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1. SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
   1. Background

Academic laboratories, industries and Universities of Pays de la Loire region have created the Bioregate cluster, focused on restorative and regenerative medicine. The aim is to improve the forces in research, training and innovation, to become a cluster internationnaly recognized.

The Bioregate cluster was initiated in November 2015 and formally brings together universities and national research institutes involved in the research domains in the Pays de la Loire area (INSERM, IFREMER, INRA, Oniris, Universities of Nantes, Angers, Le Mans, The University Hospitals of Nantes and Angers), Atlanpole Biotherapies cluster and local authorities.

Namely due to the financial support of the Région Pays de la Loire, Bioregate opens its 2nd « scientific challenges « tender set apart for members of the cluster.

The provision from the Région Pays de la Loire allotted to scientific challenge activities amounts to approximately €1,500,000. This envelope is attributed to the top projects of the three tenders of 2016, 2017 and 2018. All projects will be ideally completed before 11 November 2020.

* 1. Objectives

The 2017 call for proposals will fund projects tackling scientific challenges for approximately €500,000 with the possibility of applying for two proposal formats: Type “A” proposals with an eligible funding base set at €150,000 maximum and Type “B” proposals with a maximum base of €50,000. The objectives of this scientific challenge component are as follows:

* Assisting research in **restorative and regenerative medicine\***

Eligible proposals:

* In priority, therapeutic research (soluble factors, cell-based treatments with modified or non-modified cells, tissue engineering, bio-/nanomaterial, experimental organogenesis, biomechanical reparation, etc.)
* Diagnostic research and treatment monitoring tools for restorative or regenerative medicine,
* Development of new models, tools, and equipment specificly aiming at improving restorative and regenerative medicine therapies (e.g. 3D/bio printing, improving biomanufacturing, 3D cell culture, organoid culture for drug screening, etc.)

\*definition: the term restorative or regenerative medicine comprises all techniques aiming to restore a lacking biological function whatever the cause.

NB 1: Although no medical field of application is excluded from the proposals made in this tender, the strengthening of competitiveness in osteoarticular, dermatological, metabolic (pancreas, liver), neuro-muscular and cardio-vascular related areas is recommended.

NB 2: proposals relating to the subject of cancer treatment are not eligible apart from those pertaining to regeneration, e.g., proposals which would aim to reconstruct tissues injured after tumor resection.

* **Developing ground breaking research**. The Bioregate funding cannot be equated to other available research grants. This aid must make it possible to obtain preliminary ground breaking results to consolidate more competitive financial demand (ANR, H2020 etc). It aims to **draw in these competitive fundings.**
* **Strengthening the network of Pays de la Loire participants by encouraging collaborative research between at least two** **research structures from the Region Pays de la Loire**. Particular attention will be paid to new collaborations and multi-disciplinary approaches (Engineering sciences and social and human sciences).

NB: The Bioregate members are not eligible for the scientific challenge tender managed directly by the services of Region Pays de la Loire, the Bioregate scientific challenges tender replacing the latter. Only significantly fundamental proposals (*i.e.* the outcomes of which are pure knowledge and/or of which the value-creation perspectives are impossible to imagine at this stage), like those of development biology, for example, are asked to submit their applications as part of the tender managed by the Région Pays de la Loire.

On the other hand, the members of the Bioregate network always have access to other tenders from the Région Pays de la Loire such as  “Laboratory equipment”, “Co-financed doctoral fellowship”, etc… New funding tools have been set up in 2017 by the Région Pays de la Loire and are also accessible to members of the Bioregate network.

* 1. Criteria for 2017 Call For Proposals

1. Eligibility

- Project initiated by a lecturer-researcher or full researcher based in the Pays de la Loire region and attached to an academic laboratory of an organization or an institution of further education or research

- Project greenlighted by the laboratory director and by the supervisory institute / institution to which the Principal Investigator is affiliated. The Initiators of the proposal and their partners intending to submit a proposal are responsible for providing information at the earliest moment so as to obtain the official approval visas required for their application files and to enable rapid processing of the funding agreements/notifications of the partners of the selected proposals:

* Their supervisory authorities and their establishments of affiliation potentially managing the grants which will be awarded to them
* Their laboratory director

- Participation in at least two different laboratories in Région Pays de la Loire, one of them with recognized expertise in the scientific subject areas of Bioregate.

