METEOR

METHODOLOGIES FOR TEAM WORKING IN ECOOUTWARDS RESEARCH

Grant Agreement: 101178320

D3.2 Proposal Template

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Project description

Acronym	**METEOR**
Title	**Methodologies for Team Working in Eco-Outwards Research**
Coordinator	CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research in Warsaw
Reference	101178320
Type	Coordination and Support Action (CSA)
Programme	**Horizon Europe (HORIZON)**
Topic	CL2-2024-TRANSFORMATION
Start	01.12.2024
Duration	12/2024 to 11/2027
Website	www.meteorhorizon.eu
Consortium	**CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research,** Poland (Coordinator) **Nord Universitet,** Norway **The Open University,** United Kingdom **Universita Degli Studi Di Verona,** Italy **European University Cyprus,** Cyprus **Jyvaskylan Yliopisto,** Finland **Kastamonu Universitesi,** Türkiye **Ilia State University,** Georgia **Asociacion Para La Gestion Del Centro Europeo,** Spain **Hacettepe Universitesi,** Türkiye **Roskilde Universitet,** Denmark **SYNYO GmbH,** Austria **Universidade Do Estado Da Bahia,** Brazil (Associate)

Deliverable

Deliverable number	**D3.2**
Deliverable title	**Proposal Template**
Deliverable version	V.1
Lead beneficiary	**EUC**
Work package number	WP3
Work package title	METEOR Training Development
Due date of delivery	31.05.2025
Actual date of delivery	31.05.2025
Dissemination level	Public
Type	**Report**
Rights	METEOR Consortium
Authors	**Peter Gray** (CASE)
Reviewers	**Jan Bazyli Klakla** (CASE)

Document history

Version	Date	Beneficiary	Description
0.1	29.05.2025	CASE	Draft version of Proposal template with accompanying explanatory material and METEOR TRIPS Call text.
0.2	DD.MM.YYYY		
0.x	DD.MM.YYYY		
1.0	DD.MM.YYYY		

Executive Summary

This document presents the template that will be used by METEOR participant teams (Peer Mentoring Groups) to submit Transformative Research and Innovation Proposals (TRIPs). These proposals will be evaluated internally by METEOR evaluators, supported by Training Resource 3e, **Research Proposal Evaluation.** Proposals will be scored and will be the main form of assessment for the METEOR training programme. The proposals will be published as D4.4 Meteor Proposal Catalogue, which will be a major output publication with career benefits for participants.

The document also contains a draft version of the Call for Proposals to which participants will respond. A longer version of the Call for Proposals, and additional supporting materials, will be included in METEOR Training Resource 3a, Transformative Research.

The underlying basis for the template is to provide equality of opportunity and structural guidance to the METEOR teams, without creating excessive effort. It has been adapted from generic templates such as those provided for Horizon Europe RIA/CSA projects but with several changes to reflect the context of METEOR as a training programme. Notably, the 'Excellence' section normally found at the beginning of such templates has been re-titled 'Problem Statement and Background', whilst the ordering of 'Implementation' and 'Impact' has been reversed. This is explained in the document.

This is a first draft and discussions are continuing as METEOR develops its training resources and recruits participants. Further feedback will be used to refine the template and an updated version will be uploaded at the stage where it is adopted by participants as the basis for their proposals.

Contents

Acronyms & Abbreviations

Term	Description
CSA	Coordination and Support Action
DEI	Diversity, Equality and Inclusion
EC	European Commission
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
METEOR	Methodologies for Teamwork in Eco-Outwards Research
PMG	Peer Mentoring Group
R & I	Research and Innovation
RIA	Research and Innovation Action
RRI	Responsible Research and Innovation
TR	Training Resource
TRIP	Transformative Research and Innovation Proposal
UN SDG	United Nations Sustainable Development Goals

1 Introduction

1.1 Overview

The scope of this deliverable is to present the template that will be used by METEOR participant teams (Peer Mentoring Groups) to submit Transformative Research and Innovation Proposals (TRIPs). These proposals will be evaluated internally by METEOR evaluators, supported by Training Resource 3e, **Research Proposal Evaluation.** Proposals will be scored and will be the main form of assessment for the METEOR training programme. The proposals will be published as D4.4 Meteor Proposal Catalogue, which will be a major output publication with career benefits for participants.

