



Proposal for Redistribution of possible unused funding ARIES Governing Board 31 May 2022

Maurizio Vretenar, CERN, Project Coordinator

Background and Procedure

The present proposal has been discussed and defined in consultation by:

- The Project Coordinator (M. Vretenar)
- The Financial Officer (S. Stavrev) and his team;
- The Chair of the GB (N. Sammut)

and is based on some redistribution rules and procedures identified and voted for the EuCARD-2 project in 2017.

Please note that it is too early to make precise calculations on budget redistribution: the final figures will be known only at end of July, and will be approved by the EC only in September.

Today, we propose to vote on the criteria for redistribution, to be used for the final calculations to be done in September/October.

The final redistribution will be the subject of an electronic vote in September/October.

Basic Principles

1. **Redistribute separately the budget for TA's and the budget for NA's and JRA's** – *the share TA / (NA+JRA) is a characteristic of the project and we should avoid the complex situation of TA's to impact the smoother work of NA's and JRA's.*
2. Allocate the **unused TA budget** from facilities below target to facilities that have exceeded their target, following a specific algorithm presented in the following.
3. Limit the EC contribution to partners that have **spent less than 80% of their full project costs** (including matching funds but excluding Transnational Access) – *to reduce funding to those who did not provide enough matching resources.*
4. **Redistribute EC contributions** (NA and JRA) that cannot be claimed (not enough eligible/full cost expenditures) to partners that have engaged more resources than foreseen (full cost >100%), at **pro rata of full cost** – *using the same procedure as for EuCARD-2.*

Proposal for reallocation of TA budget

TA status for the 14 facilities:

Facility	Institute	Annex1 amendment (EC funding)					Achieved end of P3	Difference	Difference	Other budget (as Annex 1) col. G	Access + support budget per access unit	Reduction EC contrib.	Requested increase in contrib.	Capped or agreed increase	Proportionally distributed increase	New Total EC budget (proposal)	
		Access units	Access costs	User support	Other budget	Total EC budget	Access units	Access units	%	€	€	€	€	€	€	€	
Magnet	CERN	1300	0	94,453	9,902	104,355	1932	632	48.6%	9,902	72.7		45,919		13,657	118,012	
Gersemi	UU	1800	29,303	18,000	25,000	72,303	0	-1800	-100.0%	25,000	26.3	-47,303				25,000	
HiRadMat	CERN	664	0	340,486	3,057	343,543	2426	1762	265.4%	3,057	512.8		903,518	40,000		383,543	
UNILAC	GSI	768	#####	70,400	12,473	293,913	944	176	22.9%	12,473	366.5		64,497		19,182	313,095	
ANKA	KIT	768	#####	48,000	5,073	372,733	1868	1100	143.2%	5,073	478.7		526,595	40,000		412,733	
FLUTE	KIT	308	23,586	27,720	12,936	64,242	136	-172	-55.8%	12,936	166.6	-28,651				35,591	
IPHI	CEA	72	6,679	3,510	35,000	45,189	72	0	0.0%	35,000	141.5					45,189	
SINBAD	DESY	210	22,708	11,700	14,592	49,000	2	-208	-99.0%	14,592	163.8	-34,081				14,919	
VELA	STFC	288	85,200	25,920	48,771	159,891	184	-104	-36.1%	48,771	385.8	-40,127				119,765	
HNOSS	UU	3790	#####	34,742	107,937	266,436	4494	704	18.6%	107,937	41.8		29,441		8,756	275,192	
XBOX	CERN	7500	0	90,000	68,495	158,495	10701	3201	42.7%	68,495	12.0		38,412		11,424	169,919	
Apollon	CNRS	0	0	0	31,330	31,330	30	30		31,330	1334.0		40,019	40,000		71,330	
LPA-UHI100	CEA	488	57,096	16,653	14,235	87,984	328	-160	-32.8%	14,235	151.1	-24,180				63,804	
LULAL	ULUND	768	#####	40,320	17,553	188,433	788	20	2.6%	17,553	222.5		4,450		1,323	189,757	
		18724				2,237,848	23,905						-174,342	1,602,483	120,000	54,342	2,237,849

All figures refer to the Annex1 Amendement approved in July 2020, after rescaling of Units.

