"One-page" Summary of EU project idea/proposal

This document is intended as a summary of your project idea/proposal.
Notes on completion are provided at the end of the template.
Complete the parts you can, leave the others blank!
Only the first two sections ("Contact" and "Basic idea") are compulsory.

Contact: Contact person within your organisation (name + email)	
Basic idea: Concise description (no more than 3 lines!) summarising the basic idea of the project. (This should answer the question: "Tell me in 10 seconds what your project is about").	
Project Title: Provide a full title and a one-word title/acronym. See note (1).	
Work Programme Area(s): List the number (eg. 3.1.1.2) of the one area in the work programme that is most relevant to your idea. It can be useful to be even more specific, and quote the individual bullet points/sub-sections of the area in the work programme that you address. If your idea is relevant to *several* work programme areas, list the others in brackets. See note (2).	
Project Type: The choice is between Collaborative Project, NoE, CSA. See note (3).	
Objectives: Describe briefly what you are trying to achieve in the project. See notes (4), (5).	
Key Results: What concrete results will be produced within the project itself? See notes (4), (5).	
Impact: Describe what will be made possible when the project has delivered its results and achieved its objectives and these can be taken into use. See notes (5), (6), (7).	

Joe Gorman, SINTEF IKT

Partners: Provide three separate lists: HAVE (names of definite partners), MIGHT HAVE (names of likely partners) and NEED (profile of the types of organisations the project needs). Summarise the role of each partner in the project (write it in brackets after the partner name).	
European Dimension: Why is it important to perform the project as a co-operation at a European level?	
Initiator: Write either the name of your company (if it is your own idea) or the name of the other organisation who has proposed the project and invited you to join.	
Co-ordinator: There are 3 possibilities: (1) Your organisation co-ordinates proposal writing and the project itself; (2) Your organisation co-ordinates proposal writing, but someone else should co-ordinate the project itself; (3) Someone else co-ordinates proposal writing and the project itself.	
Duration/phases: In months. If distinct “phases” are planned, list these together with their duration.	
Work breakdown: Identify the main activities of the project (workpackages).	
Estimated budget/EU financing: ”Budget” refers to total costs, “financing” refers to how much the EU will fund.	

About the "one-page" summary

Its purpose is to provide:

- A concise *summary* of key information about an EU project idea or concrete initiative to develop a proposal.
- Simple *basis for further technical discussion*, either within your organisation or with potential partners when building a consortium.
- Support for *internal decision making*: is the proposal idea good enough to deserve the investment of time & effort needed to develop it further?
- Basis for some *parts of the proposal* text itself.

Don't think of the summary as a bureaucratic "form" that is a task in itself; it is supposed to help you crystallise and communicate your ideas about your project. So:

- *Keep it short.* If you find yourself writing lots of text for any of the sections, you have missed the point about what it's supposed to be for.
- If you have nothing to say for some of the sections, *leave them blank.* (But if you have little or nothing to say for *many* of the sections, maybe it's a sign that your ideas need to be matured drastically?).
- When the proposal text itself is well underway, most of the information here will be in the proposal anyway – so *you will no longer need this summary*. But parts of it should be useful in writing the 2000-character "Project Abstract" required by the Commission.

Guidance Notes

(1) The one word title is very often an acronym – but doesn't need to be. So you can just choose a simple name that you think suits the project. Don't waste time trying to find a perfect acronym, especially during the early stages of developing a proposal where all you really need is a "label" for the project. Also, project goals will evolve as the proposal develops, so what might have been a perfect acronym at the start may end up being misleading when the project is submitted.

(2) It is not essential that the proposal should be relevant to any parts of the Work Programme other than the specific Objective to which it is addressed. *However:* it strengthens the proposal if the relevance is wider than just to a single Objective, so try to identify and briefly describe any relevance to other Objectives, or to more general, high-level objectives of the Work Programme (as described in its introductory chapters).

(3) You need to read the text in the Work Programme carefully to find out which project types are allowed for which parts of the Work Programme. This is sometimes specified very precisely – down to the level of individual bullets/sub-sections within a given Objective.
If you don't know the difference between the different project types, you ought to find out urgently – it makes a big difference to what you can do in the project.

(4) It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between "objectives" and "results".
For instance, if you have an objective like "To develop a new compiler for C++", it is a bit redundant to then include "New Compiler for C++" as one of the results. If you find such

cases arise, take it as a signal that maybe you need to re-think what the objective really should be. Think about *why* you want to produce the result. For instance: perhaps the *objective* is “To make it possible to compile C++ programs twice as fast” and the *result* is the “New C++ compiler”.

(5) A common source of confusion for evaluators is that proposers fail to make it clear what will be done *within the project itself* and what will be made possible *after the project*. This is a classic case of something that is so obvious to the writer that it does not get explicitly stated in the document.
Proposers write sentences like the following: "The project will allow typical car journeys to be made with 20% less fuel consumption than is typical today". Does this mean that one of the project deliverables will be a car with a more fuel efficient engine? Or does it mean that the project will deliver the design documents for a new type of engine - but leave it up to others to actually manufacture them? Or does it mean that the project will deliver a report surveying the latest research in the area, and leave it up to others to produce engine designs and to others still to manufacture the car? All are possible interpretations of the sentence.
It is vital that the evaluator is left in absolutely no doubt about such issues. And it's not good enough that clarification can be found only by studying many different parts of the proposal: evaluators don't read every word, and if they stumble on a sentence that is vague when read in isolation they very soon develop a negative impression.
So: make a very clear distinction between:
* Concrete results that will be BROUGHT into the project, from the partners.
* Concrete results that will be DEVELOPED in the project, using EU money ("Objectives"/"Deliverables").
* Things that will become possible as a result of the project having achieved its objectives ("Impact").

This may sound rather obvious - but muddle and confusion on this is often a major contributing factor to proposals being considered "unclear".

(6) Whereas the “Objectives” and “Results” descriptions describe the work to be done by the consortium within the project itself, the “Impact” section should summarise what will be possible for others outside the project, using the project results.
Should answer the questions “Why are you doing this project”?, "So what?", “Who cares?”, “Why now?”. When the project has been completed, how will it make the world a better place - for society, for business, for standards, … ?

(7) The “Impact” section should aim to “educate the evaluator” e.g. by providing facts and figures from policy documents, or by providing other information that makes it clear why the project is useful.