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<tr>
<td>1</td>
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<tr>
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---

2

I received a message from a member where he stated that Shift2Rail’s associate members are not allowed to take part in consortiums for the upcoming call. However, I remember it was mentioned in a previous conversation that if a member were to participate in IP4, they would be entitled to receive funding.

How can both statements be reconciled?

Is a company actually limited to building a consortium dedicated to ‘Passenger Experience’ with non-associate members only?

If a member could be convinced to take part in IP4, through which channel would they get funding?

---

In the topics labelled as "OC" (Open Call) in the S2R call for for proposal 2018, the participation of non-S2R member is limited to build a consortium only with other non-S2R members and under the other special eligibility conditions per topic.

According to the eligibility criteria listed in the Shift2Rail Annual Work Plan 2018 (section 2.3.4 Standard eligibility conditions), topics labelled OC are open only to entities that are not:

1. Members of the S2R JU (founding or associated),
2. nor constituent entities of Members in the form of consortia or groupings,
3. nor affiliated entities either to the S2R JU Members or to the constituent entities of Members in the form of consortia or groupings.

Please consider that if a Member of the JU happen to be a beneficiary of the consortium replying to a topic labelled "OC", the full consortium will be considered not eligible and therefore excluded from the next steps of the evaluation.

Subject to the conditions of Article 13 and Article 18 of the Grant Agreement, there are no elements which would question the selection of a S2R Member/its affiliated entities and/or linked third as a subcontractor by a beneficiary of an Open Call grant.

Please note that the selection of consultant, organisation, institutes, entities, etc. that will perform action tasks as subcontractors - as per Art. 13 of the Grant Agreement - shall be selected respecting the best value for money principle. All relevant documents regarding the recruitment/selection process should be kept in order to demonstrate that this principle has been ensured (see Art. 18 GA).

For more information about the selection of subcontractor, please refer to the H2020 Annotated Grant Agreement pp 137-140:


Additionally different opportunities are open to non-S2R JU members to participate in research and innovation activities realised by the JU Members (topics labelled as CFM), e.g.:

- be a third party with a legal link with the beneficiary,
- be a subcontractor.
In both cases, the provisions of H2020 Rules of Participations on subcontracting and on linked third parties should be complied with. Finally please note that S2R JU member can participate in CFM topics (and get funding) which linked to the same Innovation Programme where OC topics are launched. Often those topics are marked in the call text as “complementary; this imply a collaboration between S2R JU Members and non-JU Members during the two or more parallel projects execution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Would it be possible (and would make sense) for a JU-member to apply for a call for tender? In particular, the one related to “Study on railway bridge dynamics” of the AWP 2018.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The answer is yes. Under the amended S2R 2018 Work Plan participation in Open Call for tenders (relevant within the IP2 and IP3 scopes and within the framework of the S2R JU MAAP) is also open to any Shift2Rail JU Founding or Associated member, including the constituent entities of members in the form of consortia or groupings, or affiliated entities either to the Shift2Rail JU members or to the constituent entities of members in the form of consortia or groupings. Nevertheless, in accordance with the Shift2Rail JU’s statutes (article 17- Allocation of the Union contribution) if a Shift2Rail JU Founding or Associated member is awarded with the contract, as an EU contribution, the amount received by the Founding Member or the Associated Member under this contract, and during its whole duration, should be counted against the S2R contribution planned to be received in accordance with their respective Membership Agreement and taking into consideration the maximum co-funding expected to be received in accordance with the S2R Regulation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 | S2R-OC-IP3-01-2018 – Measuring and monitoring devices for railway assets  
1. The call identifies 2 separate work streams, do you advice that at some point to have interaction between them?  
2. The call is close to market, do you expect a ready-to-implement software/hardware as a result? Can the result have different modules with different levels of TRL?  
3. In WS2, section track geometry monitoring, is specified for vehicles with speeds between 60 to 200 km/h, do you advise to also address lower speeds e.g. 40 km/h to take in account urban rail transport? |
|---|---|
|   | The call topic clearly states that “the proposed research should address one or both the following two work-streams...”, therefore your proposal should covers either one or both of them. The structure of the work plan and interactions is entirely up to you to decide. The evaluators will evaluate the quality and efficiency of the implementation based on aspects such as the coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, the appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, etc. These are aspects to be described by you and you may choose the best way to address them. Please refer to the “Topic conditions and documents” you can find in the Participant Portal under the topic you are interested to for more detailed information.  
The topic text indicate the TRL level expected for the main deliverables. You can find the Technology Readiness Level definition here: https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/data/ref/h2020/other/wp/2018-2020/annexes/h2020-wp1820-annex-g-trl_en.pdf  
The topic text also indicate the expected developments. It is up to the applicant to decide what it considers appropriate to propose for best answering the call text. |
| 5 | The Participant Portal shows the new call for proposals S2R-CFM-IP1-01-2018
Development of technology demonstrators for the next generation of traction systems and adhesion management systems
In the section “Topic conditions and documents” on this page as well as in the Annex 1 of the Amended Annual Work Plan and Budget for 2018 https://shift2rail.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/Ares-182422-Annex-1-S2R-1.pdf it is mentioned, that the call is for S2R JU Members.
Representing an affiliation that is not member of S2R, does this mean, that we cannot participate at all in this call or only being part of a joint proposal together with at least one member? | Please refer to answer to question 1 |
|---|---|
| 6 | I have a question regarding the IP3 Open Call funding scheme (S2R-OC-IP3-01-2018).
IP3 OC is an Innovation Action for which the funding for profit organisations is set at 70%. I would like to know whether the In-kind contribution (equal to 2,035,714 €) that has been specified here, represents the value of the 30% of total costs that cannot be reimbursed (due to the 70% funding rate for profit organisations)? As this value will depend on the number of profit organisations involved in the | Yes, your reasoning is correct.
The AWP 2018 makes reference to the 30% corresponding to In-kind contribution. This amount represent a maximum amount should all the beneficiaries be funded at 70% (considering the project’s budget is in line with the budget published in the AWP).
In principle, IA actions are funded 70% while non-profit beneficiaries/LTP participating in this actions may be reimbursed at 100% (Article 5 AMGA). According to their reasoning, I would say yes, the amount is the maximum in case all the beneficiaries are profit companies, but will decrease in case of several non-profit ones.
For Open Calls the rules of H2020 are applicable, please see AMGA. |
| consortium, the number may be lower if more non-profit organisations are part of a consortium. Is it correct that this figure represents the maximum in-kind contribution in case all partners are profit organisations?

Could you please explain if this reasoning is correct, and how should partners take it into consideration when building the budget?

| I have a question concerning:


In the document:


on page 91 -- I have found the following statement:

The proposed options must remain compatible (as much as possible) with the approach currently developed within IP4², to allow the adaptation of the interoperability framework mechanisms developed in the parallel complementary project CONNECTIVE (S2R-CFM-IP4-01-2017).

I went to the page:


and found out that, for all practical purposes, there is nothing there.

| The S2R programme is established in a way that projects might be complementary to each other and this is reflected in the Annual Work Plans. The complementarity is defined a topic level, and in the case of S2R-OC-IP4-01-2018, the complementary project is S2R-CFM-IP4-01-2017 (CONNECTIVE). This means that both CONNECTIVE and the successful proposal on S2R-OC-IP4-01-2018 will have to sign a Collaboration Agreement to agree on their interactions in order to ensure alignment, agree on tasks, background and results.

During the proposal phase, you might refer to the project website of CONNECTIVE to see their objectives, structure, partners, contact details and available deliverables. Moreover, you might want to see the topic description answered by CONNECTIVE (AWP2017 available here: https://shift2rail.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/S2R-JU_AWP2017_Amendment-2_FINAL.pdf). Finally, as stated in the topic description, information on previous S2R activities on the interoperability framework, including public deliverables and brochures, can be found on the S2R website:


For further information, please find the presentation done during the AWP2018 info day: https://shift2rail.org/uncategorized/shift2rail-information-day-open-call-proposals-2018-presentations-now-available/
As a matter of fact, the following information is posted:

CONNECTIVE Technical workshop
6 February 2018
CONNECTIVE’s first technical workshop to work in the design and specifications this means that the project has -- at the time of this mail -- completely nothing ready / public that anyone could align to --> as the first workshop on design and specification will take place on this coming Monday.

Hence my question – how can the expected proposals be aligned to something that does not exist / is not publicly available? Is there some document that describes what we should be aligned to that I have missed? Could you please point me to it?