The document also contains a draft version of the Call for Proposals to which participants will respond. A longer version of the Call for Proposals, and additional supporting materials, will be included in METEOR Training Resource 3a, Transformative Research.

The underlying basis for the template is to provide equality of opportunity and structural guidance to the METEOR teams, without creating excessive effort. It has been adapted from generic templates such as those provided for Horizon Europe RIA/CSA projects but with several changes to reflect the context of METEOR as a training programme. Notably, the 'Excellence' section normally found at the beginning of such templates has been re-titled 'Problem Statement and Background', whilst the ordering of 'Implementation' and 'Impact' has been reversed. This is explained in the document.

This is a first draft and discussions are continuing as METEOR develops its training resources and recruits participants. Further feedback will be used to refine the template and an updated version will be uploaded at the stage where it is adopted by participants as the basis for their proposals.

1.2 Relation to other tasks and deliverables

This deliverable is related to the following other tasks and deliverables:

Receives inputs from:

Table 1. D3.2 Input from other tasks and deliverables

Deliverable	Due Date	Input for Dx.x
D3.3	M12	Overall course catalogue Ph.1
D3.4	M18	Overall course catalogue Ph.1

Provides outputs to:

Table 2. D3.2 Output for other tasks and deliverables

Deliverable	Due Date	Output from Dx.x
D4.4 METEOR Proposal catalogue	M30	Forms basis for proposals included in the catalogue

1.3 Structure of the deliverable

The deliverable comprises an introductory text, the draft call text to which participant will respond (Appendix 1) and the draft proposal template itself (Appendix 2).

2 Introduction

2.1 METEOR Transformative Research and Innovation Proposal (TRIP) Template

2.1.1 What is a proposal in the context of METEOR?

Proposals and peer-reviewed articles are the two most important forms of creative writing for researchers. Since peer-reviewed articles come after a piece of research has been performed, they are not as fundamental to the research ecosystem as proposals, which are one of the ecosystem components that determines what kind of research and innovation work is actually done.

Proposals are also generally the result of teamwork and there is no issue around attribution to individual or collective authors. However, the contributors are often mentioned implicitly as part of the proposed project team, which involves them in presenting themselves in the best possible light relative to the chosen topic. Teamwork is involved in formulating this topic, providing background material and references, and in determining the functional aspects of the proposed project. Successful proposals make much of this teamwork invisible to the evaluators, involving decisions about style and consistency.

The evaluation of proposals is, arguably, a more demanding process than peer review, since evaluators must consider the risks and opportunities associated with spending substantial funds on a speculative activity. In addition, they usually represent a funding body which has specific requirements in relation to some kind of strategy, as set out in a Call for Proposals. In METEOR, we have kept our Call as open as possible, in order to encourage the creativity and vision of participating teams, whilst maintaining an overall position that supports transformative actions with high levels of potential benefit for society.

A summary of the current METEOR Call version is provided in Appendix 1 of this document. The Call sets various parameters for proposals including maximum funding, duration (1-10 years) and levels of interdisciplinarity.

Funding has been limited to three million EUR for all proposals. This level of funding is arbitrary, but in line with the accepted practice of the European Commission and other funding bodies. We will require participants to prepare a budget within the available amount, specifying items such as staff costs, travel and equipment. METEOR Training Resource TR3f: *Research and Innovation Project Design* will include basic information on budgeting and associated financial considerations, with the innovative feature of relating budgets to impact in a direct way.

Duration has also been set at an arbitrary level of 1-10 years. The upper limit is longer than is customary but permits more effective impact studies and/or longitudinal research, which is currently being encouraged by the EC via Horizon projects such as MapIE. The lower limit enables proposals to address urgent topics, including ongoing conflict or disaster situations. Regardless of the chosen duration, teams will be asked, via the template, to justify their choices and to explain how their proposed solution is sustainable after the end of the funding period.