- Justification that the proposal submitted is not substantially funded/fundable elsewhere

- Overall objective of the proposal:

- in the subject area of restorative and regenerative medicine

- new/risky/emerging (the projects already being routinely carried out within the laboratories or directly followed up in current projects are not eligible, in the same way that the proposals which do not appear to be original as regards the state of the art are not eligible, and in addition, the proposals positioned on technologies already being operated in innovative companies will have to demonstrate competitive character in the alternative that is proposed)

- not already substantially funded/fundable elsewhere

- Maximum duration of the project: 3 years

- Complete file including the administrative and financial elements and written in good English

NB: The potential beneficiaries of the Bioregate grant may not confide its management to the CNRS which is not a signatory of the partnership agreement.

1. Selection criteria

- Synergy of the partners’ expertise, originality of the partnership (original consortium, multidisciplinarity), a balance in the collaboration

- Credibility and ambition of scientific and technical objectives of the proposal

- Credibility of the objectives in terms of the allocation of time, funding, human resources to see the project through to the end

- Justification of competitive positioning (this aspect will be closely examined for the proposals submitted in 2017)

- Justification that the proposal submitted is not substantially funded/fundable elsewhere

- Argumentation on the added value of the proposal for the Bioregate cluster

- Quality of the thinking behind the value-creation plan and about the future extensions of proposal

- Given that the proposals in this tender are intrinsically risky projects, those principal investigators involving a doctoral student must spell out what results may be presented by the students in the event of a dysfunction experienced during the development of the initially planned proposal

* 1. Terms of payment

Bioregate will only finance at most 85 % of the total cost of the proposal (base excluding tax).

1. Type A project

- the eligible base amounting to a maximum €150 k corresponds to a thesis and to operation (not equipment of more than €20, 000); only expenditure incurred by the project are considered

- The maximum duration of the project will be 3 years

- the payments are made as

- an instalment of 40 % made on signing the agreement /funding notification by the directors of the establishments /supervisors concerned,

- a payment of 40 % midway through the project on condition that the Bioregate governance will have seen that the project is being conducted in compliance with its initial description

- the balance after Year 3, under the same terms, *i.e.* incorporating a full control of the scientific progress, the expenditure made, recruitments planned for the project

- The principal investigator along with his partners will be required to draw preliminary conclusions regarding the activity which will have been funded in the middle of Year 2 (updating) and only when it is demonstrated that the project has made headway that the 2nd payment will be made. After the audit, it is the Bioregate operational committee which will issue the decision whether to continue the project or not. Should this committee decide to halt the project, the eligibility of the expenditure will be re-assessed and a refund of the amounts received by the partners may be required.

Likewise, if the project-end audit reveals overpayment or unjustified or non eligible expenditure the final balance will be reassessed proportionately

1. Type B project

- The eligible base for a maximum amount of €50 k corresponds to operation (excluding equipment) and with the possibility of a gratification for the student at Master’s level; only expenditure incurred by the project will be considered

- The project will run a maximum of 1 or 2 years

- For the short and/or small cost proposals. A 1st payment of approximately 75 % will be made on signing the agreement/funding notification by those in charge of the relevant universities and national research institutes. The balance will be paid if the scientific financial and recruitment assessment reports are deemed to be in compliance with the description of the initial proposal by the Bioregate operational committee.

- For 2 year projects at € 50k , the principal investigator, along with the partners will be required to draw preliminary conclusions about the activity which will have been funded half way through and only when it is demonstrated that the project has made headway in compliance with its initial description will the 2nd payment be made. The terms of payment and control are the same as those for type A projects.

For both Projects B and A , the audits will be directed by the Bioregate Steering Committee and it is the OperationalCommittee which decides the action to take concerning the funding if the 1st appraisal raises questions.

1. Eligible expenditure

Only expenditure incurred by the project is eligible, the recurring costs of the establishments (salaries of the permanent staff, costs relating to the infrastructure, to heavy equipment etc.) are not covered.

* Consumable and minor equipment (cost below €20,000)
* Expenses relating to spearheading and coordinating the project
* Expenses relating to assignments, travel, stays aiming to promote the results of the project
* Costs incurred by analyses and study, services performed by entities outside the organization and requiring invoicing
* Expenditure relating to academic and economic value-creation activities
* Non permanent personnel: Master’s and doctoral student as a priority; post-doctoral, staff in UH year, engineers, etc.

NB1: **The overheads costs of supervisory bodies/establishments overseeing the Bioregate grant are not eligible. It is a contribution by the partner establishments involved in the Bioregate programme.**

NB2: The expenditure engaged for activities of coordination by the consortium and academic value-creation will make up a minimum of 5 % of the total amount of the Bioregate grant. The following are considered, for example, as actions of academic value-creation: the organization or participation in academic symposia, publication costs, activities collectively promoting Bioregate, etc.). Activities of dissemination involving the general public are not considered as academic value-creation activities but economic ones.

