

COST Innovators Grant (CIG) Application and Evaluation Guidelines Level C 2026-2027

**COST 105/21
V4.1
25 September 2025**

Copyright Notice

© The COST Association

Reproduction of this document and its content, in part or in whole, is authorised, provided the source is acknowledged, save where otherwise stated.

Document Change History

Version	Release date	Summary of changes
4.1	25 September 2025	Slight changes in the text reflecting the upgrades in e-COST platform regarding application process; improving the clarity and readability of the text.
4.0	25 September 2024	Changes in the application process
3.0	7 December 2022	No overlap of Action and CIG activities New timeline for feedback and redress procedure Clarification throughout the document on the role of the Submitter, the candidate CIG Chair and the applicants
2.0 (former CIG- Level C- Guidelines 2022-2023)	1 December 2021	In line with the Simplification exercise Changes in the terms of template usage as eligibility criterion Detailed description of explicit MC vote CIG team composition cannot be changed after submission Removed Implementation chapter as it is now contained in COST 098/21 Rules for COST Innovators Grants CIG Final Achievement Report reviewed by Rapporteur

1.0 (former CIG-Level C-Guidelines 2021-2022)	02 December 2020	Release of COST 060/19 REV COST Innovators Grant (CIG) Guidelines 2021 - 2022 CIG Committee constitution Evaluation Report (feedback to the applicants) Confidentiality Honoraria
	4 September 2019	Release of COST 060/19 COST Innovators' Grant (CIG) Guidelines (Pilot Phase)
Design of the CIG (Pilot)	11 April 2019	First release of the COST 007/19 Design of the COST Innovators' Grant document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. APPLYING FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT	5
2.1. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT	5
2.2. PREPARING AND SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT	6
2.2.1. THE APPLICATION PROCESS	6
2.2.2. APPLICATION TEMPLATE - PART A AND PART B	6
2.2.2.1. CIG APPLICATION - PART A	7
2.2.2.2. CIG APPLICATION - PART B	8
2.2.2.3. WRITING STYLE GUIDE	10
2.2.3. APPROVAL BY THE ACTION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE	10
3. EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF COST INNOVATORS GRANT APPLICATIONS	11
3.1. CIG COMMITTEE	12
3.2. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURE OVERVIEW	12
3.2.1. CIG APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING	12
3.2.2. INDIVIDUAL REMOTE EVALUATION OF THE APPLICATION	12
3.2.3. INSTRUCTIONS TO THE CIG COMMITTEE FOR THE EVALUATION OF CIG APPLICATIONS	13
3.2.4. CIG HEARINGS AND FINAL RANKING	14
4. APPROVAL BY THE CSO	14
5. EVALUATION FEEDBACK AND REDRESS	15
5.1. EVALUATION FEEDBACK	15
5.2. REDRESS PROCEDURE	15
6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST (COI) AND CONFIDENTIALITY	15
6.1. CONFIDENTIALITY	16
7. HONORARIA	17

1. INTRODUCTION

This document provides a guide on the submission, evaluation, selection and approval of CIG applications. All enquiries concerning the COST Innovators Grant can be addressed to CIG@cost.eu.

The Committee of Senior Officials of the COST Association (CSO) has adopted on 11 April 2019 a CSO Decision providing for the Design of the COST Innovators Grant¹ (CIG). The COST Executive Board has adopted the COST Innovators Grant (CIG) Application and Evaluation Guidelines 2023-2024 (COST 105/21; http://www.cost.eu/innovators_grant) on 7 December 2022. The “[Rules for COST Innovators Grants](#)”² describe the implementation of the CIG, including reporting, dissemination, and final COST Innovators Grant reports. The [Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)³ regulates the networking tools and reimbursement schemes under the CIG.

The COST Innovators Grant is a scheme designed for those ending COST Actions which demonstrate innovation potential.

For the purposes of the CIG, in addition to those definitions presented in the “[Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)”⁴, the following definition of innovation applies:

- ***Innovation** means a new or improved product, process, service, organisational method or policy approach that constitutes a state-of-the-art change in the sector or policy area in which the actor operates*⁵.

Successful applications will be allocated a budget not exceeding 125.000 EUR to cover the activities required to turn the research network results into a new commercial, technical or societal outcome. The duration of the CIG is 12 months starting the Grant Period after the end of the Action. The CIG shall not overlap with the Action. The application is prepared by a dedicated subgroup of the Action and approved by its Management Committee. One mandatory deliverable of a CIG is a Business Plan (see section 2.2.2.2). For the purposes of the CIG the definition of Business Plan is to be intended in a broad meaning and shall encompass the notion of implementation and the pathway to the rolling-out of the innovation.

