

**LIFE+ WORKSHOPS 2009**  
**GERMANY – 9 JUNE 2009**

**LIST OF UNANSWERED QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

No.	Question	Response by the Commission
1	Which percentage of proposals in the past involved “municipalities” as beneficiaries?	The LIFE project database, when searched by entering "Local Authority" under type of beneficiary, produces 311 projects, out of 2,912 entries.
2	Projects that are not already mentioned in the long list of projects considered for approval under the 2008 call are expected to be rejected. Some of these submissions have not received yet the letter of the EC explaining the rationale for the rejection and the perceived weakness of the proposal, hampering the capacity of the proposer to improve its submission for the 2009 call. When can projects not in the long list for the call 2008, be expected to have all received a feed-back letter from the EC services?	Shortly after the meeting of the LIFE+ Committee (which takes place at the end of July 2009).
3	Who in the Commission services is responsible for the “information and communication” component? No name or contact details are mentioned in the LIFE+ 2009 guidelines in this respect.	See <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/contact/lifeunit.htm">http://ec.europa.eu/environment/life/contact/lifeunit.htm</a>
4	Some projects were refused in the past because some beneficiaries were unable to provide proof of their “public body” status. What kind of proof is required from a declared public institution (or a mix of public institutions, such as a public GmbH) to justify its “public body” character?	Please refer to section "1.5 Administrative and financial information to be provided" of the Application Guide. The rules are now simpler than in the past.
5	In the guidelines for the component “information and communication” it is said that “campaigns and actions should primarily be national or transnational”. Is a project providing campaigns addressing only some regions in several EU countries appropriate for submission under this component? Is transnationality in the third component differently weighted during evaluation compared to the two other components?	Transnationality is not weighed differently for the third component. A project proposal providing campaigns addressing only some regions in several EU countries would be appropriate for submission under the "information and communication" component, provided it meets all other criteria. The underlying idea is to encourage projects with significant EU added value, which often, but not always, means a large geographical reach.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response by the Commission</b>
6	<p>Is a project targeting the education and awareness building of school pupils through excursions, special action days and moving exhibitions adequate for a positive submission under LIFE+? Considering that “training” under the third component is only possible for the prevention of forest fires, how are “information transfer” and “training” defined and differentiated under that particular component?</p>	<p>"Education" of schoolchildren as such is not a common action within LIFE+ information and communication. On the other hand, schoolchildren are often among the primary targets of awareness-raising campaigns under LIFE+. Training in the context of prevention of forest fires refers to training of forest fire agents, while "information transfer" is wider, targeting the general public.</p>