Welcome and Introduction

Massimo Garbini
SDM Managing Director
Agenda - Launch Event

- 09:30 - 10:00 Participants registration
- 10:00 - 10:15 Welcome and Introduction
- 10:15 - 14:45 2016 CEF Transport Call for Proposals
  - 10:15 - 11:15 Objectives of the 2016 CEF Transport Calls for Proposals
    - Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme
    - Deployment Programme
    - Feedback on Indications of Interests
    - 10:55 - 11:15 Questions & Answers (10 min for collecting the questions and 20 minutes for answering)
  - 11:15 - 14:15 Preparing the proposals under SDM coordination
    - CEF proposal response SDM support
    - Process of submission of the proposals
    - Technical and Administrative roadmaps

12:15-13:00 Lunch Break

- Application Forms Parts A, B, C and D
- Zoom on IP Description
- Zoom on IP Performance Aspects
- 13:45 - 14:15 Questions & Answers (10 min for collecting the questions and 20 minutes for answering)

- 14:15 - 14:45 Next Steps
  - Assessment and evaluation process
  - SGA preparation phase
  - 14:30 - 14:45 Questions & Answers (5 min for collecting the questions and 10 minutes for answering)

- 14:45 - 15:00 Closure of the meeting
- 15:00 - 16:00 Workshop on how to fill in draft IP Description and related Q&A
Objectives of the 2016 CEF Transport Calls for Proposals

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager

Mariagrazia La Piscopia
Deputy Director of Technical and Operations and DP Planning Manager
Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager
Under the **Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)**, €22.4 (net of Financial Instruments and Programme Support Actions) billion will be made available from the EU’s 2014-2020 budget to co-fund transport infrastructure projects in the EU Member States. Within this overall amount, €11.3 billion will be available only for projects in Member States eligible for the **Cohesion Fund**.

### Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme 2014-2020

**Financing instruments for Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund</th>
<th>Cohesion Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€11.1 billion</td>
<td>€11.3 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-funding rate up to 20% or up to 50%</td>
<td>Co-funding rate up to 85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FO-1**
- Removing bottlenecks and bridging missing links (~80% of maximum budget)

**FO-2**
- Ensuring sustainable and efficient transport in the long run (~5% of maximum budget)

**FO-3**
- Optimising integration and interconnection of modes and enhancing interoperability (~15% of maximum budget)

---

**EU Member States**

**EU Member States with GNI per inhabitant <90% of the EU average**

---

Four 2016 CEF Transport calls have been launched by INEA under two Work Programmes:

**2016 INEA CEF Transport Calls**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Work Programme</th>
<th>Multi-annual Work Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General envelope</td>
<td>General envelope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>€ 190 million</td>
<td>€ 650 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core and Comprehensive network</td>
<td>Core network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect with neighbouring countries</td>
<td>Rail interoperability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Services</td>
<td>ERTMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight Noise</td>
<td>Innovation and new technologies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesion envelope</th>
<th>Cohesion envelope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>€ 250 million</td>
<td>€ 849.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and new technologies</td>
<td>SESAR €300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Transport Services</td>
<td>Freight Transport Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Freight Noise</td>
<td>Rail Freight Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Community Core Network</td>
<td>Intra-Community Core Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme 2014-2020
Financing instruments for Connecting Europe Facility (CEF)
The 2016 CEF Transport Calls for Proposals, published on the 13th October 2016, make €1.9 billion of funding available for projects of common interest in the transport sector. **General call** is open to all EU Member States, with a total indicative budget of €0.8 billion.
**Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme**
**Cohesion Fund**

**Cohesion call** is open exclusively for proposals in EU Member States eligible for funding from the Cohesion Fund, with a total indicative budget of **€ 1,1 billion**

---

**Connecting Europe Facility (CEF) (2014-2020)**

- **Eligible for CEF funding**
- **Eligible for CEF funding and Cohesion Funds**

**CEF overall budget**

- **€ 1,1 bln Cohesion**

---

**2016 CEF Call**

- **€ 849.5 mln**

**SESAR-related funding**

- **100 mln**

- **11.3%**

- **Around 80% of the SESAR-related budget is explicitly linked to Common Projects**

---

**Entities from Third Countries may participate in projects of common interest, whether included in the scope of Common Projects and being necessary and indispensable for the achievement of the objective of a Common Project**

---

**Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia**

---
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With the IR N.409/2013 a new governance has been established for the SESAR Deployment.

On 5th of December 2014 the SESAR Deployment Alliance has been appointed as the SESAR Deployment Manager (SDM) by the European Commission (EC) to synchronize and coordinate the modernization of Europe’s air traffic management system, under the political oversight of the European Commission.
Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme
2016 CEF CALL: From Indications of Interest to Execution phase (1/2)

- Participation to CEF Transport calls through **SDM coordination** is mandatory for any candidate project which is PCP related in order to comply with CEF eligibility criteria and to ensure full alignment with **Deployment Programme (DP)**

- **SDM** acts as “**coordinator**” of all Implementing Partners’ responses to the CEF Call for Proposals

- **SDM** will oversee processes to be followed by the Implementing Partners in order to comply with its role as “gateway” to INEA to accomplish requests and agreed deadline, facilitating the access to EC Funds
The European Commission is working on the Deployment Programme (DP) 2016 released by SDM. DP is the reference and driver of the technical content for the 2016 CEF Transport Call for proposals.