The template, provided in Appendix 2, is loosely modelled on generic Horizon Europe templates, for three reasons. Firstly, whilst researchers will encounter a wide variety of proposal templates throughout their careers, the Horizon process is a high-stakes endeavour with challenging requirements. Secondly, because METEOR is pursuing an eco-outwards form of research and

innovation, the kind of business-case proposals found in industry and commerce would be inappropriate. Nevertheless, we have incorporated a 'business canvas' section, as does the typical Horizon template. Finally, the adoption of a Horizon-like template will be useful for training evaluators in METEOR TR3e, *Research Proposal Evaluation,* enabling them to go forward as potential EU experts or to work with national funding agencies.

We have combined the features of Part A and Part B of the Horizon process to simplify the administrative aspects. However, the template is designed so that the details of the team participants can be easily removed, if necessary, e.g. for blind review. The ethics component of Part A has been included in Section 1 and Section 2, as it is relevant to the overall justification for the concept and to aspects of implementation. In line with EC thinking, and the principles of Responsible Research and Innovation (RRI), ethics has been prioritised as a central consideration in R & I projects, rather than as a tick-box exercise. Similarly, diversity, equality and inclusion (DEI) issues, including gender, are included as parts of Sections 1, 2 and 3.

Security issues are not included as a specific item since the overall principles of METEOR should preclude security-sensitive topics being generated, although teams may wish to discuss security as part of the ethical dimension in certain cases.

2.1.2 Specific features of the template

The template is structured around three high-level sections, based on the Excellence/Impact/Implementation structure of Horizon. We have chosen to replace the 'Excellence' heading with 'Problem Statement and Background'. This is because excellence is a contested concept, based on criteria internal to the discipline(s) involved and not on any absolute standard. The reality is that 'Excellence' sections are an extended reflection on the Call topic and a justification of the proposed approach to it, based on the extant literature and the knowledge of the team. We have avoided using 'research question' as a central term, since this limits the proposal's scope for outward-facing innovation.

We have also reversed the order of implementation and impact, since logically, there is no impact without implementation. This also raises the question of value-for-money, since impact is always quantitatively affected by the available budget, which is implicitly determined by the implementation process.

2.2 Section 1

In the METEOR template, we have sub-divided the section into:

1.1 Problem Statement: what is the problem or issue that your proposal will address?
1.2 Background/state of the art: what is the scientific or technical background to your chosen topic? What does the literature say? Have there been previous attempts to address it, including other funded projects?
1.3 Alternatives: are there other ways in which your chosen problem could be addressed?
1.4 Justification: why is your proposed action the best way of addressing the problem?
1.5 Overall aim: what do you propose to do? This section will act as a summary of the proposal for reference purposes.
1.6 Specific objectives: what steps will you take to achieve your overall aim?

1.7 Ethics and DEI: what ethical and diversity, equality and inclusion considerations are involved in your choice of topic? How will you ensure that issues such as gender are taken into account in the overall design?

2.3 Section 2: Implementation

2.1 Workplan: this section will describe the overall structure of the proposed project, based on the objectives set in section 1.6. As per established practice, teams will be encouraged to use the concept of the Work Package (WP), but with justification for the chosen WP structure and timing.

2.2 Timeline: this section describes the timing of the project and justification for the duration of specific activities. The concept of the Gantt chart will be introduced in training activities, but we will specifically encourage teams to provide a narrative justifying their choice of timing and the influence of external factors. For example, in educational projects, the academic year and related timetabling affect when interventions can be introduced.

2.3 Milestones: these relate to the Gantt chart and the WP structure,

2.4 Outputs: this section describes the artefacts that will be produced by the proposed project. Since the process is generic and speculative, the outputs are not described as 'deliverables' with a technical relationship to funding, progress reports etc. We will encourage teams to design outputs with high impact outside the research ecosystem, in line with METEOR's eco-outwards approach. Whilst the production of peer-reviewed articles might constitute a high-impact output within the research ecosystem, it rarely impacts directly on the outside world without some kind of translation process, such as when research is reported in the press or on TV. Therefore, we will encourage teams to be imaginative in their choice of output formats.