NB3: If the proposal incorporates partners outside of Pays de la Loire, these cannot be principal investigators and cannot benefit from the Bioregate grant.

NB4: First and foremost, this call for proposals concerns academic partners and if there is a question of involving a private partner, the agreement of the consortium must make it possible to establish the lack of economic aid in accordance with European regulations in force (supervision 2014/C 198/01 – JOUE 26/06/2014 C198/1 or any text replacing it)

*The lack of indirect aid is presumed if at least one of the following conditions is met:*

* *The participating firms bear all the research proposal costs ;*
* *Failing to generate intellectual property rights, the results of the collaboration rights can be widely diffused and all the intellectual property rights resulting from the activities of research organizations or research infrastructures are fully allocated to these entities ;*
* *All intellectual property rights resulting from the project, as well as related rights of access, are attributed to the different partners in the collaboration in a way that suitably reflects their respective interests, their amount of participation in the work and their contributions to the proposal ;*
* *The research organization or the research infrastructure receives a remuneration equivalent to the market price for intellectual property rights which result from the activities performed by this entity and which are allotted to participating firms , or for which participating firms benefit from rights of access. . The absolute amount of value of the contributions, financial or other, from firms participating in the costs of the activities of the research organization or the research infrastructure which have generated the relevant intellectual property rights must be deducted from this payment.*
  1. Engagements of the principal investigator

1. Transparency

The investigator will draw up 2 progress reports: an update report conditional to the continuation of the funding and a final assessment report in which there will also be an indication of what follow-ups will be given to the proposal (submitting the proposal to a more competitive funding and the obtainment or not of bridging funding, for example)

- During the update or at any other moment, the investigator commits to provide notification of any possible dysfunction, of the impossibility of attaining the objectives or of a competitive positioning which was proving to be non-competitive. In order to achieve this, the investigator must address an official letter to the Bioregate operational and scientific directors. Either the project may be halted or the funding reallocated to any other proposal or reoriented/revamped. The Bioregate steering committee will appraise the matter and the Bioregate operational committee who will make the final decision.

NB: in the event of deciding on a financial sanction, only the thesis allocation will be maintained by a re-orientation of the work within the same team or towards another team; the financial sanction will be deducted from the operation

Likewise, any change to the make-up of the consortium, further opportunities for or a re-orientation of objectives of the project must be notified to the Bioregate authorities by the principal investigator.

The partners of the winning proposals commit to providing proof of expenditure. Non justified expenditure or expenditure that proves to be ineligible cannot be the object of Bioregate funding (a refund may be requested to the beneficiary if an advance payment has been made, the next payment will be blocked and/or revised in the event that this proper management rule is not observed).

1. Promotion of Bioregate and associated identity guidelines

Broadly speaking, the beneficiaries of Bioregate funding commit to promoting the Bioregate cluster. In particular, they cite Bioregate and Région Pays de la Loire in their notifications pertaining to the funded proposal and use the identity guidelines (Bioregate, REI (Research, Education and Innovation) and Région Pays de la Loire logos) in their communications.

1. Consortium agreement

The partners will approach their supervisors in order to draw up a consortium agreement. This must specify the entitlements and obligations of the partners and describe the decision-making processes in the event of it malfunctioning. This agreement must also formulate an opening assessment of the inputs of each partner and a closing assessment of the deliverables expected so that the generated intellectual property may be suitably distributed. This agreement must be produced before the end of the 1st year but it is highly recommended that it is established prior to commencement of the project.

1. Communication

Having benefited from a Bioregate grant, the principal investigator may be summoned to present the project during steering meetings, spearheading or general assemblies held by Bioregate. The Principal investigator therefore commits to replying positively to this request either in person or by the representation of a consortium collaborator.

The Principal investigator commits to providing in French or in English a non-confidential summary of the project and its progress so that it can be posted, namely on the Bioregate website.

* 1. Forwarding, selection, scheduling procedure

The complete files, **written in English with English matrices**, must be sent electronically (with the visas of approval of the laboratory heads and Institution heads of the principal investigator to the following address: rejane.bihan@univ-nantes.fr **before the 18/04/2017 12pm.**

The proposals will be firstly assessed in terms of eligibility by members of the steering committee then by 2 to 3 scientific experts not belonging to Bioregate for the selection stage following a standard grid comprising the pre-specified criteria. The proposals will then be classified and this classification submitted for validation to the Bioregate operational committee who make the final decision.

The decision will be transmitted to the principal investigator electronically:

- 5 May 2017 latest concerning eligibility.

- 30 June 2017 latest concerning selection.

The terms of agreements/funding notifications between the establishments managing the Bioregate grant and the University of Nantes for Bioregate will be specified to the principal investigator, it will be the responsibility of the latter to inform the partners and collect information possibly lacking in the proposal file.The 1st payments will take place once these agreements/ funding notifications are finalized (including attached proposal and financial documents), signed and on condition that the non-statutory staff envisaged to implement the proposal will have been identified.

* 1. Format of reply to tender

**The file must be written in English and all sections duly completed.**

**The principal investigator has to fill the second paragraph of the proposal form below. Please number pages and remove the paragraphs 1 (description of the call) and 3 (evaluation template) to make the document easier to read.**

1. Proposal Information Sheet

It comprises:

- A public summary in French and English.

**These summaries will be separately sent on a document in Word format and they could be distributed to external experts and posted specifically on the Bioregate website.** They will re-specify with letter heads, name of the investigator, host laboratory, proposal acronym.

- Approval from the universities / research institutes employing the principal investigator.

1. Matching the proposal with the objectives of the present call for proposals
2. Scientific , technical, administrative and financial description of the proposal

The involvment of each partner must clearly state:

- The number and % of FTE involved within each team/Laboratory

- What proportion of the grant will be used by each of the partners

- By indicating the amount and origin of the co-funding provided by each partner ; if this co-founding is acquired or prospective and if so the date of reply must be specified, if this co funding will be used completely or partly to back the proposal being submitted

Remark: if the proposal being tabled is part of a larger proposal, the co-fundings must feature in this box with the same details as those described above.

The financial parties must present costs pre-tax: a document in the manuscript makes it possible to present the expenditures and revenues in terms of the total estimated cost of the proposal (excluding the salaries of permanent staff, costs related to infrastructure, heavy equipment etc.); An Excel financial model provides the breakdown of the grant and the co funding exclusive of tax, per partner and per expenditure item. These details are indispensable because they provide an efficient control of expenditure midway through and at the end of the proposal.

1. Challenges and perspectives for the Bioregate cluster
2. Challenges for the cluster

* Does this project bring into play an unprecedented Pays de la Loire/Multidisciplinary collaboration?
* How does or will this proposal benefit the Bioregate collective in terms of research, training, innovation and European or international influence?

1. Proposal perspectives: value-creation plan and perspectives of subsequent funding

* If your proposal produces all the expected results, what are the economic value-creation perspectives (intellectual property, transfer of technology, provision of services, public private partnerships, creation of companies, etc?) What product(s) / service(s) could your proposal lead to? What would be the target of such product(s)/ service(s)?

It should be remembered that this point will have to be particularly well argued and that « market-oriented » proposals will be favored.

* If your proposal produces the expected results, what are the academic value creation perspectives (symposia, conferences, seminars , publications, collective promotion)?
* Has the professional future of Master’s student or thesis engaged as part of this proposal been prepared?
* How will this proposal help provide a basis for more competitive funding and what is the lead time?
  1. Success criteria assessed during and at the end of the project

- Attaining scientific objectives within deadlines set by the partners, with the resources described in the submission document for the tender application (section describing the tasks with their times and means of achievement)

- Leverage effect of the Bioregate grant upon more competitive fundings and employment

The mid-term and final audits will be instructed by the Bioregate steering committee and forwarded to the operational committee which may summon the principal investigator to present the project progress. It is the operational committee which finally judges whether the progress and completion of the project complies with what had been proposed by the consortium initially.

1. APPLICATION FILE

Completed application files will be submitted by the principal investigator by email to [rejane.bihan@univ-nantes.fr](mailto:rejane.bihan@univ-nantes.fr) before the 18/04/2017. They must be accompanied by the reasoned opinion of the director of the laboratory of the project leading institution.

* 1. Proposal Identification file

**Name of the proposal:**

**Acronym**:

**Duration of project:**

**Start date:**

**Total cost of proposal (excluding recurring expenditure; pre-VAT):**

**Sollicitated contribution from Bioregate (pre-VAT):**

Please note that the agreements/funding notifications will be drawn up on the basis of the amounts of the grant and co fundings of each partner unless the operational committee states otherwise.

