concept Note

Budget breakdown cost categories

		Total cost in €	Eligible cost in €	% of total eligible costs
1. Personnel		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
2. Travel and subsistence		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
3. External assistance		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
4. Durable goods				
	Infrastructure	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Equipment	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Prototype	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
6. Consumables		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
7. Other costs		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
8. Overheads		<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	0.00%
Total		0	0	100%

Contribution breakdown

	In €	% of total	% of total eligible costs
EU contribution requested	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0.00%	0.00%
Coordinating Beneficiary's contribution	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0.00%	
Associated Beneficiaries' contribution	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0.00%	
Co-financers contribution	<input type="text" value="0"/>	0.00%	
Total	0	100.00%	

Save



Financial Elements for Full Proposal

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
eProposal (on-line creation and submission of LIFE proposals)

European Commission > Environment > LIFE Programme > eProposal
Session will expire in 29 min

Home Call for proposals **Proposal** Messaging Account

Proposals / Climadapt / Administrative

Proposal status: Draft

Financial part

F1 - Direct Personnel costs
F2 - Travel and subsistence costs
F3 - External assistance costs
F4a - Durable goods: Infrastructure costs
F4b - Durable goods: Equipment costs
F4c - Durable goods: Prototype costs
F5a - Land purchase
F5b - Land lease
F5c - One-off compensation payments
F6 - Consumables
F7 - Other costs
F8 - Overheads
FC - Financial Contributions

Administrative part

Technical part

Attachments

Reports

Proposal exports

Version comparison

Proposal information

General project information

Project title (max. 120 characters) must be in English:

Project acronym (max. 25 characters) must contain the word LIFE:

LIFE Programme priority area:

Sector:

- Agriculture/forestry/tourism
- Infrastructure (e.g. transport, energy, construction/buildings) and Industry
- Health and wellbeing
- Water (incl. flood management, coastal areas, desertification)
- Urban adaptation/planning
- Mountain/Island areas adaptation
- Ecosystem based approaches
- Vulnerability assessments/adaptation strategies
- Industry
- Other


Expected start date:


Expected end date:

National authorities access
Access granted to National authorities in those cases where the applicants 1. Access the proposal before and a 2. Access also the communication b Please note that National authorities in eProposal. ways be modified later.

Lets go step by step ...

[Contact](#) [Legal notice](#) [Logout](#)





EUROPEAN COMMISSION

eProposal (on-line creation and submission of LIFE proposals)

European Commission > Environment > LIFE Programme > eProposal

Session will expire in 30 min
Help needed?

[Home](#) [Call for proposals](#) [Proposal](#) [Messaging](#) [Account](#)

Proposals / Climadapt / Financial Forms / F1 - Direct Personnel costs

◀ Start ◀ Prev Next ▶ End ▶

Proposal status: Draft

Direct Personnel costs Delete all

				Calculation =>	A	B	A X B	
Beneficiary short name	Action number	Type of contract	Category/Role in the project	Daily rate	Number of person-days	Direct personnel costs	Actions	
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>							Refresh
Total						0	0 €	Delete all

How to create costs lines quickly? Use your keyboard keys!

- by default the cursor is on the first field of the new line to be created
- then use tab key to move to the next field (shift+tab keys to move to previous field)
- press Enter key to create that line and move to creating a new line

Beneficiary short name	Action number	Type of contract	Category/Role in the project	Daily rate	Number of person-days	Actions
CLIF ▼	A1 ▼	Permanent staff ▼	<input type="text"/>	0	0	Add



Life
Cyclamen

Ευχαριστώ

Μαριλένα Παπασταύρου

Εθνικό Σημείο Επαφής

mpapastavrou@environment.moa.gov.cy



Life
Cyclamen



Example #1

- The budget is not fully justified, or coherent with the actions. There is an overweight in the proportion of costs spent on media spots (13% of total budget) which is not considered reasonable or cost-efficient in comparison with a not clearly defined expected output.
- The overall investment is not considered reasonable in view of the expected impacts. There would be some actions e.g. X for an unknown number of spots in MS, MS and TC, but it is uncertain how significant the effect will be or how it will be sustained through behaviour change.
- There is evidence in the proposal that some actions would be supported by other sources even if no LIFE funding were made available for these actions e.g. Actions for education and campaign indicate possible overlap with activities already occurring
- Travel outside the EU is not sufficiently justified. Travel costs by NGO for transportation within TC (€X) and for travel to management meetings in MS (€X) are not eligible costs in the project, (as the success of the impacts in MS is not dependent upon these activities).
- The cost for consumables is a high proportion of the total budget (32%) and some are not reasonable, for example, the cost of TV spots, etc.
- Some other costs are for external assistance and should be indicated on Form XX, e.g. trainers. Many “other costs” are consumables and should be indicated accordingly.