**Logical Flow**

- **2016 CEF Calls Sneak Preview on 27th September**
- **2016 CEF Calls Publication on 13th October**
- **TODAY**
  - **2016 CEF Calls Launch Event on 27th October**

The diagram shows the following steps:

- Deployment Programme 2016
- Indication of Interest
- SDM supports to 2016 CEF CALLS responses preparation
- IPs Data Collection
- IP clustering in integrated proposals for General and Cohesion
- Proposals response preparation

**Steps already performed**

**Upcoming steps**
Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme
Main roles for proposal preparation: Application preparation

**SESAR Deployment Manager**

The objective of the SDM is to assist the Implementing Partners during the preparation of their proposal(s) in response to the PCP related 2016 Transport Call (CEF and Cohesion Fund) to keep them in compliance with:
Funding under CEF Multiannual Work Programme
Main roles for proposal preparation: Application preparation

Implementing Partners (IPPs)

- Implementing Partners (IPPs) are responsible for the implementation of the ATM functionalities in the European ATM Network through the Implementation Projects.
- During the “proposal preparation” process, SDM will provide Implementing Partners (IPPs) with templates for collecting information required for proposals finalisation, in this respect the IPPs are responsible for providing:

  - Technical Information
  - Financial Information
  - Declarations of Compliance to EU Law/Policy
  - Legal and Administrative Information
Deployment Programme 2016

Mariagrazia La Piscopia
Deputy Director of Technical and Operations
and DP Planning Manager
DP 2016 is the sole acknowledged reference for PCP implementation therefore it represents the specification for PCP Part of CEF Call 2016.

It is a robust “project view” to deploy PCP timely through families of synchronised IPs.

It represents the blueprint for the ATM investment plans of the stakeholders impacted by the PCP.

It reports on PCP deployment status, identifying what is left to be deployed, where and by whom.
In order to ensure adherence to the Funding Objectives stated in the Multi-annual Work Programme and better streamline the implementation, the 2016 General Call text identifies a number of priorities.

“Single European Sky - SESAR priority” - "Common Projects"

Implementation projects that support the implementation of specific families identified in the Deployment Programme 2016.

Implementation projects aiming to implement datalink capability in support to AF6 (Initial Trajectory Information Sharing).
Deployment Programme 2016 and 2016 CEF Transport Calls
“Common Projects” Priorities – a) Identified Families in the DP

Implementation projects that support the implementation of specific families identified in the Deployment Programme 2016

**AF1**
- The upgrade of the **Arrival Management function in High Density TMAs** in order to extend its horizon up until 180-200 NM from the arrival airport
- The upgrade of **ground systems and procedures** towards the implementation of **RNP 1 operations** in the High Density TMAs

**AF2**
- The implementation and upgrade of **airport-based systems** to improve **aerodrome surveillance** and support the determination of optimal aircraft surface movement plans, and enabling the detection and alerting of potential route conflicts and collision risks. It refers also to the implementation of **Safety Nets**, both with regard to **ATC support tools and vehicles and aircraft systems**

**AF3**
- The deployment of required **ATM systems upgrades** and the operational implementation of **Free Route Airspace**

**AF4**
- The implementation of an interactive **Network Operations Plan platform**

**AF5**
- The implementation of **newPENS as IP service-based G/G network**
- The setup / establishment of a **Common SWIM Governance Framework**
Implementation projects aiming to **implement datalink capability** in support to **AF6 (Initial Trajectory Information Sharing)**

All projects shall be implemented **in accordance with the Recovery Plan** developed by the **SESAR Deployment Manager**, identifying **actors, milestones and activities needed** to achieve the full DLS implementation.

All projects shall **respect the regulatory deadlines prescribed by Reg. (EU) n. 310/2015**. Costs incurred after the deadlines for the implementation of these projects will not be funded.

Projects presented under the recovery plan must **follow the planning proposed in the applications**. **Major deviations** from the planning or **poor progress** will trigger the relevant provisions on suspension and termination.

The indicative **financial envelope** that is made available for the implementation of the recovery plan cannot exceed **30% of the budget allocated to the Common Projects**.

Deployment Programme 2016
What to check for the IP Description Preparation

Family Description [Chapter 3 – Project View]
- Technical description of the Families to be implemented
- Stakeholders considered as gaps (thus eligible for funding)
- Deployment approach to be followed in the implementation (HOW)

List of Gaps [Chapter 3 - WBS for each Family]
- List of countries/airports where the Family still needs to be implemented (i.e. Gaps towards the full PCP deployment)
- Funding opportunity in percentage of the overall remaining gap to be still addressed

High-level guidelines for CEF Calls
- High-level principles to be followed in the preparation of the CEF proposals (IPs preparation)
The 48 families of the DP 2016 illustrate all implementation initiatives needed towards full PCP deployment. In order to submit proposals, Implementing Partners shall specifically consider:

- **Readiness for implementation and IOC/FOC dates**
- **Description and scope** of the Family
- **List of stakeholder considered as gaps**, thus eligible for funding under the PCP regulatory framework
- **ATM MP references, SESAR solutions and VLDs, Guidance Material, Regulations, etc.**, to be consulted in order to prepare a fully compliant proposal
- Specific **Recommendation for IP proposals**, prepared by SDM and aiming at guiding stakeholders willing to launch initiatives linked to a Family
- **Deployment Approach**, which briefly illustrates the suggested approach to deploy the Family, identifying key milestones to be achieved during the implementation
Deployment Programme 2016
The Family WBSs and the funding opportunity

2.1.1 Initial DMAN

CEF Call 2014 Awarded Projects
- 2015_044_AF2
- 2015_085_AF2

CEF Call 2015 Awarded Projects
- 2015_161_AF2

Identified Implementation Gaps

- Amsterdam Schiphol: 100% 0%
- Berlin Brandenburg Airport: 0% 100%*
- Copenhagen Kastrup: 100% 0%
- Dublin Airport: 60% 40%
- London Stansted: - -
- Manchester Ringway: - -
- Milan Malpensa: 0% 100%
- Nice Côte d’Azur: 80% 20%
- Paris-CDG: 80% 10%
- Paris-Orly: 80% 10%
- Rome Fiumicino: 0% 100%