Reallocation of TA budget – proposed procedure

1. Confirm the “**other budget**” to all facilities – even if they did not provide access, they had travel, coordination, upgrades, advertisement. Under the condition that these costs can be claimed to the EC.
2. Calculate the **EC contribution / Access Unit** for each facility, from the remaining costs (access and user support). Deduce the amount corresponding to the units not provided.
3. Cap the redistribution of the rest to a **maximum of 40'000 € per facility**.
4. Distribute the rest at **pro-rata of the cost of additional access** provided.

	Achieved end of P3	Difference	Other budget (as Annex 1) col. G	Access & support budget per unit	Reduction EC contrib.	Requested increase in contrib.	Capped or agreed increase	Proportionally distributed increase	New Total EC budget (proposal)
Facility	Access units	Access units	€	€	€	€	€	€	€
Magnet	1932	632	9,902	72.7		45,919		13,657	118,012
Gersemi	0	-1800	25,000	26.3	-47,303				25,000
HiRadMat	2426	1762	3,057	512.8		903,518	40,000		383,543
UNILAC	944	176	12,473	366.5		64,497		19,182	313,095
ANKA	1868	1100	5,073	478.7		526,595	40,000		412,733
FLUTE	136	-172	12,936	166.6	-28,651				35,591
IPHI	72	0	35,000	141.5					45,189
SINBAD	2	-208	14,592	163.8	-34,081				14,919
VELA	184	-104	48,771	385.8	-40,127				119,765
HNOSS	4494	704	107,937	41.8		29,441		8,756	275,192
XBOX	10701	3201	68,495	12.0		38,412		11,424	169,919
Apollon	30	30	31,330	1334.0		40,019	40,000		71,330
LPA-UHI100	328	-160	14,235	151.1	-24,180				63,804
LULAL	788	20	17,553	222.5		4,450		1,323	189,757
	23,905				-174,342	1,602,483	120,000	54,342	2,237,849

Reallocation of NA and JRA budget

Total amount to be redistributed estimated between 100 and 150 k€.

Propose to follow the procedure defined for EuCARD2:

The sum is redistributed pro-rata of the part exceeding 100% of the total cost declared to the project (IRUS), with the following limitations:

1. The additional amount must be within the EC requested funding of the partner.
2. A maximum limit (cap) may be defined to avoid an unbalanced redistribution – if needed.
3. A minimum limit (threshold) for additional funding will be defined to reduce administration – usually 5 k€.

We propose that the process, including selection of thresholds, is performed in close contact with the Chair of the Board, who will follow and control the redistribution on behalf of the Board.

Example: an institute has announced at the beginning of the project a Full Cost of 100k and has declared in the IRUS to have spent 150k. Its pro-rata to be used to receive an additional budget allocation is 50k.

Alternative redistribution options

In EuCARD2, two other options for redistribution were discussed:

- redistribute unused EC funding to beneficiaries that have spent more EC funding than initially foreseen (considered not fair),
- allocate the unused EC funding to an activity within the next project.

At the time of EuCARD-2, we did not have an appropriate plan in ARIES for spending the budget, but now we have I.FAST that has just launched the call for projects of the **IFAST Innovation Fund**.

Could we consider that instead of doing all the arithmetic in the previous slide for 100 -150 k€, we **move the unused budget to the IFAST Fund and support one more project?**

Conclusion – question to the Governing Board

We ask the Governing board to **give mandate** to the Project Coordinator, supported by the Project Management team at CERN and in agreement with the Chair of the Governing Board, to submit to the Board in **September-October 2022** a **proposal for redistribution of unused ARIES EC contributions**.

This proposal will be made accordingly to the **basic criteria presented in slide 3** (amended after today's discussion if required) and will be based on the **detailed financial data** to be submitted at end of June.

The proposal will be submitted to the **electronic vote** of the members of the Board.

In case of open questions or critical comments, the Chair of the Board can ask to call for an **extraordinary meeting** of the Board to discuss remaining issues.