**Scientific coordinator:**

First name:

Surname:

Contact details (mail/tel):

Grade:

Current position:

Time per month spent on project:

Responsibility in project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last 5 years:

*It is the responsibility of scientific coordinator to cite the most significant publications in terms of the proposal being presented which will make it possible, when the proposal is assessed, to appraise the scientific quality of the work performed by the partners involved in the proposal*

Laboratory of affiliation :

Team:

Labelling (please specify the AERES assessment):

Contact details:

**Institution in charge of the budget and administrative management of the proposal, setting-up and monitoring of the agreement /funding notification :**

**- Name of the institution**

**- Address**

**- Name of the signatory of the official document**

**- Contact details of the manager**

**Consortium:**

List of partner laboratories and research teams (main or associated partners) specifying for each one: Name of the lab, name of the team, supervisor (s), AERES evaluation

*NB: A distinction is made between main partners and associated partners*

*Associated partners are scientific partners with little involvement in the present proposal, either in terms of work or in terms of proportion of funding*

Main partners:

Partner 1:

Name and details of the Principal Investigator (PI):

Name of laboratory / Research team:

Institution affiliated to for the management of the Bioregate grant:

Name and contact details of the person in the leading institution:

Estimation of the “weight” of the present proposal in the research activity of the laboratory:

Number of permanent laboratory researchers involved in the proposal:

Total number of permanent laboratory researchers in the lab:

 Team members (other than the PI)

Name – First name:

Current employment:

Time per month devoted to project:

Responsibility in the project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last five years:

*To be duplicated for each member of Partner1*

Partner 2:

Name and details of the co-applicant:

Name of laboratory / Research team:

Institution affiliated to for the management of the Bioregate grant:

Name and contact details of the person in the leading institution:

Estimation of the “weight” of the present proposal in the research activity of the laboratory:

Number of permanent laboratory researchers involved in the proposal:

Total number of permanent laboratory researchers in the lab:

Current employment:

Time per month devoted to project:

Responsibility in the project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last five years:

 Team members (other than the co-applicant)

Name – First name:

Current employment:

Time per month devoted to project:

Responsibility in the project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last five years:

*To duplicate for each member of Partner 2*

Partner 3….

*NB: for each extra partner integrated into the proposal a data sheet must be filled in using the same model. A scientific supervisor must be designated from the partner team*

Associated partners:

Associated partners are partners contributing to the project but not receiving any Bioregate grant (firm, lab based outside Pays de la Loire, etc.)

Associated partner 1

Name of the laboratory/research team:

Institution of affiliation:

 Co-applicant

Name – First name:

Current employment:

Time per month devoted to project:

Responsibility in the project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last five years:

 Team members of associated partner 1

Surname: First name:

Current employment:

Time per month spent on project:

Responsibility in the project:

Professional experiences:

Most significant publications (or patents) in the last five years

Associated Partner 2

Name of laboratory/research team:

Institution of affiliation :

….*NB: for each extra (associated) partner integrated into the proposal, a data sheet must be filled in using the same model. A scientific supervisor must be designated from the partner team*

**Persons involved in the project summary**

This table must include all technical, statutory and non-statutory persons whose funding is requested or not in the present file.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Laboratory or center of research** | **Surname First Name** | **Discipline** | **Status and grade\*** | **Time spent on project\*\*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Total FTE :**

\*Status and grade : permanent researchers lectures-researchers, doctorals, post doctorals, students, engineers, etc… (specify PU, MCF, MCF-HDR, DR, CR , etc.)

\*\* Full time equivalent: the annual average time spent on research devoted to the proposal.

The equivalent of full time must be specified by considering both the time on research and teaching time. For example, a lecturer-researcher who would devote all his time of research to the proposal would be involved at approximately 0,5 FTE..

**Summary of the proposal**(in French (1page max.) and in English) **> to produce with a separate document in Word.**

This summary could be posted on the Bioregate website in the event of funding of the proposal and will be transmitted to the external experts. It must include namely:

**-** the framework of current positioning

- Proposal objectives

- Expected results

- Methodology

**Additional visual illustrations are welcome**

Key words associated with the proposal /summary (5 maximum)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| French |  |
| English |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Visa of approval of the proposal scientific coordinator**  *Surname , First name, date and signature of the proposal coordinator with the words « read and approved »* |

**Detailed comments** are indispensable for the admissibility of the proposal. They relate to the originality of the proposal, its degree of priority, its perspectives in the event of success (impact for the development of the laboratories (s.), etc.

|  |
| --- |
| **Visa of approval and reasoned opinion of the laboratory director (a half page)**  *Surname, first name, date and signature of the head of the investigator laboratory with the words « read and approved »*  **Visa of approval and reasoned opinion of the Director of the Institution (a half page)**  *Surname, first name, date and signature of the head of the leading institution with the words « read and approved »* |

* 1. Matching the proposals with the objectives of the present call for proposals