- Amsterdam Schiphol: 100% 0%
- Berlin Brandenburg Airport: 0% 100%*
- Copenhagen Kastrup: 100% 0%
- Dublin Airport: 60% 40%
- London Stansted: - -
- Manchester Ringway: - -
- Milan Malpensa: 0% 100%
- Nice Côte d’Azur: 80% 20%
- Paris-CDG: 80% 10%
- Paris-Orly: 80% 10%
- Rome Fiumicino: 0% 100%

All Stakeholders may identify the details on what is left to be implemented at Family level in the WBSs included in the Project View, as well as specific information on the funding opportunity.

A percentage indicator represents what is available to request for funding in the upcoming CEF Calls for Proposals.

(*) The gap is considered closed for the Airport Operator.

NB: No information available for Istanbul Ataturk Airport
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Deployment Programme 2016
The “Gaps” notion and the detailed view per Stakeholder

When preparing a Call for Proposal, Operational Stakeholders shall take into account the list of gaps included in the Project View WBS and the related detailed view per stakeholder included in the Monitoring View. For the first time, the DP 2016 lists both what’s left to be implemented (the Family), where (the identified gaps in the WBS) and which stakeholders are called to participate to the implementation (provided in the monitoring View).
Deployment Programme 2016
High-level principles for Operational Stakeholders (1/2)

Addressing the “gaps” identified in the DP 2016

It is expressly recommended to define projects starting from gaps identified in the DP, preferably focused on closing one specific gap instead of spreading the same project over several gaps without closing any and bringing together all stakeholders required to close this gap instead of unnecessary fragmentation.

The “right timing”

It appears essential to submit the “right project in the right call”. The notion of “readiness for implementation” as well as the Gantt charts are there to determine your best timing. It is recommended to focus the next investments to High Readiness Families and in synchronization with the Gantt charts.

Target the “Network Relevant” Gaps

Network-critical gaps have been identified in cooperation with the NM. It is recommended to focus on initiatives crucial to resolve or mitigate the impacts of current performance (mainly capacity and flight efficiency) constraints and bottlenecks, which might hinder the overall performance at network level.
SDM recommends the systematic partnering of the stakeholders involved together in closing the same gap and SDM stands ready to act as a facilitator to ease such regrouping. In this respect, when deemed beneficial for the overall objectives of the initiatives and for the achievement of the associated performance benefits, it is recommended to evaluate the opportunity of liaising between different stakeholders [...] in order for them to present joint proposals in the framework of upcoming Calls.

It is [...] recommended to civil and military stakeholders to enhance the cooperation processes, particular when the DP 2016 identifies that military stakeholders are required to close a gap where civil stakeholders are involved.
Further information will be provided during the focus on “Assessment and Evaluation Process”
Indications of Interest Exercise
Towards Proposals elaboration: high-level feedbacks

Mariagrazia La Piscopia
Deputy Director of Technical and Operations
and DP Planning Manager
Indications of Interest Exercise 2016

What is an Indication of Interest?

A non-binding and voluntary preparatory exercise for Operational Stakeholders to initiate the activities towards the CEF Call 2016

An SDM instrument to support stakeholders in order to ensure better alignment between future proposals and the DP 2016 content

Indications of Interest

A preliminary channel to build joint implementation projects between stakeholders willing to defragment deployment

A living proof that Operational Stakeholders industry is ready to invest in the modernization of the European ATM infrastructure
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Indications of Interest Exercise 2016
Main results of the Exercise

- **201 Indications of Interest**

  - **PCP-compliant**
    - Targeted feedback to raise the future IP quality
    - 104 indications

  - **AF6 related**
    - 17 indications

  - **Closed gap**
    - 5 indications

  - **More information needed for the assessment**
    - 47 indications

  - **Out of PCP scope**
    - Suggested for submission under “Other projects” category
    - 28 indications
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Indications of Interest Exercise 2016
High-level feedback towards Operational Stakeholders - Main topics

PCP and DP 2016 compliance

Link with existing gaps

Push towards full gap closure

Completeness of information

Timing of the implementation

Avoid overlaps and duplications
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Questions and Answers
Preparing the proposals under SDM coordination

Paola Di Giovanni
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DP Realisation Manager
Process of submission of the proposals

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager
Process of submission of the proposals
High level processes (1/2)

- The Technical part of the Proposal including Budget will be elaborated on the basis of 3 iterations between SDM and IPPs.

- The aforementioned sections will be elaborated with the inputs received by the IPPs through the submission of the IP Descriptions.

- The Technical part is finalised also by taking into account the contribution received by the Implementing Partner within the “Other Impacts” section presents within the IP Description (both in the excel template and STAR tool) (*)

(*) As indicated in the Call text Chapter 9, “Impact” is one of the four criteria on which not only the proposal, but each single project will be evaluated.
Process of submission of the proposals
High level processes (2/2)

- Administrative documentations will be elaborated on bilateral Communication/feedback between IPPs and SDM

- Bilateral communications will enable a continuous support to IPPs in order to guarantee the finalisation of the data set of documentation within the deadlines agreed with the Administrative roadmap
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# Process of submission of the proposals

## Overall Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October 2016</th>
<th>November 2016</th>
<th>December 2016</th>
<th>January 2017</th>
<th>February 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W4</td>
<td>W1</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>W3</td>
<td>W4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposal(s) Elaboration

