

This mock proposal is just an example for `dfgproposal.cls` it reflects the current DFG template valid from October 2011.

PI=miko
acro=iPoW
RM=36
RAM=36

Neuantrag auf Sachbeihilfe
iPoWr: Inlligent Proposal Writing

Acronym: iPoWr

September 9, 2020

Michael Kohlhase
FAU Erlangen Nürnberg
Computer Science

Contents

0	General Information (for the ELAN system only)	1
0.1	Topic (Thema)	1
0.2	Research area and field of work (Fachgebiet und Arbeitsrichtung)	1
0.3	Anticipated total duration (Voraussichtliche Gesamtdauer)	1
0.4	Keywords	1
0.5	Application period (Antragszeitraum)	1
0.6	Zusammenfassung	0
0.7	Summary	1
1	State of the Art and Preliminary Work	1
1.1	List of Project-Related Publications	1
2	Objectives and Work Schedule (Ziele und Arbeitsprogramm)	1
2.1	Objectives	1
2.2	Work Schedule	1
3	Bibliography concerning the state of the art, the research objectives, and the work programme	3
4	Requested Modules/Funds	3
4.1	Funding for Staff	3
4.2	Funding for Direct Project Costs	4
5	Project Requirements (Voraussetzungen für die Durchführung des Vorhabens)	4
5.1	Employment status information (Angaben zur Dienststellung)	4
5.2	First-time proposal data (Angaben zur Erstantragstellung)	4
5.3	Composition of the project group (Zusammensetzung der Projektarbeitsgruppe)	4
5.4	Cooperation with other researchers (Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern)	5
5.5	Scientific equipment (Apparative Ausstattung)	5
5.6	Project-relevant interests in commercial enterprises (Projektrelevante Beteiligungen an erwerbswirtschaftlichen Unternehmen)	5
6	Additional Information	5

0 General Information (for the ELAN system only)

0.1 Topic (Thema)

Intelligentes Schreiben von Anträgen

0.2 Research area and field of work (Fachgebiet und Arbeitsrichtung)

Scientific discipline: Computer Science

Fields of work: Knowledge Management

0.3 Anticipated total duration (Voraussichtliche Gesamtdauer)

3 years; initial proposal

0.4 Keywords

LaTeX Active Documents

0.5 Application period (Antragszeitraum)

24 Months starting 1. Feb. 2010

0.6 Zusammenfassung

ToDo:1 *Fassen Sie hier bitte die wesentlichen Ziele Ihres Vorhabens allgemeinverständlich und in nicht mehr als 15 Zeilen (max. 1600 Zeichen)*
Done:1 *zusammen.* Das Schreiben von Anträgen ist oft ein kollaboratives Unterfangen in dem Beiträge von mehreren Partnern in einen kohärenten Text integriert werden müssen. Durch die Verwendung eines ASCII-basierten Formates wie \LaTeX kann dieser Prozeß in einem Versionsmanagementsystem wie SUBVERSION unterstützt werden, wodurch sie das Projektteam auf das Schreiben konzentrieren kann statt auf die Mechanik der Integration.

¹To Do: *from the proposal template*

0.7 Summary

Summarize the relevant goals of the proposed project in generally intelligible terms. Do not use more than 3000 characters, no special characters allowed. Writing grant proposals is a collaborative effort that requires the integration of contributions from many individuals. The use of an ASCII-based format like L^AT_EX [Lam94] allows to coordinate the process via a source code control system like Subversion, allowing the proposal writing team to concentrate on the contents rather than the mechanics of wrangling with text fragments and revisions.

ToDo:2
Done:2

²To Do: copy into the Elan system

1 State of the Art and Preliminary Work

ToDo:3 For new proposals please explain briefly and precisely the state of the art in your field in its direct relationship to your project. This description should make clear in which context you situate your own research and in what areas you intend to make a unique, innovative, promising contribution. This description must be concise and understandable without referring to additional literature.

For renewal proposals, please report on your previous work. This report should also be understandable without referring to additional literature.

To illustrate and enhance your presentation you may refer to your own and others' publications. Indicate whenever you are referring to other researchers' work. Please list all cited publications in your bibliography under section 3. This reference list is not considered your list of publications. Note that reviewers are not required to read any of the works you cite. This also applies to review sessions that are held on site. In this case, manuscripts and publications that provide more information on the progress reports and are published up to the review panel's meeting may be made available at the meeting to enable reviewers to read through the information. Reviews will be based only on the text of the actual proposal.