2.5 Governance: this is an apparently uncontroversial aspect of project design, but we have included it because it should reflect democratic principles, interdisciplinarity and responsiveness to external opinion. Emerging researchers need the skills to function as members of working groups, steering committees and other bodies, and also need to be involved in networks of various kinds. The role of advisory boards and other consultative bodies is important here.

2.6 Resources: this section includes a budget table and narrative descriptions of any exceptional items, with justification of why the requested resources are adequate and if applicable, arguments for whether an increased budget might leverage disproportionate increases in impact.

2.7 Consortium: this could be a difficult section for emerging researchers to address, so we will only be asking for brief descriptions and justifications of individual researchers and their potential institutional partners.

2.8 Risk management: We will ask teams to identify and quantify potential risks to the successful completion of the proposed project. Quantification of risks is important since targets are arbitrary and minor differences in numbers are less important than, for example, failure to make a crucial component work properly.

2.4 Section 3: Impact

3.1 Overall Impact: this section builds on the project summary from section 1.5 and describes the scope and ambition of the proposed project in relation to impact.

3.2 Specific Impact Areas: this section adds detail in relation to specific impact areas and audiences. In METEOR TR3g, *Impact and Behavioural Change*, participants will work on their ability to forecast impact both within quantitative parameters, and through considering the indirect effects of projects, such as networking, career advancement and institutional positioning.

3.3 Communication: this section covers the proposed methods for communicating project results and activities, as will be covered in METEOR TR3j: *Communication and Dissemination.* We will expect teams to carefully consider the available channels and media, and the practical aspects of communication.

3.4 Dissemination: this section deals with how the ideas and outputs generated in the project can be effectively inserted into the relevant Research and Innovation ecosystems and embedded in future practice.

3.5 Exploitation: this section relates to METEOR TR3i: *Entrepreneurship, Exploitation and Career Development.* Participants will be expected to consider how the proposed project could benefit their own careers, including through start-ups or other commercial activities. A business canvas section is included in this section of the template to stimulate thinking about the economic exploitation of project results, even in cases where these might not be obvious commercial prospects.

3.6 Sustainability: building upon 3.5, this section asks teams to describe how their work could continue to provide benefits for society after the end of the proposed funding period, whether through activities proposed in 3.5 or via other means. This section also asks teams to consider the environmental costs of their proposed activities and how these could be minimised.

3 Appendix 1: METEOR Call text

METEOR-Call for Transformative Research and Innovation Proposals (TRIPS)

Programme: Methodologies for Teamwork in Eco-Outwards Research, 2025-27

Mission: Develop and demonstrate collaborative and other transversal skills through training activities and by creating international, interdisciplinary proposals.

Destination: Scientifically excellent, high-impact and realistic projects with social value

The Call

METEOR invites its Peer Mentoring Groups to submit proposals for original research and innovation projects with scientific excellence, positive societal impact and a plan for efficient implementation.

The proposal will include an indicative budget, and statements on gender, diversity and ethics.

A template will be provided. There will be an overall page limit and word limits within sections. The template will reflect the format of current EU and national templates.

The research and innovation philosophy of METEOR is eco-outwards. This means that the proposed projects should not only increase knowledge but should also design innovative ways of using that knowledge. Furthermore, the proposed projects should have benefits for natural or human ecosystems, even if indirectly.

This is a doctoral-level programme, and we therefore expect ideas to reflect the state of the art across the various disciplines involved. Interdisciplinarity within the groups should lead to boundary-crossing projects that disrupt conventional expectations.

We will use the proposal as an assessment tool, but its main purpose is to create thought, discussion and action around a focused topic. The questioning process that drives successful proposals requires a group. Proposals are encountered in all forms of employment, and we are using proposals as a core activity because they require research-based knowledge but are not expected to involve time-intensive fieldwork.

Section 1 of each proposal should contain some references to relevant literature, setting out a coherent theoretical framework for the proposed action. The word ‘action’ is important, since we expect that the core idea can be implemented in some way. Implementation could be in the form of policies, systems, artefacts or devices, social innovations and much more.