#### Call Publication
- 13-10

#### IP Description
- 13-10
- 21/12

#### Technical+Financial Part (Part D)
- 03-11
- 09-01

#### Administrative+Legal Part (Part A/B/C)
- 09-11
- 05-01

### Preparation of Electronic Submission
- 06-12

### Proposal(s) Package for Member State
- 09/01

### Proposal(s) Submission
- 02-02
## Main Highlights

### Read, Reflect, and Remember

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Read</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ SDM Supporting Material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Call Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Application Forms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Reflect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Call contents and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Think about the evaluators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Remember</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Time flies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Checks prior to submission to SDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Help is available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Read**
   - Calls text
   - Work Programmes
   - Deployment Programme
   - DLS recovery plan
   - FPA_SDM Guidelines for 2016 CEF Transport Calls
   - INEA Guide for Applicants
   - Application forms
   - FAQs INEA
   - FAQs SDM

2. **Reflect**
   - CEF Transport funding is a competitive process based on defined award criteria (**Relevance, Maturity, Impact, and Quality**)
   - Calls have **requirements on applicants**
   - Calls have **requirements on actions**
   - The proposals will be **evaluated on its own merits** and based only on the information provided by the applicant

3. **Remember**
   - Start early and don't forget about the **deadlines** (SDM Roadmaps for finalisation)
   - Preparing a good application requires **time and effort** – as does the resulting project management
   - **Check** if all requested documentation has been submitted to SDM
   - **Help** is available:
     - www.sesardeploymentmanager.eu
     - 2016_generalcall@sesardeploymentmanager.eu
     - 2016_cohesioncall@sesardeploymentmanager.eu
SDM to support IPPs during “responses preparation phase” distributed on 21\textsuperscript{th} of October
the SDM Guidelines describing the support to be put in place to assist the IPPs interest in
CEF Transport Call 2016

1. Introduction (the objectives and structure of the paper)
2. SESAR Deployment Manager’s context and role
3. CEF TRANSPORT MULTI-ANNUAL CALL 2016 – Funding Objective
   • European Commission Evaluation and Selection Process
4. Preparing the Application:
   • 4.1. Part A
   • 4.2. Part B
   • 4.3. Part C
   • 4.4. Part D
5. Proposals Submission Procedure
6. Supporting tools
7. Next Steps: SGA finalization and Execution Phase
8. List of Actions
9. Annexes
Technical and Administrative roadmaps

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager
Technical and Administrative roadmaps

Technical/Financial Roadmap for Proposals Finalisation

- **13/10 Call publication**
- **27/10 Launch Event 2016 CEF Calls**

**03/11**
- **IPPs**: Provision of First Draft IP Descriptions

**10/11**
- **SDM**: Release of the feedback on the First IP Descriptions

**17/11**
- **IPPs**: Provision of the Second Draft IP Descriptions

(*) **DLS IPs will be submitted to SDM from the 2nd round**

**24/11**
- **SDM**: Release of the feedback on the Second IP Descriptions

**03/11**
- **IPPs**: Provision of the Second Draft IP Descriptions

**10/11**
- **SDM**: Release of the feedback on the Second IP Descriptions

**03/11**
- **IPPs**: Provision of: • Final IP Descriptions • Comments on First Draft of Proposals

**07/12**
- **SDM**: • Clustering of the IPs • Release of the First Draft of the Proposals to IPPs

**21/12**
- **SDM**: Release of the Final Draft of the Proposals for Approval

**05/01**
- **IPPs**: Provision of the approval on the Final Draft of the proposals

**09/01**
- **SDM**: Final Drafts to Member States for Endorsement

**02/02**
- **MS**: Member States Endorsement

**06/02**
- **SDM**: Target date for the submission of the proposals (Part A, B, C and D)

One day before the date for submission (7th of February)

(*) **DLS IPs will be submitted to SDM from the 2nd round. Only 2 rounds will be available for the DLS Projects finalisation**
Technical and Administrative roadmaps

Administrative/Legal Roadmap for Proposals Finalisation

- **21/10**: Provision of "Guidelines for 2016 CEF Transport Call responses preparation" by SDM

- **09/11**: Provision of the first draft of the overall administrative/legal documents, Financial and Technical POCs by IPPs

- **16/11**: Provision of Comments on the Administrative/Legal documents by SDM

- **01/12**: Target date for the provision of scanned copies of Administrative/Legal documents by IPPs

- **06/02**: Target date for the submission of the proposals (Part A, B, C and D) by SDM

- **05/01**: Target date for the upload of the overall documents on the TENtec website by SDM

- **06/12**: Appointment of the organization(s) who will be responsible for the MS approval within the State by IPPs

- **06/12**: Start of the elaboration and upload of Administrative and Legal Documents scanned on TENtec website by SDM

- **02/02**: Member States Endorsement by MS

- **09/01**: Request for MS endorsement by SDM

- **07/12**: Status of the Administrative/ Legal documents by SDM

- **27/10**: Launch Event 2016 CEF Calls

- **13/10**: Call publication

- **09/11**: One day before the date for submission (7th of February)

* Continuous interaction between SDM and IPPs aimed at the finalisation of the Administrative and Legal Documents collection
Support 2016 CEF Transport Calls responses preparation: IP Description

The IP Description (both in Excel template and STAR tool) aims at collecting all relevant information by stakeholders about the candidate project to be submitted to INEA in terms of:

- **Technical Aspects**: technical description (e.g. tasks, milestones, deliverables, etc.)
- **Economics**: economic and financial aspects of the project (e.g. HR cost, Travel cost, procurement etc.)
- **Performance**: expected performance of the project (self-assessment performed by stakeholders)
- **Other Impacts**: e.g. Social and Economic Impact; Impact on Competition; Impact on Traffic Management...etc.

First round of submission through the IP Description (excel)

02/12/2016

03/11/2016

17/11/2016

Migration of IPs information and saving with STAR

06/02/2017

Submission of the Proposals to INEA
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Tools to support 2016 CEF Transport Calls responses preparation (1/2)

1. Dedicated email address
   - 2016_generalcall@sesardeploymentmanager.eu
   - 2016_cohesioncall@sesardeploymentmanager.eu

2. Questions & Answers
   - The relevant Questions & Answers will be updated on the dedicated section on SDM website every two weeks

3. Videos
   - Deployment Programme
   - Co-funding for your ATM investment
   - Proposal Preparation
   - Member States involvement
4. SDM website

- www.sesardeploymentmanager.eu

5. Repository

To ensure that each Implementing Partner involved in the Proposals Preparation will get all the documents, **to facilitate the collection of administrative documents** from SDM, and for reasons of Partner confidentiality, **SDM has created a specific repository.**

**Repository** will be structured in two main areas:

1. **Public** - will be used by SDM to share the Drafts of Part D and Budget, and will contain the Call documents, Guidelines, Roadmap and FAQ subfolders ecc

2. **Restricted** - differentiated area for each Partner involved in the responses preparation phase, where all administrative (Parts A, B and C) documentation will be uploaded

6. Bi-weekly to-do list

In order to support the Operational Stakeholders, the SDM will send a “to-do-list” on a bi-weekly basis. This communication will contain a list of all the activities to perform in the upcoming weeks and the administrative/contractual documents to provide with their respective deadlines
Tools to support 2016 CEF Transport Calls responses preparation
Focus on the Repository

The submission of all Administrative information concerning the 2016 CEF Transport Calls Preparation will only be done through the use of STAR.

A dedicated repository has been created where IPPs can upload

- Administrative documentation
- Comments on Part D and Budget

Each Company will have a dedicated folder in which to upload all requested documents
The folders will have the following partition, and will be replicated for each company:

1. Authorisation
2. Form A
3. Legal Entity Form
4. Supporting Documents to LEF
5. Annex B-I, B-II
6. Financial Identification Form
7. Supporting Documents to FIF
8. Financial Capacity Check Form
9. Operational Capacity
10. Supporting Documents-Financial statements
11. Requirements for Third/Neighbouring countries (B-III, B-IV)
12. Form C
13. Supporting documents Form C
14. Annex C-I
15. Comments on Application Form Part D
16. Comments on Budget
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Application Forms
Parts A, B, C and D

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager
According to the INEA “process for the proposal elaboration”, the proposals will be elaborated through the finalisation of the following forms:

**PART A**
Main characteristics of the proposal and budget of the Action

**PART B**
Administrative Information on Applicants

**PART C**
Compliance with Union Policy and Law

**PART D**
Technical Information
Application Forms Parts A, B, C and D

Documentation to be submitted (2/2)

Proposal response Templates

PART A: Main characteristics of the proposal and budget of the Action:

• Brief description of the proposed Action
• EU Member State approval
• Financial information of the proposed Action

PART B: Administrative Information on Applicants:

• Legal Entity Form
• Grounds for exclusion
• Financial Identification Form
• Requirements on Financial and Operational Capacity

PART C: Compliance with Union Policy and Law

• Compliance with EU environmental policy
• Compatibility with EU law on State Aid
• Compatibility with Public Procurement
• Other sources of EU financing

PART D: Technical and Financial Information:

1. General Description of the Global Project
2. Description of the proposed Action
3. Award criteria, relevance
4. Award criteria, maturity of the Action
5. Award criteria, impact of the proposed Action
6. Award criteria, quality of the proposed Action
7. Annexes/supporting documents
Application Form Parts A, B, and C
Major Highlights for proposals finalization (1/2)

Administrative – Parts A, B, C

1. The full batch of documentation needs to be sent once per each company – not one per Project

2. All the documentation needs to be independent for each Cluster. That is, each Company needs to replicate the documentation as many times as the number of Clusters it participates in

3. All documents have to be provided in digital copy. Only the documents that are undersigned have to be provided to SDM both in scanned and hard copy, independently for each Cluster

4. All Action contributors, independently if they are Project Leaders or Project Contributors, need to provide the entire batch of documentation

5. Only one Application Form Part C needs to be sent by each Company, taking into account all Projects under a Company’s responsibility (both as Project Leader and as Contributor)
   - Only if different Projects from the same company require different answers, then multiple Parts C shall be submitted, by making specific reference to which Project each Form refers to

6. All documents must be duly signed, dated and stamped wherever indicated in the Form itself

7. All supporting documents indicated in any of the Form are considered as a requirement, and shall be provided to SDM by the Implementing Partners (whenever applicable)
**Technical & Financial – Part D**

1. **Application Form Part D will be completed by SDM.** Implementing Partners are not requested to submit the Form Part D.

2. **SDM will finalise three Drafts of Application Form Part D** and send them to IPPs for comments/approval (according to the Roadmap).

3. **Part D will be populated by:**
   1. **Elaborating the financial and technical information** provided by the Implementing Partners through their IP Descriptions.
   2. **Taking into account** the contribution received by the sheet “Other Impacts” (e.g., presents within the IP Description (both in the excel template and STAR tool).
   3. **Taking into account** the information provided through the Part C in relation to the compliance of the project with EU policies and law in the fields of environmental protection, interoperability, state aid, public procurement, and other sources of EU funding.
The proposals will be evaluated on its own merits and based only on the information provided by the applicant
Zoom on IP Description

Heiko Teper
DP Realisation Manager
Zoom on IP description
General structure of the description

Technical Aspects
- Project Leader and its contributors
- Start and end date
- Project Objectives
- Associated DP 2016 Gap to be covered
- Main AF, Sub-AF and Family of the DP
- Civil/Mil Coordination
- Description of Works
- Project’s Tasks and their description
- Milestones and Deliverables
- WBS and GANTT Charts
- Risks Register
- ...

Economics
- Breakdown of all costs by project contributor and by task on a yearly basis
- HR costs and associated travel costs
- Procurement and investment costs
- Any other cost to be incurred by the applicant
- Other sources of funding
- Revenues of the proposed IP (if any)

Performance
- Contribution to overall performance expected by the Implementation project
- Self-assessment of the impacts with regard to:
  - Safety
  - Capacity
  - Cost-Efficiency
  - Flight Efficiency
  - Predictability
  - Resilience
- Contribution to performance in any other domain (e.g. Flexibility, Interoperability, Security, etc.)

Other impacts
- Social and economic impact of the Implementation Project
- Approval and/or political commitment
- Readiness/maturity of the project
- Public consultation to put in place in support of the project
- Impact on competition
- Impact on regional/local development
- ...
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The following slides provide “general principles” for the IP description preparation aiming at:

- Ensuring **compliance with the formal requisites** for the project proposals submission
- Guaranteeing **consistency across all IPs** presented within the same proposal
- Facilitating **interactions with the SDM** (both in the proposal preparation and for reporting)
- Allowing **effective monitoring** by the SDM during the execution of the Action

SDM underlines that **all fields of the IP description template** shall be duly and exhaustively filled in for the INEA formal evaluation.

It will be therefore **impossible to include incomplete IP descriptions in the final SDM-coordinated proposal** to be submitted to INEA.
3 main PoCs are requested:

- **Project Manager**
  - Person in charge of the overall project preparation and coordination

- **Financial PoC**
  - Person in charge of the budget and other financial matters

- **Administrative PoC**
  - Person in charge of all administrative/bureaucratic matters

- They can be the same person, but it is highly advisable to indicate 3 different PoCs in light of the specificity of their duties.
- In addition, it might be helpful to include alternate PoCs to ensure immediate responsiveness to interactions with SDM at any stage of project lifecycle, especially in light of day-to-day monitoring.

For each of them it is necessary to indicate:

- Name and surname (without titles, e.g. Dr./Mr./Mrs./etc.)
- E-mail address
- Phone number
The project description should provide an high-level overview of the IP with all necessary information for a complete evaluation of the project.

The main information that should be provided include:

- Implementation objectives of the IP
- Rationale for the inclusion of the IP in the framework of PCP implementation
- Technical and operational concepts
- Specific functionalities within the main Family that the IP is expected to cover
- Current state of play of implementation (for projects already started)
- Envisaged activities (in line with project tasks)
- Any further information adding value from a technical point of view
The eligibility period of the 2016 CEF Call spans from the submission date (7\textsuperscript{th} February 2017) up until 31\textsuperscript{st} December 2020. No project can outlast this specific timeframe.

As specifically pointed out by INEA during the CEF Info Day, it will not be possible to include in the SDM-coordinated proposals those projects whose start date is beyond August 2018 (i.e. eighteen months after the proposals’ submission).
Full alignment between the project’s structure (for instance in terms of tasks) and the project timeframe as a whole shall always be granted

- The **project start date** should correspond to the start date of the first task

- The **project end date** should correspond to the end date of the last task
Zoom on IP description
Technical Aspects – Project Gantt chart/WBS

- The Gantt chart and/or the WBS of the project should be fully consistent with the project technical description in terms of:
  - **Structure of the project**: e.g. preparatory tasks, consequentiality/links among project activities, etc.
  - Number of tasks/milestones/deliverables, etc.
  - **Project duration**: e.g. the timescale stemming from the project description should be the same as the one emerging from the Gantt chart
  - Responsible units within the organisation: they should be the same as in the WBS

Providing a coherent Gantt chart/WBS is key to:
- Guarantee the internal consistency of IP description
- Prevent further interactions during the proposal preparation in order to refine this part of the project description
- Set the way for an efficient monitoring of the project by the SDM during the execution phase
The tasks should represent the IP’s technical and operational aspects in an exhaustive way.

Each task should be accompanied by a clear description and include information on associated milestones, deliverables and costs.

**Description**

The description of each Task should include *inter alia*:
- Activities to be performed within the Task
- Expected results

**Milestones/Deliverables**

At least one key milestone/key deliverable should be associated to each task, in order to allow an effective accomplishment of the task objectives.

**Costs**

At least one cost should be associated to each task (HR, travel, procurement, investment and/or other costs).
Two types of **milestones** should be included in the project planning:

- **“Key milestones”** are always linked to a specific task
- **“Monitoring milestones”** (both for all Families and Family-specific) are not linked to a Task but to the project as a whole

Each **deliverable** should be linked to a specific task

For the elaboration of each deliverable, both a **start date** and an **end date** should be specified

At least **one key milestone** and/or **one deliverable** should be associated to each task
Risks shall be identified **before the project start**, on the basis of a preliminary evaluation of potential elements of uncertainty/complexity and externalities.

At least one risk per project should be identified, so as to allow a **proactive monitoring** of potential elements that might impact on the project execution.

A relevant **mitigation action** should be associated to each risk, describing the possible solutions/initiatives for the mitigation of the risk.

During the **project’s execution phase**, the list of the risks could be however **integrated and complemented**, on the basis of the deployment status, the evolution of the context, the political/institutional situation, etc.
For each organization participating to an IP, the following information shall be provided:

**HR Costs**
- FTEs
- Training Costs
- Non Training Costs
- Travel Costs

**Procurement and Investment Costs**
- Description
- Supplier
- Procurement Procedure
- Status of the Procurement
- Signature date of the Contract

**Other Costs**
- Description of the Costs (Audit costs, certification costs, etc.)

**Overhead Costs**
Overhead costs are not eligible for funding under CEF Framework

All yearly cost entries shall be associated to a specific task and to a specific contributor.

**NB.** Only costs incurred between February 2017 and December 2020 are eligible for CEF funding. All other cost entries will not be considered as part of the budget of the project.
For each task of the Implementation Project, a unique funding rate shall be selected:

- **50%** for studies and ground-based components of the SESAR systems
- **20%** for on-board components of the SESAR systems
- **85%** for all costs eligible for Cohesion Call

Stakeholders shall also indicate all other sources of funding, choosing among:

- State budget
- Regional and local budget
- Applicant funds (including EIB loans)
- Other loans
- Other EU funds (ERDF, FPR)
- Public Private Partnerships
- Other sources
### Zoom on IP description

**Performance Impacts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KPA</th>
<th>Expert Judgement</th>
<th>Direct or Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Prerequisites if yes &quot;P&quot; or &quot;I&quot;</th>
<th>Area of expected benefits (ECAC, name of FAB, ECAC name of AGC, Aircraft)</th>
<th>Start date of Pilot (mm/yyyy)</th>
<th>Full Pilot Expected (mm/yyyy)</th>
<th>% of improvement</th>
<th>Rationale &amp; Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SAFETY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPACITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANS Cost Efficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flight Efficiency in Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Flight Efficiency in Fuel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Predictability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others (Flexibility, Interoperability, Security...)**

#### Cost Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost-Effectiveness</th>
<th>ANS Cost Efficiency</th>
<th>Technology Cost Reduction</th>
<th>Technology Value</th>
<th>Technology Cost Value</th>
<th>Technology Cost Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ANCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*IGOS: Aircraft Manager
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer
*ATCO: Air Traffic Control Officer

Further information will be provided during the Zoom on Performance.
Zoom on IP description

Other Impacts

Social and Economic Impact

Findings and results from the socio-economic analysis associated to the implementation project

Impact on Competition

Positive or negative impacts on regional and national competition

Political commitments to the IP

Description of existing political commitments (government decisions, national plans, etc.)

Readiness / Maturity of the IP

State of preparation of the implementation (signed contracts, already starting, etc.)

Traffic Management, Congestion, etc.

Positive and negative impact on traffic management, congestion, modal split, etc.

Regional / Local Development

Positive and negative impacts on regional and local development (incl. neighbouring regions)

Approval of the IP

Clarification on the status of any necessary approval leading to the beginning of the project

Public Consultation

Public consultation already carried out or to be carried out (stakeholders involvement)

Building Permits

If needed, specify the availability of the needed building permits to proceed with the project

Impact on Environment

Results and conclusions of any environmental assessment conducted in association with the IP
Zoom on IP Performance Aspects

Michel Gorog
Head of Performance and Financial System
Zoom on IP Performance Aspects
Regulation (EU) 716/2014

ATM Functionality (AF)

AF1: Extended AMAN & PNB
AF2: Airports integration & throughput
AF3: Flexible ASM & Free route
AF4: Network Collaborative Mgmt.
AF5: Initial SWIM
AF6: Initial Trajectory Info. Sharing
Zoom on IP Performance Aspects

The process


**Phase 1**
- Project manager fills in the performance grid

**Phase 2a**
- SDM experts check consistency of all projects

**Phase 3a**
- SDM experts initiate CBA with support from NM for AF3 & 4

**Phase 2b**
- SDM experts define the gaps 2016

**Phase 3b**
- SDM experts assess the gaps in terms of expected Performance & CBA

**Award Decision**

**Awarded Projects**

**Remaining Gaps**

**Next CEF Transport Calls**
Chapter 3: Four sheets

- 3. Performance – Guidance
- 3. Performance – Assessment Grid
  - Expert Judgement
  - Direct or Indirect Impact
  - Prerequisite?
  - Area of expected benefits
  - Start date of Perf. / Full Perf. Expected (mm/yyyy)
  - % of improvement
  - Rationale and Facts
- 3. Performance – Definitions
- 3. Performance – KPAs & KPIs
Questions & Answers
Next Steps

Paola Di Giovanni
FPA Coordination Manager
INEA, supported by independent technical experts, carries out a series of preliminary checks on specific requirements and criteria:

- **Admissibility requirements**: a) electronic submission; b) respect of deadline for submission; c) completeness (Part A+B+C+D); d) signature by Applicants
- **Eligibility criteria** (Art. 9 CEF Regulation): a) criteria for eligibility of Applicants; b) criteria for eligibility of Actions
- **Selection criteria** (Multi-annual work programme): a) financial capacity; b) operational capacity
- **Compliance with EU legislation**: Proposals will be requested to demonstrate their compliance with the EU law and policy

Admissible proposals are evaluated against the **award criteria** (Section 9 Multi-annual work-programme):

- **Relevance**: contribution of the proposed Action to the TEN-T priorities, the funding priorities and the specific priorities and objectives
- **Maturity**: state of preparation of the proposed Action and the readiness to start the implementation of the proposed activities
- **Impact**: expected effect of the EU financial support on a financial viability of an economically and socially desirable investment
- **Quality**: soundness of the proposed Action and overall coherence
## Indicative timeline of the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017 (17:00 Brussels local time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>February-May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of CEF Coordination Committee Information of European Parliament</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Selection Decision</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of Grant Preparation</td>
<td>As of July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Grant</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on the evaluation process

