



CLARIFICATION NO.2

INTERNAL GSA REFERENCE: WF241520

Related to GSA/GRANT/08/2017 - “Development of GNSS receiver technologies for Premium and General mass market”

Question no.1: Could you please provide us with a more detailed clarification on what GSA means with eligible total costs? Which costs are eligible, also regarding to tariffs, overhead, etc.?

Answer: The total eligible costs, are the total costs necessary for the action's implementation as set out in the estimated budget of the action "C1 form", which respect the eligibility criteria listed in the call for proposal under section 12.2. Information on eligible costs, including the detailed explanation for each category under which costs may be budgeted, can be found under section 12.2 "Funding form" of the Call for proposal.

The exact scope of the eligibility of costs is defined in the grant agreement, which will be signed with the successful applicant(s). A draft of the Grant Agreement is available as part of the call documents published on the GSA's website.

Overheads (described in the Call as indirect costs on pages 29 and 30) are set at a flat-rate amount of 7% of the total eligible direct costs of the action excluding subcontracting costs. These costs represent the beneficiary's general administrative costs which can be regarded as chargeable to the action/project.

Indirect costs may not include costs entered under another budget heading, meaning that the beneficiary may not declare its overheads as a type of direct costs and cannot charge the accounting value of overheads (indirect costs). Indirect costs are not eligible for beneficiaries that receive an operating grant.

Costs such as duties (including tariffs), taxes or charges can be budgeted under the project depending on their exact nature, deductibility and the necessity to incur such costs. See paragraph 2.10 on page 29 of the Call for proposal for specific information on this cost category.

Question no.2: About the “an audit report produced by an approved external auditor certifying the accounts for the last financial year available.” (Section 9.1). Does the official document made yearly by the external accountant (“Expert Comptable” in French) meets the above requirements ? If not can you advise who are the approved external auditors? Can you also confirm that this audit must be provided as the same time as the submitted application (12th July)?

Answer: The document on the certified accounts produced by your external accountant for the last closed financial year may be provided to satisfy the mentioned condition. The document must be provided at the same time as the application by the 12th of July 2018.



Question no.3: In the call for proposal document ("gsa-grant-08-2017_call-for-proposal.pdf", pag. 25) the only eligible personnel costs are:

- Cost of personnel working under an employment contract;
- Costs of natural persons working under a contract with the beneficiary other than an employment contract.

However, the hours spent directly on the action by the "SME owners without a salary" seem not to be covered by the eligible costs for this call. Is this correct or such working hours are eligible for "unit costs", as for H2020 R&I actions?

Answer: The Call for proposal does not have a unit-cost option covering the costs of "SME owners without a salary" case, as covered under the H2020 Research and Innovation actions or Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions.

Subcontracting arrangements with the SME owner are also not possible.

As indicated in section 12.2. pag. 25 of the call for proposal, the only eligible personnel costs in this call for proposals are:

- Cost of personnel working under an employment contract;
- Costs of natural persons working under a contract with the beneficiary other than an employment contract.

Question no.4: As per the personnel costs of the project, what's the formula used for the founders case? We intend to present a proposal and we do not clearly see what's the way founders personnel cost has to be justified. Our founders work full time in the company but under the legal formula of subcontracted freelance (since the Spanish law states it this way) such that every month we invoice our own company for the work done. Is there any specific way to justify this personnel cost? As far as I know from our participation in other H2020 projects, there is a specific formula for this case. Will this call take into account as well this personnel cost possibility?

Answer: Please see answer no. 3 above.

Question no.5: I noticed that in the "Approach" part of the chapter 1 "Concept and approach" of the B1 form template, it is ask to include "The deliverables list, team allocation, effort distribution and a preliminary risk register;". However, in the chapter 3 "Implementation", we have to fill in a table of deliverables, a table of risks and a table of Planned staff Efforts. What is asked in the Approach paragraph of the Chapter 1 sounds redundant with these 3 tables of the chapter 3.

Please can you clarify the differences between what is expected in paragraph Approach of the chapter 1 about "The deliverables list, team allocation, effort distribution and a preliminary risk register;" and the 3 tables "Deliverables", "Risks" and "Planned Staff Effort" of the Chapter 3?