1.1 List of Project-Related Publications

ToDo:4 Please include a list of own publications that are related to the proposed project. It serves as an important basis for assessing your proposal. The number of publications to cite here is determined as follows:

Single applicant two publications per year of the funding duration

Multiple applicants three publications per year of the funding duration

These rules refer to the proposed funding duration for new proposals and the completed duration for renewal proposals.

If you are submitting a proposal to the DFG for the first time and have therefore not published in the proposed research area, please list the up to five most important publications so far.

1.1.1 Peer-Reviewed Articles

Articles

[Koh+11] M. Kohlhase et al. "The Planetary System: Web 3.0 & Active Documents for STEM". In: *Procedia Computer Science* 4 (2011): *Special issue: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Science (ICCS)*. Ed. by M. Sato, S. Matsuoka, P. M. Slood, G. D. van Albada, and J. Dongarra. Finalist at the Executable Paper Grand Challenge, pp. 598–607. DOI: [10.1016/j.procs.2011.04.063](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2011.04.063).

Monographs

[Knu84] D. E. Knuth. *The TeXbook*. Addison Wesley, 1984.

[Lam94] L. Lamport. *LaTeX: A Document Preparation System, 2/e*. Addison Wesley, 1994.

5

1.1.2 Other Articles None.

1.1.3 Patents None.

2 Objectives and Work Schedule (Ziele und Arbeitsprogramm)

2.1 Objectives

O1: Supporting Authors This is the first objective, after all we have to write proposals all the time, and we would rather spend time on research.

O2: Supporting Reviewers They are only human too, so let's have a heart for them as well.

2.2 Work Schedule

ToDo:6 Give a short high-level introduction to how the work in the project should proceed, explain Tables 1 and 1. The project is organized around five work packages, which we summarize in Figure 1.

We ensure the dissemination and creation of the periodic integrative reports containing the periodic Project Management Report, the Project Management Handbook, an Knowledge Dissemination Plan (WP1), the Proceedings of the Annual iPoWr Summer School as well as non-public Dissemination and Exploitation plans (WP2), as well as a report of the iPoWr project milestones.

³To Do: from the proposal guidelines

⁴To Do: from the proposal template

⁵EDNOTE: Anmerkung Jens: Ein nützliches Feature wäre hier, wenn das Paket eine (eventuell über Optionen der Dokumentklasse unterdrückbare) Warnung ausgeben würde, wenn zu viele Publikationen entsprechend DFG-Richtlinien angegeben werden. Die Anzahl ist sehr eng begrenzt.

⁶To Do: from the proposal template

id=firstob

id=second

id=manag

RM=2

RAM=8

WP	Title	RM	RAM
WP1	Project Management	2	8
WP2	Dissemination and Exploitation	8	
WP3	Class	12	8
WP4	Template	12	
WP5	A work package without tasks		
totals		34	16

R(A)M $\hat{=}$ Researcher (Assistant) Months

Table 1: Work Packages

Work Package 1: Project Management (2 RM+8 RAM)

Based on the “Bewilligungsbescheid” of the DFG, and based on the financial and administrative data agreed, the project manager will carry out the overall project management, including administrative management. A project quality handbook will be defined, and a iPoWr help-desk for answering questions about the format (first project-internal, and after month 12 public) will be established. The project management will consist of the following tasks

T1 To perform the administrative, scientific/technical, and financial management of the project

T2 To co-ordinate the contacts with the DFG and other funding bodies, building on the results in [T1.1](#)

T3 To control quality and timing of project results and to resolve conflicts

T4 To set up inter-project communication rules and mechanisms

Work Package 2: Dissemination and Exploitation (8 RM+?? RAM)

Much of the activity of a project involves small groups of nodes in joint work. This work package is set up to ensure their best wide-scale integration, communication, and synergetic presentation of the results. Clearly identified means of dissemination of work-in-progress as well as final results will serve the effectiveness of work within the project and steadily improve the visibility and usage of the emerging semantic services.

The work package members set up events for dissemination of the research and work-in-progress results for researchers (workshops and summer schools), and for industry (trade fairs). An in-depth evaluation will be undertaken of the response of test-users.

T1 sdfkj

T2 sdfkjksdf

T3 sdfkjksdf

T4

Within two months of the start of the project, a project website will go live. This website will have two areas: a members’ area and a public area...

Work Package 3: A LaTeX class for EU Proposals (12 RM+8 RAM)

We plan to develop a \LaTeX class for marking up EU Proposals

We will follow strict software design principles, first comes a requirements analys, then ...