*NB: the specified number of words expected applies to type A or B proposals*

* + Subject of the proposal and consortium :
    - How does your proposal approach restorative and regenerative medicine? (3 lines)
    - In what way is the association of expertise applied in this proposal cutting edge? (3 lines)
      * Are the partners initiating their 1st collaboration?
      * How could the proposal be termed “multidisciplinary”?
  + Original and risky nature of proposal (20 lines):
    - How is this proposal ground-breaking in relation to the state of the art?
    - Is the technology or a similar technology being developed in a cutting-edge firm? How will what you propose constitute a technological leap /a competitive edge?
    - What degree of risk does the proposal include? How can it be considered as a break with the usual activities of the lab(s)?
    - What is the main challenge from this proposal facing your lab/ research teams and your partners:
      * The development of new fields of expertise through diversification and surrounding original subject areas
      * and/or the development of the scientific positioning of team or laboratory
  + Justification of proposal submission (10 lines) :
    - Please specify how the submitted proposal could not be subsequently presented for other tenders and notably those of the ANR
    - Please specify if this proposal has been submitted for other funding(s) which one(s)?
    - If the proposal is linked with other on-going or recently submitted proposals (PCRD, ANR, Région, CPE etc.) by the lab(s) involved. Please specify
    - How would the proposal presented to Bioregate enable you to position yourself on more competitive funding(s)? Which one(s)?

* 1. Description of the proposal

***NB: The total volume expected for the § C; excluding financial grids, for a Proposal A between 11-13 pages, for a Proposal B between 7-9 pages.***

1. Context, strategy and stakes (2 pages max. for the A’s, 1 page max. for the B’s.)

This section will namely clarify the following:

* The technological break envisaged: nature and stakes
* Current competitive positioning (scope: national, international and nature of competitors: academic laboratories or firms)
* Description of your strategy
* How is this strategy relevant in terms of the industrial and academic competition?
* The connection with other proposals (regional, ANR, PCRD, CPER) and with participants/ regional structures (competitiveness hubs, etc.)

1. Description of the scientific proposal (5 pages max. for the A’s, 4 pages max for the B’s.)

• State of the Art Description of the research on the subject areas of the proposal

• Scientific objectives

• Operational focuses

• Implementation schedule (deliverables and recruitments)

• Quality of the consortium: synergy of the members, involvement and role of each party (main and associated partners)

• Results expected

1. Spearheading and management of the project (1 page max. for the A’s, 0.5 page for the B’s)

• Organization and description of the management style and governance of the proposal (roles of the main partners and associated partners)

• dedicated staff support

• Structure, organization or institution overseeing the financial management of the project (please indicate the contact details of the person in charge of the management for each partner)

1. Stakes for the Bioregate cluster and project perspectives (4 pages max for the A’s and 2 pages max. for the B’s)
2. Stakes for the Bioregate cluster

How does or will this proposal benefit the Bioregate cluster in terms of training, innovation international or European renown?

1. Project perspectives: value-creation plan and perspectives of subsequent fundings

* If your proposal produces all the expected results, what are the prospects for economic value-creation (intellectual property, transfer of technology, provision of services, public/private partnerships directly related to the results of the present proposal, hiring a value-creation engineer, development of technology demonstrator/prototype, strategic positioning study of the scientific findings with a view to developing further training etc.)?

What product(s)) / service(s) could your proposal lead to? What would be the target of these product(s)) / service(s))?

NB: the partners in the proposal have the possibility of resorting to specialized participants within the scope of economic value-creation activities: Business Innovation Centers, competitiveness hubs, TTO, research value-creation department in their establishments, etc.

* If your product produces all the expected results what are the academic value-creation perspectives (symposium conference seminars, publications, collective promotion, development of further training facilities and namely for Masters in research and doctoral training)? What is the potential of development in the area of study that your scientif challenge proposal will explore? If successful, what is the added value expected for the visilibity of the lab? What could be the follow-ups envisaged for the proposal in terms of developing the priority scientific subject areas of the lab and the structuration of the consortium?
* What is the preparedness plan for the professional future of the Master’s or thesis student hired within the framework of the proposal?
* How will this proposal help to provide a basis for more competitive funding, what is the time frame?

1. Success indicators of the project (1 page max for proposals A and B)

In order to measure the benefits of the project in terms of results and scientific positioning, monitoring and assessment indicators must be proposed.

- Please specify 4 to 5 quality indicators relating, for example, to the expected structuring effects, the qualitative leap expected, the modalities of sustainability of the tools, etc.