Indicative timeline of the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>February-May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of Call Coordination Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information of European Parliament</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of call</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principles

Objectivity
- Eligible, selection and award criteria clearly defined in the work programme and the call for proposals

Equal treatment
- All proposals evaluated against the same criteria
- No preferential treatment to any applicant

Transparency
- Adequate feedback to applicants on the outcomes of the evaluation
Focus on the evaluation process

Indicative timeline of the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>February-May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of Call Coordination Committee</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information of European Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Selection Decision</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of Grant Preparation</td>
<td>As of July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Grant</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation steps

- **Preliminary Checks**
  - Admissibility check
  - Eligibility check

- **Technical Evaluation**
  - Individual assessment
  - Consensus meetings

- **Internal Evaluation & Selection**
  - Draft list of proposals recommended for funding

Admissibility Check

- Proposal submitted **electronically** in TENtec
- Proposal submitted on **time**
- Complete Proposal
- Proposal **signed** by all applicants

Eligibility Check

- **Eligibility of Applicants**
  - Member States
  - Other Applicants with MS agreement

- **Eligibility of Action**
  - IPs of Common Interest
  - Call-specific criteria
  - Priority-specific criteria
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Focus on the evaluation process

Technical Evaluation

- Technical Evaluation performed by External Independent Experts
- External experts provide technical support on the submitted proposals
- Each proposal is assessed independently by at least three experts
- Experts evaluate on the basis of the information included in the application and against the defined award criteria:
  - Relevance
  - Maturity
  - Quality
  - Impact
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**Assessment and Evaluation Process**

**Focus on the Award Criteria**

In order to **comply with the requirements of technical evaluator**, it is strongly recommended to keep in mind the following four aspects during the **preparation of the Implementation Project Description**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>Maturity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make the description Relevant:</td>
<td>Demonstrate the Maturity of the project:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Motivating the feature of your project</td>
<td>✓ Explaining the readiness to be implemented of the project;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Supporting your statements with qualitative/quantitative data</td>
<td>✓ Evidencing the low uncertainty/risk about the start of the Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain the Impact of the project:</td>
<td>Improve the Quality of the project description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Evidencing the impact provided by the CEF Transport funding;</td>
<td>✓ Demonstrate that the description is sound;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Explaining positive socio-economic, climate and environment effects of the project</td>
<td>✓ Check the completeness and clearness of the description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on the evaluation process

**Indicative timeline of the selection process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of LCP Coordination Committee</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information of European Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Selection Decision</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of Grant Preparation</td>
<td>As of July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Grant</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation steps**

- **Preliminary Checks**
  - Admissibility check
- **Technical Evaluation**
  - Individual assessment
  - Consensus meetings
- **Internal Evaluation & Selection**
  - Draft list of proposals recommended for funding

**Internal Evaluation**

- Considers the results of the technical evaluation
- Performs budgetary adjustments
- Checks complementarity of Actions
- Considers EU Added value of Actions
- Identifies potential synergies
- Takes into account budgetary constraints

**Draft list of proposals recommended for funding**
# Indicative timeline of the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017 (17:00 Brussels local time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>February-May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of CEF Coordination Committee</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information of European Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Selection Decision</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of Grant Preparation</td>
<td>As of July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Grant</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus on the evaluation process

Indicative timeline of the selection process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection process step</th>
<th>Indicative date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call publication</td>
<td>13 October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for the submission of proposals</td>
<td>7 February 2017 17:00 (Brussels local time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of proposals</td>
<td>February-May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation of CEF Coordination Committee</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information of European Parliament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of Selection Decision</td>
<td>July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch of Grant Preparation</td>
<td>As of July 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time To Grant</td>
<td>November 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Selection decision

Preparation of Selection Decision

EC Inter-Service Consultation

Consultation of CEF Coordination Committee
Information of the European Parliament

Adoption of Commission Selection Decision

Information to Applicants and Launch of Grant Preparation

Extract of the INEA Info Day
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The **Specific Grant Agreement (SGA)** preparation phase starts after the publication of the INEA selection results (on the basis of the outcomes of the CEF Financial Committee) and will last until the Specific Grant Agreement signature. 

**Objectives**
- Align *technical/financial contents* of the proposal according to the results of the evaluation process and indications received from INEA/EC
- Finalize *administrative/contractual aspects* (e.g. Mandates, Accession to ICA, etc.)
- Allow the **Specific Grant Agreement (SGA) signature**, and all its prerequisites

**Main Areas**
- Administrative/Contractual (e.g. Declaration status quo, bank details, mandates, etc.)
- Technical (e.g. Action Structure Implementation project details, etc.)
- Financial (e.g. Budget of the Action)
Assessment and Evaluation Process

1. Call for Indications of Interest
   - CEF Calls 2016 Publication 13/10/16

2. Proposals responses preparation
   - Submission to INEA 07/02

3. INEA Evaluation Process
   - Projects selection by INEA July 2017

4. SGA preparation phase
   - Projects formal awarding 30/09

5. Project Execution

CEF Calls 2016
Publication 13/10/16

Projects selection
by INEA July 2017

Projects formal
awarding 30/09

LET’S DELIVER TOGETHER
Closure of the meeting

Massimo Garbini
SDM Managing Director
Workshop on how to fill in draft IP Description and related Q&A
Thank you for your attention!

follow us @SESAR_DM
www.sesardeploymentmanager.eu

Disclaimer

The content and conditions of the Work Programme, CEF Call text, FPA and Grant Agreement always prevail on any different information, which may be included in this document and/or in any formal or informal communication with the beneficiaries such as the approval of reports (e.g. ASR), exchange of emails, etc.

Supported by
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