T1 sdfsd

T2 sdfsd

T3 sdfsd

T4 sdfsd

Work Package 4: Proposal Template (12 RM+?? RAM)

We plan to develop a template file for iPoWr proposals

We abstract an example from existing proposals

T1 sdfsd

T2 sdfsd




Figure 1: Gantt Chart: Overview Work Package Activities– lower bar shows the overall effort (RM only) per month

Work Package 5: A work package without tasks (RM+?? RAM)

And finally, a work package without tasks, so we can see the effect on the gantt chart in fig 1.

3 Bibliography concerning the state of the art, the research objectives, and the work programme

In this bibliography, list only the works you cite in your presentation of the state of the art, the research objectives, and the work programme. This bibliography is not the list of publications. Non-published works must be included with the proposal.

ToDo:7
Done:7

- [aut] the proposal authors. ... *should provide more high-class references* ...
- [Knu84] D. E. Knuth. *The T_EXbook*. Addison Wesley, 1984.
- [Koh+11] M. Kohlhase et al. “The Planetary System: Web 3.0 & Active Documents for STEM”. In: *Procedia Computer Science 4 (2011): Special issue: Proceedings of the International Conference on Computational Science (ICCS)*. Ed. by M. Sato, S. Matsuoka, P. M. Sloot, G. D. van Albada, and J. Dongarra. Finalist at the Executable Paper Grand Challenge, pp. 598–607. DOI: [10.1016/j.procs.2011.04.063](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2011.04.063).
- [Koh10] M. Kohlhase. *Preparing DFG Proposals in L^AT_EX with dfgproposal.cls*. Self-documenting L^AT_EX package, <https://github.com/KWARC/LaTeX-proposal/tree/master/dfg/dfgproposal.pdf>; ask the author for access. 2010.
- [Lam94] L. Lamport. *LaTeX: A Document Preparation System, 2/e*. Addison Wesley, 1994.
- [Lan10] C. Lange. “Towards OpenMath Content Dictionaries as Linked Data”. In: *23rd OpenMath Workshop*. Ed. by M. Kohlhase and C. Lange. July 2010. arXiv: [1006.4057v1 \[cs.DL\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1006.4057v1). URL: <http://cicm2010.cnam.fr/om/>.

4 Requested Modules/Funds

For each applicant, we apply for funding within the Basic Module.

4.1 Funding for Staff

4.1.1 Research Staff

We apply for the following positions. All run over the entire duration of the proposed project.

Non-doctoral staff ⁸

EdN:8

- One doctoral researcher for 2 years at 100% for Michael Kohlhase.
- One doctoral researcher for 2 years at 100% for Florian Rabe.

Other research assistants ⁹

EdN:9

- One student with BSc. for 2 years at 100% for Michael Kohlhase.
- One student with BSc. for 2 years at 100% for Florian Rabe.

⁰Bars shown at reduced height (e.g. 50%) indicate reduced intensity during that work phase (e.g. to 50%).

⁷To Do: from the proposal template

⁸EdNOTE: compute amount in elan and copy here

⁹EdNOTE: students with BSc.

4.1.2 Non-Academic Staff **None.**

4.1.3 Student Assistants **None.**

4.2 Funding for Direct Project Costs

4.2.1 Equipment up to 10,000 €, Software and Consumables

None. PC will cover the workspace, computing needs, and consumables for its staff as part of the basic support.

4.2.2 Travel Expenses

BOP:10 The travel budget shall cover:

- visits to external collaborators. We expect two international visits. We estimate that each visit will be most effective, if the junior researchers can spend about 3 weeks with the partners. Thus we estimate 2500 € per visit.
- visits to national conferences to disseminate the results of iPoWr. We expect one visit for each year for each of the three researchers. (3 x 3 x 1000 €)
- visits to international conferences to disseminate the results of iPoWr. These are in particular the International Joint Conference on Document Engineering (DocEng) and the Tech User Group Meeting (TUG). We expect one visit for each proposed researcher and for each year. (3 x 3 x 1500 €)

EOP:10 This sums up to a total amount of 32.500 € for travel expenses for the whole funding period of three years which is split into 16.250 € for each institute (PC and Jacobs University).

4.2.3 Visiting Researchers

Total expenses **10.200 €**

As explained in Section 4.2.2, we expect 5 incoming research visits. Assuming an average duration of 3 weeks, we estimate the cost of one visit at 600 € for traveling and 70 € per night for accommodation, amounting to 2040 € per visit.

– **4.1.2.6, 4.1.3 (Expenses for Laboratory Animals / Other Costs / