

GRANT PREPARATION REPORT - INTERNAL

PROPOSAL INFO:

Proposal number:	700626	Call / Subcall:	H2020-BES-2014-2015 / H2020-BES-2015
Acronym:	iCROSS	Topic:	Border crossing points topic 1: Novel mobility concepts for land border security
Title:	Intelligent Portable ContROl SyStem	Type of action:	Research and Innovation action (RIA)
Duration:	36	Prefinancing:	
N° of RP:	2	Duration RP:	RP1: 18 months RP2: 18 months
Ethics issues:	Yes	Ethics clearance:	CONDITIONALLY_CLEARED

N° of participants that have signed the Declaration of Honour: 12 out of 13

Proposed start date: 01/09/2016

A fixed start date has been agreed with the REA in order to align all partners to deliver the first deliverable of Task 2.1, which is analysis of user requirements and definition of use case scenarios. This work is to be carried out during the first 4 month of the project implementation. Postponing the start date of the project will minimise the risk of delaying the work depending on the results of task 2.1.

Beneficiaries with EWS (No)

Beneficiaries with weak or insufficient financial capacity (Yes)

(If yes, explain how this result was taken into account in the grant agreement)

Beneficiary [REDACTED]

After the analysis the PO considers that:

The risk is purely financial, which is however limited. The project has 13 partners, [REDACTED] is one of the partner not the coordinator. [REDACTED] With the proposed prefinancing [REDACTED] minus [REDACTED] the financial risk is almost entirely covered by the guarantee fund.

Furthermore the project proposed the reporting on every 6 months (periodic progress reports as well as annual reports planned as the deliverables). This system of reporting will allow the PO to monitor the risks.

Reinforced monitoring is therefore considered as not necessary.

Third parties (No)

(Are there any third parties identified in the Annex 1 other than third parties carrying out the work and already defined in Art. 14, Annex 1 and table of beneficiaries in SYGMA)

Subcontracting (Yes)

(Are there any subcontracting costs and tasks identified in Annex 1 and in the budget?)

Subcontracting is foreseen by one of the partners (JAS) for the purchase for installation of the iCROSS mobile border check system components. This is justified by the nature of the project.

Other significant comments

The project has taken into account the comments presented in ESR and slightly modified the Technical Annex, namely:

- The project provided further clarification why it covers also the hidden human detector tool even if this was not requested in the topic.
- The further details justifying the use of wi-fi hotspot was provided.

Does the project offer any significant communication opportunities for the European Commission? (No)

The opportunities should be on the level of senior management - commissioner

Are there any ethics issues? (Yes)

If yes: - specify if there are hESC issues. - indicate how the requirements identified have been addressed by the consortium in the DoA - specify if national/local certificates are required and whether they have been received or not

In total 7 requirements after the ethic review were provided for the project. 3 of them are going to be implemented after the signature of the project. The relevant deliverables have been added.

There were 4 pre-grant requirements concerning:

- Detailed information on the informed consent procedure, collection, storage, protection, retention and destruction of data;
- Incidental findings policy
- Details on the specific techniques mentioned in technical annex,
- Detailed information on recruitment and informed consent.

The Project has prepared the extensive Code of Ethics and Ethics Advisor (as the part of DoA), where all above mentioned requirements were described in details.

If the proposal needs the security scrutiny, has the security scrutiny been performed? (Yes)

If yes, indicate how the elements identified in the Security Scrutiny Report have been addressed by the consortium in the DoA

The security scrutiny was conducted and presented recommendation for setting up the Security Advisory Board (SAB), which will assess the sensitivity of selected deliverables before its publication. The project in the section 6.3.2 of part B of DoA confirmed the creation of SAB, which will be led by the Project Security Officer (already nominated at the proposal stage).

Other significant comments

Comment of significant issues relevant to the authorizing officer

Reinforced monitoring will be implemented through the following activities (No)

At beneficiary level: supporting docs for cost claims, audit, mandatory participation in review X, ... At actionlevel: early reviews, review with all beneficiaries present, ...