Example #2

- Although most costs appear adequate for the proposed actions, the budget is not fully justified; in particular, in Actions XX, there is an overweight in the proportion of costs spent on research activities, such as XX questionnaire and XXX for the DS tool, which are not considered reasonable or cost-efficient in comparison with the expected impact, especially as the applicants highlight that many actions are already well known.
- The value for money of the overall investment is weak in view of the expected impact, because even though the proposal addresses adoption of XXXX, no concrete improvements or impact are targeted within the project duration.
- Whilst the cost categories in Form X are mainly reasonable several weaknesses have been observed. On Form X, high daily rates for XX are not sufficiently explained by the description of staff categories or specific tasks.
- On Form XX, travel costs to dissemination events and conferences are not clearly supported by information on the destination, or duration, of trips and appear overestimated; some cost items for external assistance are lump sums with insufficient detail in the X Forms, which makes it difficult to assess the value for money and the daily fees for external experts. Costs are also not correctly tendered wherever required for non-public entities.

Example #3

- The budget is sufficiently justified and coherent; costs are adequate to carry out the actions by the means proposed.
- The proposal is generally assessed to be cost-efficient and represents value for money against the expected environmental benefits and results to be achieved, as the proposed methodologies will contribute to reduce the amount of xxxx used in the xxxx sector.
- The costs for durable goods on form xx are reasonable, sufficiently detailed and correctly allocated, and appear necessary for the implementation of the proposed actions.
- Overall, the budget is well designed and contains no major weaknesses which would hinder a successful implementation; hence, the project can be approved with a minimal effort of financial revision.

Example #4

- The budget is not fully justified and not balanced. Personnel costs are deemed excessive: they represent 48% of the total budget. Together with the costs of personnel under external assistance, this results in more than 20 FTE. This is not considered reasonable, nor justified, for a 4-year project.
- As the budget is not fully justified, the cost efficiency of the proposal is doubtful.
- Costs are reasonable with respect to national conditions.
- The requested EU contribution represents 75% of the total project costs, which is acceptable for a proposal targeting XXXX, a priority species.
- All costs are correctly allocated in the proposed budget and the budget excludes ineligible costs.
- Personnel costs are high. It is not possible to assess if the time allocation is appropriate, since no breakdown of costs per sub-action is provided and the roles and tasks have not been explained. Particularly high personnel dedications are foreseen for the beneficiaries XX and XX. The daily rates quoted are in line with the respective national conditions.

Example 4 cont.

- Travel and subsistence costs are high, but adequately justified and appropriate for the tasks proposed. High costs are largely due to the international ambition of the project, targeting over XX sites located in different islands.
- External assistance costs and costs for equipment are reasonable, but insufficiently described. They are provided as lump sums, which makes it difficult to assess their value for money.
- Costs for consumables in Form XX are reasonable overall, but provided as lump sums, making it difficult to assess their validity.
- Other costs are presented as lump sums and insufficiently described. An independent audit should also be foreseen for the beneficiary XX.
- Public tendering procedures are adequately foreseen where required.
- Project management costs account for 10% of the total project budget, which is considered reasonable for a project involving seven partners and three countries.
- The proposal is considered moderate value for money, as for a high budget, significant conservation benefits would be gained in over XXX areas. However, these benefits are not fully quantified, and there are doubts about the cost-efficiency of the project.

Example #5

- The budget is not fully justified. In particular, there seems to be a risk of overlap of personnel and external assistance costs. The cost of action x seems underestimated, taking into account the number of xxx that is planned to be installed. Although awareness raising about xxxx plays a crucial role there seems to be an overemphasis in the proportion of costs spent on dissemination activities (around 24%), particularly taking into account that the project is not demonstrative.
- The financial contributions of the beneficiaries/co-financiers, the proposed budget, and the proposed budget expenditures, comply with the rules and principles of the LIFE programme.
- Personnel costs are in line with national conditions.
- Travel and subsistence costs are not clearly supported by the project description in forms xx, and travel destinations, or approximate distances, are not specified.
- Costs for external assistance include lump sums, insufficiently explained.
- The costs for durable goods on forms xxx are reasonable, sufficiently detailed and correctly allocated, and appear necessary for the implementation of the proposed actions. Depreciation rules are correctly applied.

Example #5 cont.

- The costs for consumables are reasonable, but insufficiently detailed (the number of items to be purchased is not provided).
- Other costs are generally sufficiently described. However, an independent financial audit is not included, even though it is required, since the requested contribution of the coordinating beneficiary exceeds € 325,000.
- All costs are correctly tendered where required.
- The project management costs are appropriate considering the project's size and ambitions.
- No ineligible costs have been identified. However, the eligibility of two preparatory actions is not totally clear. Action xx foresees an extensive monitoring, which does not seem justified in the context of a project. Action xx foresees the development of a regional action plan and although the proposal states that it will be adopted and legally binding before the end of the project, no milestone/deliverable or commitment are included.
- The project's value for money is assessed as medium-low, considering that the budget is not fully justified and the conservation benefits are not high.