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FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
M18
Summary

• Global overview per type of activities and per work package
  – Reported costs compared to total eligible costs
  – Reported effort compared to total project effort
• Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses for each WP
• Reported costs compared to total eligible costs per partner
Reported costs / Total eligible costs per type of activity

- Total eligible costs = 7 575 312 €
- Total reported costs = 2 920 600 € → 38.5%
Reported costs / Total eligible costs per WP
Reported effort / Project effort per type of activity

- Total project man/month = 603.50
- Total reported effort = 255.38 → 42.3%
Reported effort / Project effort per WP

- No man /month for WP7, support activity
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses

WP1 - Management

- Personnel costs: 63%
- Travel: 2%
- Subcontracting: 6%
- Consumables: 0%
- Indirect costs: 29%

74.32% of the WP1 budget has been spent

- High management costs corresponding to much more effort and time than expected for IFREMER (coordinator) and MARIS (technical coordinator)
- Many partners and sub-contractors: time consuming activities
  - Interactions with all members of the consortium: questions, reminders, travel organisations, …
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses

WP2 – Coordination and monitoring

42.85% of the WP2 budget has been spent

- Travel costs linked to the 2 plenary meetings and 4 steering committees
- In terms of Man/months: 2 partners have overspent
  - IFREMER: lots of activities in coordination at the start of the project
  - OGS: Monitoring activity underestimated at the negotiation

1 175 599 €
503 696 €
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses
WP3 – Capacity building and training

- 23,07 % of the WP3 budget has been spent

- Travel costs linked to the travel to Ostend for the training course
- Personnel costs for the training course organisation and the lecturers
- Sub-contracting for IODE (host of the training course)

WP3

462 563 €  
106 710 €

23%  
1%  
12%  
41%

Personnel costs  
Travel  
Subcontracting  
Consumables  
Indirect costs
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses

WP4 – Metadata directories

42,82 % of the WP4 budget has been spent

- Subcontracting to SHOM (IFREMER), INRH (IEO), INSTM (IEO), INEWI (OGS), IMBK (OGS), RSHU (SIO-RAS), SHODB (TUBITAK):
  - Installation of tools for metadata, metadata input and updates
- Most partners involved: only 6 have reported no time and costs (ENEA, ICES, NIOZ, LHEI, MHI-DMIST, IO-BAS), 4 have overspent (IHPT, VLIZ, MRI, OC-UCY)
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses
WP5 – Data directory CDI

38.53% of the WP5 budget has been spent
- Subcontracting to SHOM (IFREMER), INRH (IEO), INSTM (IEO), INEWI (OGS), IMBK (OGS), RSHU (SIO-RAS), SHODB (TUBITAK): Installation of tools for CDI catalogue, connection to the infrastructure, CDI metadata input and updates
- Most partners involved: only 2 have reported no time and costs (BSH and ENEA), 2 have overspent (IHPT, CNR)
EXPENSES RATE COMPARE TO THE INITIAL BUDGET

WP6 - Communication

35,87% of the WP6 budget has been spent

• Partners involved: IFREMER, MARIS, ENEA, IES-JRC and RBINS-BMDC
• Subcontracting to EU-Consult (MARIS), CLU (ENEA)
• Consumables for paper publication in international reviews (International Innovation, Journal of Technology)
• Travel for SeaDataNet promotion in international meetings and conferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>384,820 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>138,045 €</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reported costs per partner
WP7 – Access to metadata, data and products

29.81% of the WP7 budget has been spent

- 4 partners reported no costs (OGS, ICES, UniHB, TUBITAK)
- 24 partners reported estimated costs (37.5% of their requested to EU)
- 12 partners reported real costs (21.8% of their requested to EU)
- 4 partners are not concerned (INGV, CLS, AWI, IES-JRC)
43,12% of the WP8 budget has been spent

- 22 partners involved: 2 reported no time and cost (NERI, ICES), 5 overspent time (MARIS, OGS, ENEA, CLS, OC-CUY)
- Travelling for TTG meetings (4 meetings)
- Subcontracting to STFC (NERC-BODC), UTM-CSIC (IEO)
Distribution of reported costs per type of expenses

WP9 – Development of tools and services

47.32% of the WP9 budget has been spent

- 22 partners involved: 2 reported no time and cost (NERC-BODC, IEO), 3 overspent time (IFREMER, IMR, OC-UCY)
  - Overspent due to the effort to upgrade software versions
- Travelling for TTG meetings (4 meetings)
21.58% of the WP10 budget has been spent

- All but 2 partners involved: 11 reported no time and cost, 2 overspent time (ENEA, CNR)
- Travelling for product meetings (2 joined meetings with MyOcean)
- Subcontracting to SHOM (IFREMER), external expert (METU-IMS)
Reported costs / Total eligible costs per partner
Conclusion

• Some overspending linked to a lot of involvement at the beginning of the project

• But as a whole, at month 18 (37.5% of the total duration of the project)
  – 38.5% of the total eligible costs have been reported
  – 42.3% of the total man/month reported