The purpose of METEOR is to expand your research horizon, to connect what you do and what you know to other bodies of knowledge in order to transform the world in a positive way. This can also be described as impact, which constitutes the real value of the proposed project. METEOR will show that the proposal writing process is not just an irritating chore that academics have to do to fund their research or please their institution. It should be a fundamental dimension of how we do things.

The proposal template includes a business canvas, which will require you to think about the creation and measurement of value in your proposed project. Preparing this canvas does not mean that your idea has to be commercially viable. Rather, it should demonstrate that the value of its outputs (its impact) exceeds the value of its inputs (i.e. the requested funding). This will require teams to apply creative thinking and imaginative measurement methods or indicators.

The Call: Parameters and Constraints

All serious research takes place within a set of constraints, usually imposed by funding bodies but also by society and other actors within the research ecosystem. EU research, such as in the Horizon programme, is constrained by a series of factors before it becomes a specific call. These include:

1. The institutional principles and purposes of the EU, such as promoting social cohesion and economic growth.
2. Political considerations at Council of Ministers level
3. Internal European Commission policies, principles and politics
4. Directorate-general policies, principles and politics
5. Knowledge, attitudes and priorities of EC desk officers
6. External opinion and lobbying of experts and interest groups

Each of these stages constrains the function of the project in performing its allocated mission.

Constraints operate along seven principal axes:

1. Content
2. Budget
3. Time
4. Space
5. Outcomes
6. External reaction (apart from EC, significant in the evolution process)
7. Ethics

The EC Horizon Programme and METEOR are both constrained in the same way, except that in the case of TRIPs, our budget is non-existent or fictional. However, any budget is fictional until it reaches the bank of the research-performing organisation. Skills in the research community might be thought of as a constraint, but in practice the pool of available skills is assumed to be unlimited. Consortia have to show that the outcomes of their projects are not constrained by any lack of skill. To some extent the formation of groups is arbitrary and there will be an unpredictable mix of skills, with results which are equally unpredictable but also constrained, as we explore using an analogy.

The seven external constraints on TRIPs and how they are specified in the METEOR Call.

1. Content
2. Budget
3. Time
4. Space
5. Outcomes
6. External reaction
7. Ethics

Content: what will be the topic of your TRIP?

The topic of your TRIP is limited by three things: your collective imagination as a group, your negotiated consensus as to what it should be, and the principle of “do no harm”. It could be further steered by the UN SDGs or other sets of “good things”, which will be documented in the training resources, but essentially (some) external people should benefit, and not at the expense of others.

As a research and innovation project, the topic might result in various forms of outcome, which we will discuss further below. Outcomes can be material (a new or better thing), systemic (a new or better way of doing things), artistic (a new or better way of creative expression) or anything else, so long as you can justify it with evidence. This is important because the basis of research is science and scientific methods.

The Budget Constraint: How did we decide?

As we are committed to equal opportunities, it makes sense to offer the same amount of fictional funding to all groups, so we have set an overall budget constraint of 3 million Euros, which is typical for EU projects and makes sense in many commercial fields as well.

All projects require staff time together with other specific costs such as travel, some kinds of equipment and dissemination of results. Detailed training on budgets will be given in Training Resources 3f and 3h. There will be a budget template for guidance. The criteria for evaluating proposals will include items relating to the budget and whether it is realistic for the proposed work. We include these criteria because thinking about budgets is often a good way of testing assumptions about how a project will be implemented and how much impact it will have, as well as an important transversal skill.

The budget also has a relationship with the scale and ambition of the proposal. Ambition is not the same as scale. Our ambition to transform doctoral education is more than just delivering some training courses. We want you to be ambitious in some way that exceeds the actual processes and activities in your proposal. Clearly one can be under- or over-ambitious, and fail in either direction. Ambition is also an evaluation criterion, designed to test your powers of judgement in making claims and justifying your potential impact.

The Time Constraint.

In METEOR, we will give you between 9-12 months to prepare your proposal, with the exact deadlines being fixed once dates are in place for the academies. This again is a typical period for developing a Horizon proposal, although we have simplified the process somewhat! In terms of your own time commitment, we suggest an average of an hour per week over the duration of the METEOR programme although this is a guideline only and we hope you won't hear the clock ticking!