- ***Business Plan** means a written document that describes in detail how an innovation is going to reach the users. A business plan defines the overall strategy for bringing the innovation to the users and lays out an appropriate written plan from a marketing, advocacy, communication or promotion, financial and operational viewpoint, including the sustainability of each.*

2. APPLYING FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT

2.1. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT

In order to be eligible, CIG applications shall:

- Be submitted upon invitation by the COST Association⁶;
- Be submitted by the Action Chair or Vice-Chair⁷ on behalf of the Management Committee of the Action before the submission deadline;
- Be approved by the MC by explicit (i.e., not tacit) vote, with a quorum of 2/3 and a simple majority of expressed votes (see Section 2.2.3);

¹ COST 007/19 Design of the COST Innovators Grant

² [COST 098/21 - Rules for COST Innovators Grants](#)

³ [COST 094/21 – Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)

⁴ [COST 094/21 – Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)

⁵ [European Parliament: “Mainstreaming Innovation Funding in the EU Budget” 18/4/2019](#)

⁶ The invitation is issued to the pool of COST Actions that end in the definite period and that have fulfilled the mid-term reporting obligation (PR2).

⁷ The submission by the Chair takes precedence.

- Respect fundamental ethical principles as described in the [“Rules and Principles for COST Activities”](#)⁸;
- Tackle Science and Technology challenges with peaceful purposes only;
- Address all sections of the mandatory CIG application template (Parts A and B) and not modify in any way the number or the title of the sections;
- Be written in **English**, the working language of the COST Association.

Applications may be declared non-eligible at any step of the process, whenever a breach of the above eligibility criteria is identified. Submitter and the candidate CIG Chair will be informed by the COST Association of the non-eligibility of their application.

2.2. PREPARING AND SUBMITTING AN APPLICATION FOR A COST INNOVATORS GRANT

2.2.1. THE APPLICATION PROCESS

The COST Association may formally invite COST Actions to apply for a CIG; an invitation is only possible for Actions that did submit an Action Progress Report 2, which has been checked by the COST Association. These Actions will be notified in due time on the CIG submission deadline and evaluation schedule.

Applications shall be submitted by the Action Chair or by the Action Vice-Chair (hereafter the “submitter”), on behalf of the Management Committee, regardless of whether or not the Action Chair or Vice Chair are members of the CIG Team.

Only one submission is allowed per COST Action, and only the last version submitted by the Action Chair or Vice-Chair before the deadline will be considered for evaluation; the submission by the Chair takes precedence.

To submit an application, the Action Chair (or Vice Chair) should use the dedicated CIGA vote, i.e. the MC decision tool in e-COST, to initiate a CIG specific e-vote. A specific link to initiate a CIGA vote is sent to the Chair and Vice Chair of invited Action.

The CIGA e-vote shall :

1. have one single attachment (PDF file) containing both Part A and Part B of the CIG application, named ***CIG Application for Action CAXXXX***⁹.
2. be initiated before the submission deadline indicated by COST in the invitation to apply.
3. contain the statement: “As MC member in COST Action **CAXXXX**, I approve its CIG application and the proposed CIG Team. The CIG Team will exercise the MC responsibilities regarding the CIG activities as described in the CIG application.”

2.2.2. APPLICATION TEMPLATE - PART A AND PART B

The application template (Word file), available on the COST website¹⁰, is mandatory and shall not be modified.

The instructions thereby provided shall be followed to prepare a CIG application. The CIG Application Part A and Part B shall be completed and submitted by the deadline, as described above.

