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EARTO members very much appreciate the efforts of the EU institutions to preserve continuity in the Framework Programmes' (FPs) rules for participation and Model Grant Agreement (MGA) provisions, while further improving simplification and efficiency. Following the European Commission (EC) proposal to move from hourly rates to daily rates for the calculation of personnel costs in Horizon Europe, EARTO has been closely following the development of the MGA provision on this topic ${ }^{1}$.

As EARTO stressed in previous papers ${ }^{1}$, the daily rate approach is not a simplification for most FP beneficiaries and would not be in line with their usual cost accounting practices. Converting hours into days would rather increase the administrative burden for both beneficiaries and auditors (e.g. additional conversion of hours into days including for part time workers, crosschecking calendar years and reporting periods), and thereby increase the risk of errors. In addition, it would only have limited effects to improve cross-reliance on audits for FP beneficiaries since most national and regional RD\&I funding programmes are and will continue to be based on hours for personnel costs' reporting.

However, if adopting a unified corporate approach for the MGA requires moving to daily rates for personnel costs in Horizon Europe, EARTO hereby recalls its main recommendations:

- As stated in the Common Understanding on the Horizon Europe Regulation ${ }^{2}$, the calculation of personnel costs and in particular the "day-equivalent" methodologies to convert hours into days should aim to deviate as little as possible from beneficiaries' usual cost accounting practices. To do so, different options to calculate days-equivalents should be offered to beneficiaries and clearly mentioned in the MGA, in continuity with H2O20 rules. Beneficiaries should be able to choose their preferred option.
- As many beneficiaries will keep relying on timesheets based on hours as reliable time-recording system, the conversion of hours into days should strictly be limited to the time of reporting. This would help to limit as much as possible the extra administrative burden that this conversion will automatically generate.
- The option of using average personnel costs via unit costs, which is in accordance with the usual cost accounting practices of beneficiaries, needs to be maintained in Horizon Europe.

To move towards practical implementation, EARTO financial experts hereby present their personnel costs' calculations based on their understanding of the EC daily rate and dayequivalent methodology ${ }^{3}$. This paper aims to explain how the remaining open questions regarding the hours-to-days conversion methodology would be best answered according to beneficiaries' usual cost accounting practices.
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## 1. Calculating personnel costs in Horizon Europe

The European Commission's formula to calculate personnel costs in Horizon Europe, as stated in the new corporate Model Grant Agreement, is as follows:


Source: EC Presentation "HE Model Grant Agreement Novelties" - June 2020
The EC also points out that this calculation will be performed by calendar year, and not anymore by taking into account the last closed financial year. In addition, "annual personnel costs for the person" should either be:

- an average standard tariff for a $\mathbf{1 0 0} \%$ FTE employee based on actual costs at the level of the organisation in accordance with the beneficiary's usual cost accounting practices,
- or the actual personnel costs for the employee, in which case the payment of extra payslips ( $13^{\text {th }}$ and $14^{\text {th }}$ months) needs to be equally broken down on a monthly basis and included in the personnel costs' calculation.

Based on this formula, we would calculate the personnel costs for a person 100\% Full Time Equivalent (FTE) as shown in Table 1.

| Example for Staff group A - 100\% FTE Reporting Period: 03/2021-12/2021 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Basis per calendar year | 01-12/2021 |
| Annual personnel costs for the person (APC) | 90.000,00€ |
| Daily rate denominator (D) | 215 days |
| Project hours during the reporting period (Ph) | 400 hours |
| Daily rate ( $D r=A P C / D$ ) | 90.000,00€ /215 days $=\mathbf{4 1 8 , 6 0 €} /$ day |
| Day-equivalent ( $D e$ ) calculated with one of the 3 options (see sections 3 below) | 7,8 hours/day |
| Project days worked ( $D w=P h / D e$ ) Rounded (half day) | 400 hours $/ 7,8 h$ per day $=51,28$ days 51,5 days |
| Project Personnel costs $(P P C=D r * D w)$ | $\begin{gathered} 418,60 € \text { per day } * 51,5 \text { days }= \\ \mathbf{2 1 . 5 5 7 , 9 0 €} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Examples and calculations on how the daily rate denominator need to be adapted in different circumstances are detailed in part 2. The calculation of the day-equivalent under the 3 different options presented by the EC is worked out in part 3 for $100 \%$ FTE, and in part 4 for part-time employees and when there is a change of contract (i.e. FTE rate) during the reporting period.

## 2. Calculating the denominator for the daily rate

In general, a fixed number of 215 days per year to be used as denominator for the calculation of the daily rate for a full calendar year in Horizon Europe will create imbalances between countries and organisations. The number of working days per year, calculated to take account holidays (contractual holidays, national public holidays, organisations' holidays), differs quite considerably between countries and organisations, depending for instance on the employment contracts and the general collective agreements.

[^0]In any case, such denominator for the calculation of the daily rate will need to be adapted to take into account specific circumstances, such as the situation when a reporting period ends before the end of the year, but also for employees taking a parental leave, or for employees leaving or joining the organisation in the middle of a reporting period. This would benefit from an ex-ante assessment (e.g. CoMUC) providing legal certainty to the beneficiaries.
a. Calculating the denominator for daily rates per reporting periods

Based on the EC formula, personnel costs will need to be calculated based on the current calendar year. In such case, we would calculate the daily rate denominator in view of financial statements for reporting periods as shown in table 2. However, it is important to note that:

- when a reporting period starts after the beginning of the year, calculating personnel costs based on the full calendar year as it is intended in the EC non paper and as calculated in table 2 could create issues during audits, since according to beneficiaries usual cost accounting practices salaries are paid on a monthly basis (incl. salary raises during the year, $13^{\text {th }}$ and $14^{\text {th }}$ payslips, etc.).
- when a reporting period ends before the end of the year, the daily rate denominator will necessarily need to be adapted to be able to take into account actual personnel costs (see table 2).
In addition, this would result in a mixed system with previous years' calculations based on annual salaries and current years based on monthly salaries, which will require adjustments to previous cost statements (as in FP7).

$\left.$|  | Basis per calendar year |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Daily rate denominator |
| :--- |
| 215 days $/ 12$ months $*$ months in |
| basis per calendar year | \right\rvert\,

## Table 2

b. Calculating the denominator for daily rates for employees entering or leaving the organisation during the year
We would calculate the daily rate denominator in case of staff changes during the reporting period as shown in table 3. It is also important to note that staff could also start or leave midmonth, in which case the \% employment of the year would need to be calculated on a daily or hourly basis for the running month(s).

| Reporting period: <br> 01/2021-12/2021 | Basis per calendar year | \% <br> employment <br> of the year | Daily rate denominator <br> \% of employment of the <br> year re-calculated to days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Example 1: Staff group A starts on 01/03/2021 |  |  |  |
| For Staff group A | $03-12 / 2021(10$ months) | $10 / 12=83,3 \%$ | $83,3 \% * 215=\mathbf{1 7 9 , 1}$ days |
| Full year Staff | $01-12 / 2021$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ days |
| Example 2: Staff group B leaves on 31/05/2021 |  |  |  |
| For Staff group B | $01-05 / 2021(5$ months) | $5 / 12=41,7 \%$ | $41,7 \% * 215=\mathbf{8 9 , 6}$ days |
| Full year Staff | $01-12 / 2021$ | $100 \%$ | $\mathbf{2 1 5}$ days |
| Table 3 |  |  |  |

c. Calculating the denominator for daily rates for employees in case of parental leave We would calculate the daily rate denominator in case of parental leaves during the reporting period as shown in table 4. It is also important to note that staff could also leave and/or come back mid-month, in which case the \% employment of the year would need to be calculated on a daily or hourly basis for the running month(s).

| Reporting period: <br> $03 / 2021-12 / 2021$ | Basis per <br> calendar <br> year | \% employment <br> of the year | Daily rate denominator <br> \% of employment of the year <br> re-calculated to days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Example: Staff group A takes a 6 months parental leave from 01/05/2021 to 31/10/2021

| For Staff group A | $01-12 / 2021$ | $6 / 12=50 \%$ | $50 \% * 215=\mathbf{1 0 7 , 5}$ days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Table 4

## 3. Converting hours into day equivalents under the 3 options for full time employees

a. Option 1 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on the average number of hours that the person must work per working day according to her/his contract"

Under this option, we would calculate the day-equivalent for an employee working 100\% FTE over 5 days a week ("staff group A") as shown in table 5. In addition, we also understand that the number of hours that a person must work per working day according to her/his contract can include both contractual and paid overtimes, which can both be considered in the amount of working hours/week.

| Option 1 - Conversion based on the number of hours that the person must work per <br> working day according to his/her contract in the specific period of the calendar year <br> $>$ <br> Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group A (100\% FTE) |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Reporting Period | $03-12 / 2021$ |
| Basis per calendar year | $01-12 / 2021$ |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | $100 \%$ |
| Contract hours per week | $\mathbf{3 8 , 5 h / w e e k}$ |
| Day-equivalent | 38,5 hours $/ 5$ days $=\mathbf{7 , 7 h} /$ day |

Table 5
b. Option 2 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on the usual standard annual productive hours of the beneficiary, if it is at least $90 \%$ of the workable time"
The standard annual productive hours can be calculated as the average annual productive hours of all employees of the beneficiary, based on the time recording system of the beneficiary and according to its usual cost accounting practices. In accordance with beneficiaries' usual cost accounting practices, these average productive hours already take into account absences (incl. sickness, holidays, bank holidays, etc.), as well as non-project related work.

Example: The standard annual workable time could be calculated as follows:

$$
\text { Total days / year }+365
$$

> Saturdays \& Sundays
-104
> Public holidays (Mo-Fr)

- 8
> Company paid holiday (closing days)
> Annual paid holidays - 2

TOTAL $\quad 226$ days $\times 7,7$ hours $^{2}$ day $^{4}=1.740$ hours/year
Under the EC rules for Horizon Europe, if the standard annual productive hours are lower than $90 \%$ of the workable time of a $100 \%$ FTE, the standard annual productive hours are capped by this $90 \%$.

Under this option, we would calculate the day-equivalent for an employee working 100\% FTE over 5 days a week ("staff group A") as shown in table 6. Ideally, if beneficiaries can demonstrate that their standard annual productive hours and their workable hours have and will remain stable through the years, they could set a fixed conversion rate for the whole Horizon Europe programme, instead of redefining it every year.

| Option 2 - Conversion based on the usual standard annual productive hours of the <br> beneficiary, if it is at least $\mathbf{9 0 \%}$ of the workable time <br> - Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group A (100\% FTE) <br> Reporting Period: $03 / 2021-12 / 2021$ |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Reporting Period | $03-12 / 2021$ |
| Basis per calendar year | $01-12 / 2021$ |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | $100 \%$ |
| Standard annual productive hours | 1.540 hours per year |
| Standard annual workable hours | 1.740 hours per year |
| Standard annual productive hours <br> capped by the 90\% of the <br> standard annual workable hours | $1.740 * 90 \%=1.566>1.540$ <br> $\mathbf{1 . 5 6 6}$ hours per year |
| Day-equivalent | 1.566 hours $/ 215$ days = 7,28h/day |

Table 6
c. Option 3 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on a fixed number of hours"

Under this option, and for an employee working 100\% FTE over 5 days a week ("staff group A"), 1 day-equivalent $=8$ hours (see table 7).

| Option $\mathbf{3}$ - Conversion based on a fixed number of hours: $\mathbf{1}$ day-equivalent = $\mathbf{8}$ hours |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group A (100\% FTE) |  |
| Reporting Period | $03-12 / 2021$ |
| Basis per calendar year | $01-12 / 2021$ |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | $100 \%$ |
| Day-equivalent | $\mathbf{8 h} /$ day |

Table 7

[^1]
## 4. Converting hours into day-equivalents under the 3 options when an employee (incl. part-time) has a change of contract during a reporting period

Converting the working time of part-time workers into day-equivalent under the three different options detailed above require specific attention. In addition, a change of contract during a reporting period (e.g. from $100 \%$ FTE to $50 \%$ FTE, parental leave, etc.), which will also lead to a change of the daily rate denominator, also requires some specific calculations. This could become an error intensive area in Horizon Europe. The calculation of the day-equivalent under the 3 options for these specific but usual situations are laid down below.

## - Methodologies to calculate the daily rates for employees working part-time:

Depending on the contract, an employee working less than 100\% Full Time Equivalent (FTE) can have his weekly hours distributed over less than 5 working days.

With this in mind, if an employee's contract is less than $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ FTE, the most efficient way to calculate the day-equivalent based on beneficiaries' usual cost accounting practices is to calculate it as a \% of the day-equivalent for $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ FTE, as shown in table 8 (Method 1). Such calculation method only requires knowing the part time \%FTE. The number of working days per week is not relevant. This also means that the denominator for the daily rate will not need to be recalculated and will remain the same as for the $100 \%$ FTE.

The method presented in the EC non-paper to calculate the day-equivalent for employees working less than $100 \%$ FTE is shown in table 8 (Method 2). Such method requires to take into account the weekly hours of an employee and the number of working days per week. In such case, when the employee works less than 5 days per week, the denominator for the daily rate would need to be recalculated. This method would require further calculations, thereby generating a higher administrative burden for beneficiaries. It would in addition increase the risk of errors.

|  | Daily rate denominator | Day-equivalent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FTE 100\% - 38,5h/week | 215 days | 7,7 hours per day |
| Method 1 to calculate the daily rate for part-time workers - based on the daily rate for $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%} \%$ FTE $=>$ preferred method, based on usual cost accounting practices, does not require recalculation of the daily rate denominator |  |  |
| Calculations | Same denominator as for $100 \%$ FTE | daily rate for 100\% FTE <br> * \% part time FTE |
| FTE 50\% distributed in 5 working days | 215 days | $\begin{aligned} & 7,7 h / d a y * 50 \% \\ &= 3,85 \\ & \text { hours } / \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |
| FTE 50\% distributed in 3 working days | 215 days | $\begin{aligned} & 7,7 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } * 50 \% \\ = & \mathbf{3 , 8 5} \text { hours } / \text { day } \end{aligned}$ |
| Method 2 to calculate the daily rate for part-time workers (presented in EC non-paper) - based on the weekly hours and number of working days a week => not preferred as it requires knowledge of the number of working days per week and requires recalculation of the daily rate denominator if less than 5 working days per week |  |  |
| Calculations | 215 days per year <br> / 5 working week days <br> * number of days worked | Working hours per week / number of working days |
| FTE 50\% - 19,25h/week distributed in 5 working days | $\begin{aligned} & 215 / 5 * 5 \\ & =\mathbf{2 1 5} \text { days } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19,25 / 5 \\ =\mathbf{3 , 8 5} \text { hours } / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |
| FTE 50\% - 19,25h/week distributed in 3 working days | $\begin{gathered} 215 / 5 * 3 \\ =129 \text { days } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19,25 / 3 \\ =\mathbf{6 , 4} \text { hours } / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |

Table 8
The tables 9 to 11 below show how we would convert the reporting hours recorded for the action into "day equivalents" for part-time workers and when there is a change of work contract during a reporting period under each of the 3 options mentioned in part 3. The calculation methodology is actually the same for each of the 3 options (based on the method 1 presented in table 8 ).
a. Option 1 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on the average number of hours that the person must work per working day according to her/his contract"

Under this option, for an employee ("staff group B") which has a change in his working contract (i.e FTE rate) during the reporting period, we would calculate the day-equivalent as shown in table 9.

| Option 1 - Conversion based on the number of hours that the person must work per working day according to his/her contract in the specific period of the calendar year <br> $>$ Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group B (mixed FTE) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reporting period | 01-09/2022 (9 months) |  |
| Daily rate denominator | 215 days / 12 months * 9 months $=161,25$ days |  |
| Basis per calendar year | 01-02/2022 (2 months) | 03-09/2022 (7 months) |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | 100\% FTE | 50\% FTE |
| Contract hours per week | 38,5h/week | 19,25h/week |
| Day-equivalent | 38,5 hours / 5 days $=\mathbf{7 , 7 h} / \mathbf{d a y}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \text { FTE }=7,7 h / \text { day } \\ 7,7 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } * 50 \%=3,85 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |
| Average FTE for the reporting period | (100\%* 2months $+50 \% * 7$ months) $/ 9$ months $=\mathbf{6 1 , 1 1 \%}$ |  |
| Average day-equivalent for the reporting period | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \text { FTE }=7,7 h / \text { day } \\ 7,7 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day }{ }^{*} 61,11 \%=\mathbf{4 , 7 1 h} / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |  |

Table 9
b. Option 2 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on the usual standard annual productive hours of the beneficiary, if it is at least $90 \%$ of the workable time"

As detailed under point 2.b, the standard annual productive hours can be calculated as the average annual productive hours of all employees of the beneficiary, based on the time recording system of the beneficiary and according to the beneficiaries usual cost accounting practices. Part-time employees are included in such standard annual productive hours, corrected as $100 \%$ FTE. Under this option, for an employee ("staff group B") which has a change in his working contract (i.e. FTE rate) during the reporting period, we would calculate the day-equivalent as shown in table 10.

| Option 2 - Conversion based on the usual standard annual productive hours of the beneficiary, if it is at least $90 \%$ of the workable time <br> $>$ Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group B (mixed FTE) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reporting period | 01-09/2022 (9 months) |  |
| Daily rate denominator | 215 days / 12 months * 9 months $=161,25$ days |  |
| Basis per calendar year | 01-02/2022 (2 months) | 03-09/2022 (7 months) |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | 100\% FTE | 50\% FTE |
| Standard annual productive hours (incl. 90\% capping) | 1.566 hours per year |  |
| Day-equivalent | $\begin{gathered} 1.566 \text { hours } / 215 \text { days }= \\ \mathbf{7 , 2 8 h} / \mathbf{d a y} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \text { FTE }=7,28 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } \\ 7,28 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } * 50 \%=3,64 \mathrm{~h} / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |
| Average FTE for the reporting period | (100\%* 2months $+50 \% * 7$ months) $/ 9$ months $=\mathbf{6 1 , 1 1 \%}$ |  |
| Average day-equivalent for the reporting period | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \text { FTE }=7,28 \mathrm{~h} / \mathrm{day} \\ 7,28 \mathrm{~h} * 61,11 \%=\mathbf{4 , 4 5} / \text { day } \end{gathered}$ |  |

Table 10
c. Option 3 - Converting hours into day-equivalents "based on a fixed number of hours"

Under this option, for an employee ("staff group B") which has a change in his working contract (i.e.
FTE rate) during the reporting period, we would calculate the day-equivalent as shown in table 11.

| Option 3-Conversion based on a fixed number of hours: 1 day-equivalent $=8$ hours > Example of Personnel costs calculation for staff group B (mixed FTE) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reporting period | 01-09/ | months) |
| Daily rate denominator | 215 days / 12 month | ths $=161,25$ days |
| Basis per calendar year | 01-02/2022 (2 months) | 03-09/2022 (7 months) |
| Full Time Equivalent (FTE) | 100\% FTE | 50\% FTE |
| Day-equivalent | 8h/day | $\begin{gathered} 100 \% \text { FTE }=8 \mathrm{~h} / \mathrm{day} \\ 8 \text { hours * } 50 \%=4 \mathrm{~h} / \mathrm{day} \end{gathered}$ |
| Average FTE for the reporting period | (100\%* 2months $+50 \% * 7$ months) $/ 9$ months $=\mathbf{6 1 , 1 1 \%}$ |  |
| Average day-equivalent for the reporting period | $100 \%$ FTE $=8 h /$ day8 hours $* 61,11 \%=\mathbf{4 . 8 9 h} /$ day |  |

Table 11

EARTO and its financial experts would very much welcome an open discussion with the EC services on these technical calculations and are ready to support the EC in their drafting of the Annotated Grant Agreement provision on this topic. In addition, other points should also be clarified by the EC before the start of Horizon Europe, including for instance the audit process (incl. for monthly declarations), the compatibility of such approach with unit costs options, with internal invoicing and with the reporting of work progress, etc.

For more information on EARTO's recent position papers towards Horizon Europe's Model Grant Agreement (financial provisions):

- EARTO Paper on Horizon Europe's Internal Invoices Scheme - 26 February 2020
- EARTO Analysis of the draft Horizon Europe MGA: Financial provisions - 21 February 2020
- EARTO Input towards HE MGA: Ensure continuity with H2020 personnel costs' options - 2 December 2019
- EARTO Answer to EC Consultation on Horizon Europe Implementation -23 September 2019
- EARTO Recommendations on Horizon Europe's Implementation: Financial Aspects -30 April 2019


## RTOs - Research and Technology Organisations

From the lab to your everyday life. RTOs innovate to improve your health and well-being, your safety and security, your mobility and connectivity. RTOs' technologies cover all scientific fields. Their work ranges from basic research to new products and services' development. RTOs are non-profit organisations with public missions to support society. To do so, they closely cooperate with industries, large and small, as well as a wide array of public actors.
EARTO - European Association of Research and Technology Organisations
Founded in 1999, EARTO promotes RTOs and represents their interest in Europe. EARTO network counts over 350 RTOs in more than 20 countries. EARTO members represent 150.000 highly-skilled researchers and engineers managing a wide range of innovation infrastructures.
EARTO Working Group Financial Experts: composed of 40+ RTO Financial Controllers and Specialists from EARTO members. Established in 2013, this Working Group is following financial aspects of the EU RD\&I Framework Programme, including simplification measures, audits (incl. System \& Process Audits), cost models, H2020 Large Research Infrastructures scheme, the internal invoices' schemes, simplified costs options (e.g. lump-sums).


[^0]:    "The combined total of agreed annual leave and public holidays varies greatly across the EU. In 2018, it ranged from 28 days in the UK and 29 in Belgium, Estonia and Ireland, to 39 days in Denmark and Germany and 41 days in Slovakia. This means the difference between the smallest and largest figures is equivalent to nearly three working weeks. Two other countries with notably high levels of leave in 2018 were Austria and Malta, with 38 days each."
    Source: Eurofound report - Working time in 2017-2018

[^1]:    ${ }^{4}$ based on working contract or collective agreement