« The proposal has reached its goals if… «

* Please specify 4 to 5 indicators to evaluate the project at the beginning (proposal submission), mid-term (interim progress report) and upon completion.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | T+0 : proposal submission | Midway objective | Objective at Project end |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

NB: The indicators submitted in the present file will be returned to in the annual progress report. A report model will be attached to the funding agreement and will equally propose a grid of indicators in order to appraise the development of the project.

The indicators proposed by the principal investigator provides consistency with and complements the success indicators specific to the Bioregate tender cf § I. H., in particular with the assessment of the leverage effect of the Bioregate grant upon more competitive funding and regional employment.

1. Proposal cost and funding plan

*For the record, the eligible expenditure is as follows \*:*

*\*expenditure for programme support:*

*- consumables and minor equipment costing less than €20,000,*

*- costs relating to the spearheading and coordination of the consortium,*

*- Assignment expenses, trips and stays for the promotion of the proposal, or the Bioregate cluster*

*- study and analysis costs, service provisions made by entities outside the organization and requiring invoicing,*

*- Expenditure connected with economic and academic value-creation activities,*

*\*wages and social charges uniquely of contractual non-permanent staff*

*- doctoral or trainees for example and essentially in Master’s*

*NB: the Bioregate subs will only cover minimum amounts fixed by law, any possible extras will be paid by the host laboratory*

\*equipment:

- the acquisition of minor equipment required to carry out the proposal

NB: small computing equipment (IPad, PC’s, etc.) is only eligible for the doctoral student funded by the Bioregate grant

The funding plan concerns the costs directly incurred by the proposal (excluding salaries of permanent staff, depreciation, infrastructural maintenance or heavy equipment, and features the co-fundings provided by the partners and the Bioregate grant.

**Please remember that the proportion of the Bioregate grant must not exceed 85 % of the total cost of the proposal**.

The table must describe the main components of the proposal funding plan as a whole and **exclusive of tax**:

Bioregate grant + acquired or not co-funding + capital funds

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total expenditure incurred by the proposal** | | **Total revenues**  Envisaged and requested | |
| **Types of expenditure** | **Provisional costs** | **Financial backing requested** | **Amount** |
| **OPERATION**  **OPERATION**  **OPERA** | *Personnel*   * *Fixed-term contract staff (number and duration)* * *Doctoral students (number and duration)* * *Post-doctoral students (number and duration )* * *Master trainees (number and duration)*   *Other operating costs :* |  | Capital funds of the proposal partners |  |
| Grant requested to Bioregate |  |
| Other co-fundings requested or acquired (other bodies, establishments, foundations, etc) |  |
| **EQUIPMENT** | *Please list equipment* |  | Capital funds of the proposal partners |  |
| Grant requested to Bioregate |  |
| Other co-fundings solicited or acquired (other bodies, establishments.) |  |
|  | **TOTAL AMOUNT OF THE PROPOSAL** |  |  |  |

Co-funding of the partner P1: amount, origin, acquired or prospective, date of validation of the obtainment of the prospective co-funding.

Co-funding of the partner P2: amount, origin, acquired or prospective, date of validation of the obtainment of the prospective co-funding.

Co-funding of the partner P3:

1. Detail of the application for grant per expenditure item and per partner

The present file is necessarily accompanied with a detailed table which describes the grant requested to Bioregate, per operational focus, per type of expenditure, per partner. This table must be completed in Excel (.xls) as supplied.

Please justify the main items of expense solicited from Bioregate (½ to 1 page):

1. Detail of the PhD student wage or Master ‘student bonus (possibly another interim position wage)

✔Theses envisaged as part of the proposal:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Theses | Host laboratory (supervision) | Partner laboratoy (co-supervision) | Planned Subjects | Institution employing doctoral student | Dates of start and end of contract |
| n°1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| n°2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please specify the names (if known) and periods in which the student(s) will be involved in the project being submitted.

In the event that the results expected in the proposal presented as part of Bioregate were compromised, what options must be explored to assure the student of the success of his/her thesis defense. (0.5-1 page)

✔Gratifications of students at Master’s level envisaged within the framework of the proposal:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Trainee | Host laboratory (supervision ) | Partner laboratory (if co-supervision) | Envisaged Subjects | Institution employing student | Start and end dates |
| N°1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| N°2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please specify the names (if known) and the periods during which the student(s) will be involved in the proposal being submitted.

✔Interim positions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Type of position | Host laboratoire (supervision) | Partner laboratory (if known) supervision) | Planned  Subjects | Employing institution | Start and end dates |
| n°1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| n°2 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Please specify the names (if known) and the periods during which the interim(s) will be involved in proposal being submitted.