⁸ [COST 088/21 - Rules and Principles for COST Activities](#)

⁹ CAXXXX shall be replaced by the Action code

¹⁰ http://www.cost.eu/innovators_grant_application

2.2.2.1. CIG APPLICATION - PART A

Application title	
Application acronym	
Code of COST Action from which the CIG application originates	CA_____
Submitter (must be Action Chair/ Vice Chair)	<i>name, email address</i>
Origin of CIG application in the Action	<i>Explain here how the solution proposed in this CIG application originates from the Action</i>
CIG Grant Holder	<p><i>Grant Holder name, Grant Holder Scientific Representative name & email address.</i></p> <p><i>It is advised that the CIG is managed by the same Grant Holder institution as the COST Action . If this is not possible, the new Grant Holder institution shall be the affiliation of one of the CIG Team members. The Grant Holder institution shall be established in a COST Full or Cooperating Member.</i></p>
Summary (for publication if application is approved)	<p><i>Write here a short summary of the application,</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>explaining the case or need and how the CIG will address it, and</i> ➤ <i>highlighting the expected outcomes of the CIG.</i> <p><i>This description should be understandable for a non-specialist in your field and should not contain any confidential information.</i></p> <p><i>Word limit: between 100 and 500 words</i></p>
Keywords (up to five)	
Composition of CIG Team	<p><i>In the table below, list the members of the CIG Team, clearly specifying who will be the CIG Chair and Vice-Chair. There is no requirement for the Action Chair or the Vice-Chair to become the CIG Chair or Vice-Chair.</i></p> <p><i>NOTE: The CIG Team members must be affiliated either in a COST Full Member, COST Cooperating Member or be an approved MC Observer.</i></p> <p><i>The composition of the CIG Team is specified in the CIG application. It is not possible to join a CIG Team after its submission.</i></p>

Name and email	Institution	Country of affiliation	Role in the CIG	Relevant expertise and expected contribution in the CIG
			CIG Chair	
			CIG Vice-Chair	

			CIG Team Member	
			Add rows as necessary	

The CIG team members (hereafter the “applicants”) agree to commit to their contribution as described above and in Part B - Implementation.

2.2.2.2. CIG APPLICATION - PART B

The CIG Application part B has the following sections:

- **Innovation Potential**
- **Expected impact**
- **Plan for Implementing the CIG**

The CIG application PART B must not exceed **six (6) pages**; the CIG Committee (see section 3.1) will not evaluate any additional pages. The first page of the template with the instructions and text in *italics* should be deleted when saving the application to PDF file.

Applications shall be submitted using the “CIG application template” and the following COST standard style: Arial font, size 10, line spacing 1 - choose “Normal, Text” style option from the ribbon styles gallery, margins, line spacing, etc. Any application not fulfilling the aforementioned “CIG application template”, will be converted into the standard template by COST. Exceeding pages will not be considered for the evaluation of the application.

The instructions related to each section are given below.

1. INNOVATION POTENTIAL (RECOMMENDED 2 PAGES)

This section will be used by the CIG Committee to evaluate the Innovation Potential.

This section will be evaluated by a CIG Committee sub-group. If the mark does not reach the threshold¹¹ for Innovation Potential, the CIG application will not be invited to the Hearings and not considered for funding.

1.1 WHAT IS THE PRACTICAL CHALLENGE AND TARGET GROUP THAT YOU WILL ADDRESS?

Describe clearly and concisely the challenge or need that the CIG is aiming to solve or alleviate, and to whom this is addressed.

1.2 WHAT IS YOUR PROPOSED SOLUTION? WHAT WILL BE THE MAIN OUTCOMES OF THE CIG?

Describe the idea you would like to develop further to address the issue described under 1.1, stating clearly the outcomes that will be achieved and the end point that will be reached under this grant.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE CIG.

Describe clear objectives of the CIG. Please formulate the objectives in a “SMART” (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Timely) way. These objectives shall not contain any confidential information as they might be published on the COST website.

1.4 WHAT IS INNOVATIVE ABOUT YOUR SOLUTION?

¹¹ Section 3.2.2

Describe the novelty of the innovation you aim to achieve and how this advances the state of the art.

Applicants should state in their proposal the added value of the CIG compared to a mere continuation of the Action. Additionally, they should explain who the competitors or alternative solutions are and detail the competitive advantages of the CIG.

2. EXPECTED IMPACT (RECOMMENDED 2 PAGES)

This section will be used by the CIG Committee to evaluate the Expected Impact.

2.1 DESCRIBE WHO AND/ OR WHAT WILL BENEFIT, HOW, WHEN AND TO WHICH EXTENT?

Describe clearly and concisely who (end-users) or what (e.g., the environment, animal welfare, etc.) will benefit from it, and when and how this benefit will occur or will be realised.

The impacts and benefits can be societal or technological or economic. The impacts of a CIG must go beyond those arising from scientific publications. Whenever relevant, CIGs are encouraged to include user/customer feedback beyond the research community by different means such as: have a pilot test that require a reality check of their innovation or involve the users from the beginning in co-design activities.

