



SWEET Call 1-2022

Questions and answers (Q&A)

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



1 General Questions

Q 1.1: 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 1.2: 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 1.3: 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 1.4: 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:

The applicant's institutional Lol must be signed by the head of the institution. This means that the signature of the Applicant (PI) is not sufficient. Yes, it is appropriate for the Vice-Director of the institution to sign the Lol.