






Annex 2: Details on Cost Claims and Amendment in RP 3

Event	Details Time Line		Reasons for delays	Detailed information
Cost Claim 2 (after second reporting period):	Submission of the Periodic Report: 02.09.2015 Submission of the Cost Claim: 28.09.2015 Acceptance of Cost Claim by EC: 25.04.2016		The Cost Claim was first submitted three weeks after the Periodic Report because the NEF was still in Amendment mode for Amendment 2 (Call I experiments)	09/07/15: Reporting session open in NEF 02/09/15: submission of 2 nd Periodic Report 28/09/15: submission of 2 nd Cost Claim in NEF TUM used the time span of at which the NEF was blocked by Amendment III (29/09/15 – 29/02/16) to clarify all the detailed questions received from the EC.
		Payment discipline: 7 months (instead of 6 months)	Directly after the submission of the Cost Claim the unplanned Amendment III (PDTI RTD consortia) had to be squeezed in. This blocked the NEF for 4 months (29/09/15 – 14/01/16). The Cost Claim session could be re-opened on 29/02/16, the Cost Claim was re-resubmitted on 09/03/16 and approved on 27/04/16.	

Amendment III (inclusion of PDTI RTD consortia)	Call deadline: 14.03.2015 (sewer) / 23.06.2015 (healthcare re-launch, synchronized with Call II experiments) NEF session open: 29.09.2015 Grant Agreement accepted: 26.01.2016		<p>The Amendment II itself was a swift process. "Time consumers" in the process were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The fact that the NEF system was still blocked by the second Cost Claim at the moment when the selection of the consortia was finalized • The re-launch of the healthcare call (which took three months) • The replacement of GIRAFF in the Clark consortium as GIRAFF declared bankruptcy after the selection was confirmed. 	The PDTI consortia were selected in XXX. THE NEF system was blocked with the second Cost Claim until 28/09/15. Then the Amendment was squeezed in (Cost Claim session suspended for 4 months. TUM already started to process the Amendment off-line by seeking the support of the Validation Team to sought out provisional PICs. But it was only after the NEF system was in Amendment mode that inconsistencies between the internal database of the EC, the NEF system and the data submitted to TUM could be identified and checked. We performed "fake" submissions in the system to speed up this clarification process. The physical documents were collected in January 2016.
		Time to grant (call deadline versus signed Grant Agreement): 10 months sewer and 7 months healthcare (instead of 9 months)		
		Planning security (Amendment session open in NEF versus approved Amendment Request): 4 months (instead of 6 months)		
Amendment IV (inclusion of Call II experiments)	Call deadline: 23.06.2015 NEF session open: 27.04.2016 Grant Agreement accepted: 28.11.2016		<p>The reasons for the delay were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEF session was opened 10 months after the call deadline as the NEF was blocked with the second Cost Claim and with the unplanned PDTI 	12/11/16: Communication of Call II results (at that time the NEF was in Amendment mode to process Amendment III). Until early January 2016 verification loops on the data provided by them took place.
		Time to grant (call deadline versus signed Grant Agreement): 17 months (instead of 9 months)		

		Planning security Amendment session open in NEF versus approved Amendment Request): 7 months instead of 6 (yellow traffic light.	<p>Amendment that we needed to squeeze in. as otherwise the PDTI development process of 30 months could not be finalized within the runtime of E++.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validation of partners under H2020 rules instead of FP7 (Indirect Cost Models missing) • Extended LEAR mandate required • Partners had to upload all documents to the portal before Validation Team can process whereas previously a dedicated project manager at the Validation team was the single point of contact and communications loops could be closed by Email correspondence. TUM was not informed about this and needed some time to realize <p>The Amendment itself was managed well within 7 months instead of 6 despite the changes in the Validation process and the holiday period in-between.</p>	<p>05/01/16: 6 provisional and 1 sleeping PIC</p> <p>12/01/16: information that new LEAR mandate form had to be provided (transition from FP7 to H2020).</p> <p>27/04/16: Changes in the approved consortia: AAWSBE1 changed partner Averoff with STENA (non-validated SME) and MAX-ES removed partner IRT SystemX. Analysis had to be done and evaluations to be submitted to demonstrate that this change would not impair the results of the experiment.</p> <p>03/06/16: budget as excel sheet submitted to PO. 13 deviations in Indirect Cost Models (transition FP7 to H2020).</p> <p>It took from 03/06/16 till 03/11/16 to clarify all deviations, have all partners with correct ICM and valid LEAR in NEF, straighten out all budgets (after clarifications first with partners and then with PO) and to collect the correct paper documents from all partners plus the legal signature needed.</p>