For the TRIP itself, we will leave it to you to propose a timescale within an overall frame of 1-10 years. Shorter periods are convenient for administrators but preclude many kinds of interventions e.g. in education, where longitudinal research is crucial to determine impact. Conversely, short projects are good for maintaining the engagement of their participants. The nature of your chosen problem is also relevant, since some phenomena are more urgently in need of action than others.

Space

What we mean here is the 'where' of your TRIP. The Call does not limit you geographically, although the intention is that the groups should have a multi-national membership. This means that your TRIP should include at least the countries represented in your group, with more being included if you can show how this would work in practice. It would, for example, be feasible to propose a multi-national initiative in a third-party country, where urgent problems need to be addressed.

Space also raises the issue of language. For practical reasons METEOR is conducted in English but we welcome proposals that take account of other languages and the implications for your TRIP.

Outputs and Outcomes

Outputs are artefacts: pieces of equipment, apps, documents, anything with form. Outcomes are a class of constraint imposed by funders who have a specific vision of why they would like you to perform one kind of research rather than another. Outcomes are changes that occur as a result of the project and are a large part of the resulting impact.

From METEOR, the European Commission wants a new wave of postgraduates and early career researchers with enhanced teamworking and other so-called transversal skills. What we want is the best of both worlds, transformative research and innovative ideas, developed by this new wave of researchers.

We want to keep constraints on outputs and outcomes to a minimum, so your creativity can flow freely.

External reaction

External reaction to proposals is an underestimated form of constraint, simply because very few people see them. Mostly, reaction to research occurs after the event, and only if it gets into the public domain. Peer review is obviously one form of external reaction, but in most cases, peer or expert review of proposals is highly confidential, and only happens after submission. This reduces or eliminates the possibility of formative assessment and input.

Ethics

The ethical dimension of your TRIPs is very important and there will be training in how to address ethical questions across disciplines and other boundaries.

Word count

This is a pragmatic constraint, but it is an important one. Sometimes it is easier to write more rather than less. We have indicated word counts in each of the sections that are designed to encourage brevity whilst providing enough space for rich discussion.

4 Appendix 2: METEOR Proposal Template

Proposal Title

Proposal Acronym

Peer Mentoring Group identifier

Note: Word counts are indicative and it is fine to write less than the set limit!

Dates of events or actions should be given in project months (PM) where M2 is the end of the second month after the start date. You can assume a start date of September 1st 2027 as a default.

Section 1: Problem Statement and Background

1.1 Problem Statement: what is the problem or issue that your proposal will address?

Max 500 words

1.2 Background/state of the art: what is the scientific or technical background to your chosen topic? What does the literature say? Have there been previous attempts to address it, including other funded projects?

Max 3,000 words

1.3 Alternatives: are there other ways in which your chosen problem could be addressed?

Max 500 words

1.4 Justification: why is your proposed action the best way of addressing the problem?

Max 500 words

1.5 Overall aim: what do you propose to do? This section will act as a summary of the proposal for reference purposes.

Max 1,000 words

1.6 Specific objectives: what steps will you take to achieve your overall aim?

Max 1,000 words

1.7 Ethics and DEI: what ethical and diversity, equality and inclusion considerations are involved in your choice of topic? How will you ensure that issues such as gender are taken into account in the overall design?

Ethics and DEI statement: Max 1,000 words

Section 2: Implementation

2.1 Workplan: this section describes the overall structure of the proposed project, based on the objectives set in section 1.6. You may wish to use the concept of the Work Package (WP), with appropriate justification for the chosen WP structure and timing.

Work plan: max 1,000 words

Table 2.1: Work package summary

WP no.	WP Title	Description
(add rows as req'd		

2.2 Timeline: this section describes the timing of the project and justification for the duration of specific activities. It should include a Gantt chart and a narrative justifying the choice of timing. It should also include a table incorporating a schedule of planned events.

[Insert Gantt chart]

Narrative: max 1,000 words

Table 2.2: Schedule of events

Event no.	Event name	Description
Add rows as req'd		

2.3 Milestones: these relate to the Gantt chart and the WP structure.

Table 2.3: Milestones (min 6, max 18)

Milestone no.	Description	Date (PM)
Add rows as req'd		

2.4 Outputs: this section describes the artefacts that will be produced by the proposed project. These can include documents, videos, material objects, software, events or performances.

Table 2.4: Outputs

Output no.	Output title	Description
Add rows as req'd		

2.5 Governance: this section describes how the project will be organised, including the composition of committees or working groups, and guidelines for decision-making.

Description: max 1,000 words

2.6 Resources: this section includes a budget table and narrative descriptions of any exceptional items, with justification of why the requested resources are adequate and if applicable, arguments for whether an increased budget might leverage disproportionate increases in impact. Excel budget tables will be demonstrated in TR3f and may be used as a basis for table 2.6.

Table 2.6: Outline budget

Cost type (e.g.)	Amount EUR	Related WP	Remarks
Staff costs			
Travel and accommodation			
Equipment			
Overheads			
Exceptional costs			

2.7 Consortium: this could be a difficult section for emerging researchers to address, so we will only be asking for brief descriptions and justifications of individual researchers and their potential institutional partners.

Table 2.7: Consortium

Researcher	Skillset/research interests	Role in project	Institutional involvement
Add rows as req'd			

2.8 Risk management: Identify potential risks to the successful completion of the proposed project.

Table 2.8: Risk Management

Potential Risk	Proposed Mitigation measure
(add rows as req'd)	

Section 3: Impact

3.1 Overall Impact: this section builds on the project summary from section 1.5 and describes the scope and ambition of the proposed project in relation to impact.

Description: max. 1,000 words

3.2 Specific Impact Areas: this section adds detail in relation to specific impact areas and audiences. In METEOR TR3g, *Impact and Behavioural Change*, participants will work on forecasting impact both within quantitative parameters, and through considering the indirect effects of projects, such as networking, career advancement and institutional positioning.

Description: max. 1,000 words

Table 3.2: Summary of specific impact areas

Impact area or target group	Brief Impact description	Impact quantification (if applicable)
(add rows as req'd)		

3.3 Communication: this section covers the proposed methods for communicating project results and activities, as will be covered in METEOR TR3j: *Communication and Dissemination.* We will expect teams to carefully consider the available channels and media, and the practical aspects of communication.

Table 3.3: Communication Channels and Audiences

Target Audience	Channel or medium	Target Audience numbers
(add rows as req'd)		

3.4 Dissemination: this section deals with how the ideas and outputs generated in the project can be effectively inserted into the relevant Research and Innovation ecosystems and embedded in future practice.

Description: max. 1,000 words

3.5 Exploitation: this section relates to METEOR TR3i: *Entrepreneurship, Exploitation and Career Development.* Participants will be expected to consider how the proposed project could benefit their own careers, including through start-ups or other commercial activities. A business canvas section is included in this section of the template to stimulate thinking about the economic exploitation of project results, even in cases where these might not be obvious commercial prospects. Although this may repeat what has been said earlier, it provides a cross-check for essential dimensions of the proposal.

Description: max. 1,000 words

[insert business canvas diagram]

Six suggested headings for diagram:

1) What is your proposed R & I outcome? (Product)
2) Who benefits from this outcome and to what extent? (Clients)
3) How will you reach these clients?
4) How much will it cost to achieve the proposed benefits?
5) How might you sustain the impact of the proposed project?
6) What are the risks involved?

3.6 Sustainability: building upon 3.5, this section asks teams to describe how their work could continue to provide benefits for society after the end of the proposed funding period, whether through activities proposed in 3.5 or via other means. This section also asks teams to consider the environmental costs of their proposed activities and how these could be minimised.

Description: max. 1,000 words

5 Conclusions

The METEOR Proposal Template brings together a range of considerations in formulating a project and understanding the constraints applicable to real world research and innovation. We have considered several aspects of the template format and will exploit the interconnections between these aspects in our training resources.

The template may change as we begin our training programmes and interact with participants, but we believe that the core elements are robust and will produce focused, innovative and impactful proposals.