



SWEET Call 1-2022

Questions and answers (Q&A)

Please carefully read the SWEET Call Guideline and this Q&A document.



1 Questions related to the full proposal phase

Q 1.1: For the letter of commitment (applicants) it is said: “If, within one institution, several cost entities are applicants, their commitment is stated either in separate letters (signed by the head of the group/laboratory), or in one common letter (signed by an authorized representative of the institution). In the latter case, the commitment of the host institution may be included in the same letter.” Do we get that right, that the LOCs can be signed at the level of head of the group and not at institutional head level, even if there is only one group of that institution applicant in the consortium?

Answer:

Since at the full proposal phase, the term applicant is explicitly broken-down at the level of cost entities, if there is only one cost entity in the institution, it is indeed sufficient that the head of this cost entity signs the letter of commitment. If there are several cost entities in the institution and commitment is declared in one letter (institutional letter), a representative of the institution (higher hierarchy level) must sign it.

Q 1.2: We are not quite sure, what is meant by No. 8 in the template: “Sources of federal financial assistance”. Is this only for running applications or also for running projects and what federal instruments are included here? Can you maybe give us an example what is included/referred to here? (Guidelines, 3.4 say that third-party funding includes contributions from sources other than the Federal Administration – does that include also e.g. SFOE, NFP, SNF, other SWEETS?)

Answer:

Third-party contributions exclude all federal financial support (such as SFOE and other Fed Offices, Innosuisse, snsf), since declaring these could be a case of double funding. However, though we do not recommend it, co-funding of a project, i.e., applying simultaneously for support from different federal instruments, is legal, which is why Section 8 enables the declaration of such co-funding. Note that if there are federally funded projects with which there are synergies or collaborations with the consortium WPs, then those should be included in Section 7 of the template.

2 Questions related to the pre-proposal phase

Q 2.1: Since no continuation of CROSS is foreseen beyond 31.12.2022 is it correct to assume that the participation of running SWEET consortia in Co-Evolution would need to be funded by Co-Evolution? One example would be the Living and Working call. I presume the winning projects from this call will also participate in Co-evolution. Do the necessary funds again come from Co-Evolution?

Answer:

Applicants that are part of the Co-Evolution Consortium must be funded by SWEET funding provided by the Co-Evolution Call, own contributions, or third-party contributions. (Note that as stated in Section 3.4 of the Call Guideline, third-party contributions are financial contributions from sources other than the Federal administration, applicants, and cooperation partners.) Whether the applicants are part of existing consortia or not is irrelevant.



Q 2.2: As the topic is not following the former SWEETs in its more classical line of research structure and has a strong focus on transdisciplinarity and models/simulations, the ‘normal’ let’s put idea/development X into practice with an implementation partner PnD style is only partially suited for this Call. Given this background: Could you please provide some ideas what is and what is not allowed/suitable for a PnD structure in this Call?

Answer:

Given the special nature of this call, there were discussions within the SFOE during the elaboration of the call guideline as to whether it even made sense to set aside funding for P+D projects. In the end, we did so not because we see particularly obvious topics for P+D projects, but because we did not want to restrict the consortium’s freedom. Depending on the consortium members and the topics chosen for the focus reports, P+D projects could be envisaged that focus at least partially on the public acceptance of and response to technologies to which the public is directly exposed, for example. (Without wishing to influence the consortium’s thinking in any specific way, the Erlenmatt Ost project, partially funded by the SFOE through the P+D programme, might serve as inspiration.) What is important to keep in mind is that for all SWEET calls, P+D projects must be well integrated with the project portfolio. For this call, this should be interpreted as P+D projects being related to the topics of one or more focus reports and containing natural sciences/engineering, economic sciences, and SSH aspects.

Q 2.3: As the Call should ideally bring together all interested research groups, would it be possible by the SFOE, that you publish which groups are ‘Coordinators’ of consortia proposals, so that interested groups could actually contact those?

Answer:

It is not entirely clear whether the question relates to (a) coordinators of consortia intending to submit pre-proposal in response to this call or (b) coordinators of consortia that responded to previous calls. If it’s the former: The SFOE cannot get involved in the formation of consortia and therefore does not share information about other consortia that have notified the SFOE about their intention to submit a pre-proposal. If it’s the latter, information about the coordinators of the consortia from Call 1-2020 and 1-2021 can be found [here](#) and [here](#) (see flyer).

Q 2.4: In the paragraph 4.2, SWEET Call 1-2022: Call Guideline, it is mentioned that Lols must be signed by authorized representatives. Could you please tell us who these people are? Is the signature of the applicant sufficient for the Lol of the applicant or is the signature of the rectorate also required? For the institutional Lol, the vice-rector of research of the institution as well as the dean of the faculty concerned will sign this letter, will this be appropriate?

Answer:

It depends on what you mean by “applicant”. If the applicant is a lab/group, then the head of the lab/group (PI) is authorized to sign the letter. If the applicant is the institution, the signature of a PI is in this case not sufficient, but it is appropriate for the Vice-Director of the institution to sign the Lol.