Answer: In section 1.II, item (c) of the preliminary work plan, the items mentioned in the question shall be presented in the context of the approach proposed to perform the work. The tables in section 3 on the other hand are intended to give a detailed and clear view of the different items to be



produced in the project, the resources used, etc. in order to prove that proposed implementation is sound.

Question no.6: Could be a manufacturing industry which will actively cooperating in the design of the prototype, integrating it with their product recognised as a “system integrator” and then considered as Eligible applicant? To clarify better the manufacturing industry, I refer it is part of the automotive industry sector and definitiely not ,active in the development, integration and/or manufacturing of GNSS components, recievers, antennas and/or expert in the field of GNSS Research and development (R&D)‘

Answer: As long as the final integrated product targets the markets addressed by the call, the answer is yes.

Question no.7: I would like to request and extension of the deadline for the submission of the proposal.

Answer: The deadline for the submission of the proposals will not be extended.

Question no.8: In the B1-B2 Forms, Section I.1 Concept, it is asked to describe the market stream addressed and the innovation proposed by the solution. In the webinar, slide 28, it is written: Description of the proposed technical solution and how the project is relevant for the main objectives, in particular the description of:

- The process to identify the requirements, design and develop the receiver’s prototype
- The validation plan to assess the receiver’s performance against the operational requirements, both in simulated and in real environment
- The dissemination activities towards the relevant stakeholders

We find that theses descriptions relates more to the “Approach” section rather than to the “Concept” section of the B1 form.

Answer: The webinar was intended only as an information session and is not part of the call’s official documentation. If conflicts between the webinar the call’s documentation are perceived by the applicants, the call’s documentation text takes precedence.

Question no.9: In the webinar, slide 29, it is written: 1.II. This section shall contain, as minimum, a detailed description of the proposed implementation of the project including:

- A methodology for requirements identification, design, development and testing of the receiver
- A preliminary strategy for the validation of the receiver’s performances
- How the applicants propose to leverage the partners in the consortium and the key external stakeholders (e.g. GNSS receiver/chipset manufacturers, finance, telecommunication and energy industry, as well as other relevant stakeholders)
- The list of deliverables and related deliverables plan
- The roadmap for operational implementation

We find that the descriptions in the Slide 28 are very close to the description in the Slide 29, close to the description of the section “Approach” of the B1 form.



Answer: The webinar was intended only as an information session and is not part of the call's official documentation. If conflicts between the webinar the call's documentation are perceived by the applicants, the call's documentation text takes precedence.

Question n.10: Meanwhile, we don't understand a clear link between the description of the Slide 28 and the description of the section "Concept" of the B1 form. Thus, process to identify the requirements, validation plan, dissemination activities looks more related to the "Approach" section rather than the "Concept" section. Could GSA provide more clarifications?

Answer: The webinar was intended only as an information session and is not part of the call's official documentation. If conflicts between the webinar the call's documentation are perceived by the applicants, the call's documentation text takes precedence.

Question no.11: It is unclear to us how the milestones and deliverables apply to the prototype development or to the developed technology core itself. For instance in the case we target to develop a relevant sub-component (Hardware and/or Software), and the prototype will thus be a device that is built upon this sub-component, in which extent the documents listed in the deliverables (like in Section 2.4, 4) 5)) and the milestones project work plan (Section 2.5, 3)a. and 3)b.) apply to the prototype development or to the technology/sub-component development by itself ?

Answer: The deliverable list is the minimum that GSA considers necessary to achieve the objectives laid in the call. The candidate is free to add additional deliverables as considered necessary. The milestones in sections 2.5(3) concern the design phase and they are usual (even standard) practice in technology development projects. These milestones are compulsory and shall be included in the project plan. Concerning the development of sub-components, the candidate shall define the project logic in such a way that those milestones can be aligned across sub-components and the integrated solution and they can be achieved.

Question no. 12: In the document B1-B2 template, in section 1) II) "Approach", it is asked to fill in section b) and c) information that relates to activities, deliverables, effort, risks. In which extent this is not a duplicate information with the section 3. "Implementation" I.3), II.1 (Milestones) II.2 (Risks)?

Answer: Please see answer 5 above.

End of Document