2.2 PLAN FOR EXPLOITATION

Describe clearly and concisely how you will ensure that the proposed ideas will be brought forward after the end of the CIG (users' take-up, commercial exploitation, investment funding etc.). Plans should be realistic and describe end-user take-up or hook-up to further innovation schemes or funding sources.

3. PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CIG (RECOMMENDED 2 PAGES)

This section will be used by the CIG Committee to evaluate the plan for implementing the CIG.

3.1 WORK PLAN

Describe which COST networking tools (see Annotated Rules) will be used to achieve the objectives set for the CIG. Please summarise in the table below the foreseen workplan, ensuring that it also includes the necessary activities to deliver an appropriate Business Plan which is a mandatory deliverable for all CIGs. For each activity, state which of the CIG Team Members have committed to contribute to this activity. Note: The Grant Period for the CIGs will run for 12 months.

What will be done	Which COST Networking Tool(s) will be used	Expertise required	CIG Team Members committed to this activity	Budget required
Subtotal				
FSAC (15% of Subtotal)				15% of Subtotal
Total				

Total budget requested may not exceed 125 000 EUR, including FSAC.

3.2 INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS

Identify whether Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) must be considered for the implementation of the CIG. If so, please identify a plan of mitigation and/or risk assessment.

Background:

Intellectual Property (IP) protection helps inventors create value from their ideas, turning inspiration into sustainable business success¹². Because of its mere nature, the likelihood of IPs deriving from the CIG is considered high. Experience shows that agreeing on IP rules is by far more complicated once IP issues arise than before.

The CIG application shall therefore contain a plan for dealing with Intellectual Property Rights that might arise out of the CIG. This aims at avoiding any possible IPR related conflicts and disputes among COST participants.

COST is required through its agreement with the European Commission to implement the principles set out in the Code of Practice annexed to the Commission's Recommendation on IP management¹³. Developing an IP policy is one of the main principles of this Code of Practice.

In order to develop this IPR Plan, CIG applicants are recommended to consult the European IPR Helpdesk (www.iprhelpdesk.eu) for available materials¹⁴.

2.2.2.3. WRITING STYLE GUIDE

The COST Association strongly advises complying with the following recommendation when preparing an application:

- Check language and spelling;
- Present the text in a logical way, avoiding unnecessary repetition between the different sections;
- No footnotes;
- Use of capital letters for COST-specific and Action-related expressions;
- Explain all acronyms, including those commonly used in the Framework Programme context;
- Use of "Europe" or "COST Member Countries" when referring to the overall geographical scope of COST. "European Union" or "EU Member States" should only be used to refer to the EU as a player ("EU legislation", "EU programmes", "EU policies" etc.) or when only EU Member State(s) need to be explicitly mentioned, excluding COST Members not being Member States of the EU;
- Use of "framework" or "scheme" when referring to COST (COST is an intergovernmental framework, not an "EU instrument", although it is funded by the EU Framework Programme);
- Avoid pronouns such as "I", "we"; rather use "the CIG";
- Avoid expressions such as "planned" or "proposed" when referring to the CIG; rather use "aims at", "will", etc.;
- Avoid overstatements regarding the potential impact of the CIG.

2.2.3. APPROVAL BY THE ACTION MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

The CIG application is subject to the approval of the COST Action MC. In order to be eligible, the application shall be approved by **explicit** vote (i.e., not tacit).

¹² Intellectual Property Office (IPO) <http://www.ipo.gov.uk/ip4b.htm>

¹³ Commission Recommendation C (2008) 1329 of 10.4.2008 on the management of intellectual property in knowledge transfer activities and the Code of Practice for universities and other public research organisations https://ec.europa.eu/invest-in-research/pdf/ip_recommendation_en.pdf

¹⁴ <https://www.iprhelpdesk.eu/home>; [Intellectual Property Helpdesk \(europa.eu\)](https://www.iprhelpdesk.europa.eu); <https://euiipo.europa.eu/ohimportal/en>

The Action MC will be asked to approve the CIG Application, including the composition of the CIG Team. No additional member of the CIG Team will be admitted after submission of the CIG application to the COST Association.

The MC approval of the CIG application entails granting of responsibilities of the Action MC to the CIG Team, for CIG activities. In this regard, the Action MC members will be asked to sign up to the following statement:

“As MC member in COST Action CAXXXXX, I approve its CIG application and the proposed CIG Team. The CIG Team is the decision-making body of the CIG and is responsible of the CIG implementation as described in the CIG application.”