What is the professional future envisaged for all other persons whose positions are described above? (3-5 lines per position)

1. Risk assessment of the doctoral student engaged in the currently proposed proposal

This should address whether the proposal requires the funding of a doctoral student: to clarify what results he or she may present at the end of the thesis if the present proposal fails (0.5 pages)

1. Suggested reviewers

In order to shorten the processing time of the files and extend the reviewers’ data base, the **principal investigator can list the names of at least 5 experts outside Pays de la Loire and non-members of the Bioregate network** apt to conduct the assessment of the proposal. These reviewers can be French, European or international with the only constraint being that they can examine the proposal file in English.

**Reviewers selection must not raise conflict of interest: on-going collaborations, co-publications or direct competition. Non-fulfilment of this rule might halt the evaluation process or the funding isf the project has already started. Additionnal external reviewers will be sollicitated by the steering committee.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Surname – First name | Discipline | Laboratory | Institution of affiliation | Mail | Telephone |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

The principal investigators can also provide the names of researchers or research teams not suitable to review their grant, for conflict of interest reasons.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Surname – First name | Discipline | Laboratory | Institution of affiliation |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

1. EVALUATION OF BIOREGATE “SCIENTIFIC CHALLENGE” PROPOSALS
   1. Internal assessment (eligibility)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CRITERIA** | **Meets Specification Yes/no** | **Comments** |
| Subject: restorative or regenerative medicine (therapy, diagnosis or technology support for the development of restorative or regenerative medicine ) |  |  |
| Pays de la Loire academic PI |  |  |
| Proposal greenlighted by the by the Management |  |  |
| At least 2 Pays de la Loire labs of which one is an expert in Bioregate sub subject areas |  |  |
| Duration of project max 3 years |  |  |
| Amount solicited from Bioregate in line with the possible allocations |  |  |
| Proposal which cannot be submitted to another tender |  |  |
| Project breaking from usual activities of lab partners involved in the proposal |  |  |
| Complete and properly written file |  |  |

* 1. External evaluation (selection)

Name of proposal:

Acronym:

Name of scientific coordinator:

Laboratory and institution initiating proposal:

Name of reviewer (this will be confidential for consortium partners):

Institution/Lab to which the examiner is affiliated:

Reviewer contact details (mail and telephone):

Evaluation:

|  |
| --- |
| A. Overview :  The total mark is calculated out of 110. Each of the items is graded out of 10 according to the following scale :   * 0 information lacking, incomplete, or inadequate * 2 weak * 4 average * 6 good * 8 very good or excellent * 10 exceptional   The assessments < 20 or > 80 will have to be particularly well supported with arguments. |

B. Assessment questions:

1. Relevance and scientific excellence of the proposal (40 points)

1.1Quality and clarity of the presentation of objectives /10

* 1. Originality and ambition of the objectives in terms of the competition /10
  2. Project feasibility (matching of the objectives and the means allocated ) /10
  3. Quality of the consortium (quality of each partner, complementarity, balance in the contributions of the main partners, O&M of the consortium) …………………………………./10

Comments:

2. Potential impact of the project and its results (40 points)

2.1 Impact on the area of research: added value of the programme in relation to previous or current work, progress in problem areas /10

2.2 Impact on the lab(s) involved: risk taking, and prompting the opening up of the lab or team; contribution to access European / international excellence …………………………………………………………………………………………………………………../10

2.3 Impact for the Bioregate cluster:

- Impact of the results expected in terms of research, training, innovation and international influence for the cluster…………………………………………………………………………………………………/10

- credibility of the plans of economic value-creation and pursuit towards a more ambitious proposal /10

Comments:

3. Administrative and financial management of the proposal (20 points)

3.1 Quality of the funding plan (consistency in the budget, relevance and justification of the budget concerning costs and cost sharing, level and origin of co financings)……………/10

3.2 Justification that this proposal is not fundable through other sources…………………../10

Comments:

4- In the present call for proposals, the scientific challenge is not restricted to technological breakthorough, but also to project that would be funded through regular calls, for example because it represents a risky project, out of the actual strength of the principal investigator. Given these elements, the innovative and original character of the proposal, does it justify the term “scientific challenges”? What is the real amount of risk?

Justification of the originality in relation to what is routinely carried out in the lab…………………………………………………………………………………………………../10

Comments:

General appreciation of the proposal (precise and concise comments, 5-10 lines):

Grade out of 110:

Time spent by the reviewer:

Self assessment of the degree of expertise of the reviewer on the subject of the file proposed for his/her assessment evaluation (out of 10):