2.2.3.1 QUORUM AND VOTING SYSTEM

Quorum: the quorum is reached when, within the time limit, at least **two-thirds (2/3)** of the countries represented in the MC have voted.

Voting system: if the quorum is reached before the deadline, a decision is approved by simple majority of votes (50%+1).

2.2.3.2 VOTE PER COUNTRY

Votes are processed by COST country represented in the Action MC, not by person.

For COST Countries having two MC members, their position should be coordinated before the deadline.

If, within the time limit, the two MC members:

- cast a same vote: the vote will count as one;
- cast a different vote: : the vote is void for their country;
- don't cast his/her vote: this is an abstention and the country is not counted in the quorum.

If, within the time limit, only one MC member casts his/er vote, only that vote will be taken into account.

Votes not casted are considered as an abstention and are not counted in the quorum.

3. EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF COST INNOVATORS GRANT APPLICATIONS

The CIG evaluation and selection procedure fulfils three core principles: excellence, fairness and transparency. COST strives to avoid any Conflict of Interest (CoI) and all those involved in the process must commit to confidentiality.

COST expects an ethical behaviour from all the participants in COST activities. The rules regarding confidentiality and Conflict of Interest in the evaluation, selection and approval of CIGs are described in section 6.

The evaluation and selection of CIG applications are carried out by the CIG Committee as described in sections 3.1 and 3.2. The CIG Committee may work remotely or meet as an evaluation panel.

Applicants shall not contact any of the CIG Committee Members regarding their application. Any attempt to do so may lead to immediate exclusion of the application from the process.

3.1. CIG COMMITTEE

CIG applications are evaluated and selected by a CIG Committee. The CIG Committee is composed of up to 10 members, of which approximately 40% are COST Scientific Committee (SC) Members. The CIG Committee is appointed by the COST Director.

Each application is evaluated by a CIG Committee sub-group consisting of at least three members.

3.2. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURE OVERVIEW

The evaluation and selection of CIG applications is composed of two phases:

- remote individual evaluation of the application that will determine whether they will reach selection stage
- Hearings of the top-ranked applicants or their representant mandatorily from the CIG team (only one presenter per invited proposal is allowed).

3.2.1. CIG APPLICATION EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING

The table below presents the	EXPECTED IMPACT	IMPLEMENTATION
Total marks for the section = 6 points	Total marks for the section = 6 points	Total marks for the section = 3 points
<p>TOTAL MAXIMUM MARKS AWARDED = 15 points</p> <p>OVERALL AVERAGE MARK THRESHOLD = 8 points</p>		

Each evaluator can give a CIG application a maximum score of 15 points. The CIG application overall average mark will be calculated by averaging the total scores given by each evaluator. Applications that do not reach the overall average mark of the threshold will not be considered for funding.

Applications are ranked according to the overall average mark.

3.2.2. INDIVIDUAL REMOTE EVALUATION OF THE APPLICATION

Each eligible CIG application is evaluated by a CIG Committee sub-group using the evaluation criteria and scored as described in section 3.2.1.

Only applications that reach an average score above 2 for the “Innovation Potential” criteria will be further evaluated.

Each application obtains an overall average mark calculated as the average of the three (3) individual evaluations.

The applications are ranked according to the overall average mark.

Applications that do not reach the overall average mark threshold of 8 points will not be considered for the next evaluation phase.

At least four (4) weeks prior to the Hearings, all Submitters and the candidate CIG Chairs will receive an evaluation report with the comments and the overall average mark obtained at this phase.

Note: The comments of the CIG Committee sub-group members (evaluators) may not be aligned, since a consensus is not imposed.

3.2.3. Instructions to the CIG Committee for the evaluation of CIG applications

Below are the specific questions for evaluation to be considered by the CIG Committee on each of the criteria:

INNOVATION POTENTIAL
<p>Q1: To what extent does the application describe an innovation challenge, problem or need that is real, relevant, and timely?</p> <p><i>Evaluators should assess to what extent the problem or need described is highly relevant and timely, and addresses a real potential market, society, policy or technology change.</i></p>
<p>Q2: To what extent is the proposed solution innovative, feasible, and adequate in addressing the problem or need described above?</p> <p><i>Evaluators should assess to what extent the proposed solution is highly novel/ innovative, advances the state of the art, identifies the gaps and addresses them in a feasible and adequate manner to tackle the problem or need.</i></p>
EXPECTED IMPACT
<p>Q3: To what extent does the application describe expected impacts that are both significant and credible (realistic)?</p> <p><i>Evaluators should assess to what extent the envisaged impacts are significant and credible. The impacts of a CIG must go beyond those arising from scientific publications. Explanations on the timeline and nature of the expected impacts should be significant, measurable and convincing.</i></p>
<p>Q4: To what extent is the plan for exploitation both realistic and adequate?</p> <p><i>Evaluators should assess to what extent the exploitation plan is realistic and adequate. Evaluators should assess to what extent it is ensured that the proposed ideas will be brought forward after the end of the CIG. Plans should be realistic and describe end-user take-up or hook-up to further innovation schemes or funding sources.</i></p>
PLAN FOR IMPLEMENTING THE CIG
<p>Q5: To what extent are the work plan and the team appropriate for achieving the stated objectives of the CIG?</p> <p><i>Evaluators should assess to what extent the role and skills of each CIG team member are clearly explained and match the requirements of the CIG. Additionally, the proposed CIG activities (COST tools) need to clearly describe how they will ensure that the CIG objectives will be reached.</i></p> <p><i>Evaluators should also assess the credibility and feasibility of the proposed implementation and of the description of the IPR considerations.</i></p> <p><i>Please note:</i></p> <p><i>The CIG Team is led by the CIG Chair and the CIG Vice-Chair; the CIG Chair or Vice-Chair might or</i></p>

might not be the same person(s) as the Action Chair or Vice-Chair.

The composition of the CIG Team is specified in the CIG application. It is not possible to join a CIG Team after submission of the CIG application to the COST Association.

The CIG Committee will use the following harmonised scale for all the evaluation criteria:

Description	Mark
The application fully addresses all relevant aspects of the questions. Any shortcomings are minor.	3 (High)
Although the application addresses the question well, improvements would be necessary.	2 (Medium)
The question is not addressed in an adequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses, or missing or incomplete information.	1 (Low)

3.2.4. CIG HEARINGS AND FINAL RANKING

The purpose of the Hearings is to establish a ranked shortlist of CIG applications to be recommended for funding to the Committee of Senior Officials (CSO) of the COST Association, taking into consideration the available budget for each CIG call.

Only the top ranked applications are invited to attend the Hearings; the number of invited applications depend on the available budget.

Applications failing to reach the overall average mark threshold of 8 points, or an average score above 2 for the “Innovation Potential” criteria, will not be invited to the Hearings and therefore not considered for funding.

If invited CIG applicants do not attend the Hearing, their application will not be considered for funding.

At the Hearings, the CIG Committee will refer to the written CIG application, and to the presentation only. The scores obtained at the previous remote evaluation phase are not taken into consideration.

Hearings being part of the Evaluation and Selection procedure, the same evaluation criteria described in section 3.2.1 will apply.

The CIG Committee assesses the feasibility of the CIG application (e.g., appropriateness of the proposed CIG Team, CIG objectives and how COST tools will be used to achieve these objectives) and addresses any relevant matters identified during the remote evaluation phase.

The CIG Committee ranks the applications presented at the Hearings and sends their ranking and their recommendations for funding to the CSO for approval.

The outcome of the Hearings will be communicated to the Submitter and the candidate CIG Chair shortly after the CSO decision.

4. APPROVAL BY THE CSO

The final decision on approval and funding for CIGs is taken by the CSO, based on the recommendations for funding submitted by the CIG Committee, taking into account the available budget.

The CSO may decide not to approve any of the selected CIGs.

5. EVALUATION FEEDBACK AND REDRESS

5.1. EVALUATION FEEDBACK

The outcome of the remote evaluation of each CIG application is communicated to the Submitter and the candidate CIG Chair after the remote evaluation phase (as described in section 3.2.2) and at least 4 weeks before the Hearings.

The outcome of the Hearings is communicated to the Submitter and the candidate CIG Chair soon after the final decision by the CSO (as described in section 4).

5.2. REDRESS PROCEDURE

In order to comply with the fairness and transparency of the CIG application process, the COST Association has established a Redress Procedure. The Submitter or the candidate CIG Chair may submit a redress request **within 15 calendar days** following the notification of the outcome of the **remote** evaluation phase (see section 3.2.2).

Redress is allowed only in case of alleged procedural shortcomings and factual errors, i.e., whenever the applicants deem that:

- the evaluation has not been carried out in accordance with the CIG Evaluation and Selection procedure;
- the Evaluation Report bears factual errors.

Requests for redress dealing with the assessments by the CIG Committee shall not be admissible.

The decisions from the Hearings by the CIG Committee (see section 3.2.4) shall not be open to redress.

The redress procedure may be initiated only by email sent to redress@cost.eu. In the email, the requestor shall:

- Indicate in the subject line the name of the submitted application(see section 2.2.1);
- Provide a detailed description of the alleged procedural shortcoming(s) or factual error(s).

6. CONFLICT OF INTEREST (COI) AND CONFIDENTIALITY

The Col rules apply to all those concerned by the CIG application, evaluation, selection and approval process (CIG Committee Members and CSO members). Each individual involved in the evaluation, selection and approval of applications may not take any benefit from any CIG approved under the particular collection they participated in.

In particular:

- CIG Committee Members shall not participate in any CIG that was selected during their mandate.
- CNCs, SC and CSO members shall not be CIG Participants.

A Conflict of Interest can be real, potential or perceived.

Cases of Real Conflict of Interest

CIG Committee Members and CSO members:

- Having been involved in the preparation of the application.

Cases of Potential Conflict of Interest

CIG Committee Members and CSO members:

- having a professional or personal relationship with a CIG applicant;
- benefiting directly or indirectly if the application shall be accepted or rejected.

Cases of Perceived Conflict of Interest

CIG Committee Members and CSO members feeling for any reason unable to provide an impartial review of the application.

In case:

1. the Col is confirmed/identified **before** the evaluation starts, the person concerned will not be able to participate in the evaluation/selection/approval procedure in the ongoing CIG evaluation and is replaced, if applicable.
2. the Col is confirmed/identified **during** the evaluation/selection/approval:
 - The person must stop evaluating/selecting/approving in the ongoing CIG evaluation and is replaced, if applicable;
 - Any comments and marks already given shall be discarded.
3. the Col is confirmed/identified **after** the evaluation/selection/approval has taken place, the COST Association shall examine the potential impact and consequences of the Col and take appropriate measures.

The COST Association has the right to take the lead in any resolution process of a Col situation at any moment of the evaluation and selection procedure.

All cases of Col must be recorded by the COST Association.

Declaration of Conflict of Interest

Any CIG Committee Member involved in the evaluation or selection procedures shall sign a declaration stating/accepting s/he:

- Is not aware of any conflict of interest regarding the application(s) to be evaluated/selected;
- Shall inform immediately the COST Association of any conflict of interest discovered during the evaluation process;
- Shall maintain the confidentiality of the procedure.

Failure to declare the Col may have the following consequences:

- Notification to the COST Association Director;
- Notification to the CSO for Scientific Committee Members;
- Removal of the CIG Committee Member from the COST Expert Database.

6.1. CONFIDENTIALITY

COST expects that each person involved in the CIG evaluation, selection and approval process (CIG Committee Members, and CSO members):

- Treats confidentially any information, and the personal data of any natural person concerned by or involved in the submission, evaluation, selection and approval of applications process, and document, in any form (i.e.; paper or electronic), disclosed in writing or orally in relation to the performance of the evaluation;
- Processes any confidential information or documents as described above only for the purposes and for the duration of the submission, evaluation, selection and approval of applications process;
- Does not, either directly or indirectly, disclose any confidential information or document related to applications or applicants, without prior written approval of the COST Association;
- Does not discuss any application with others, including other CIG Committee Members or staff not directly involved in evaluating the applications, except during formal discussions during the evaluation and selection phases;
- Does not disclose any detail of the evaluation process and its outcomes, nor of any application submitted, for any purpose other than fulfilling their tasks as CIG Committee Member;
- Does not disclose the names of other CIG Committee Members participating in the evaluation;
- Does not communicate with applicants on any application during or after the evaluation until the approval of CSO.

7.HONORARIA

An honorarium of 500 EUR shall be paid to each CIG Committee member in each collection for the remote work carried out. CIG Committee members will be reimbursed for attending the Hearings in accordance with the [Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)¹⁵ and will receive an additional honorarium of EUR 500,00 per day of attendance or EUR 250,00 per half day of attendance.

¹⁵ [COST 094/21 – Annotated Rules for COST Actions](#)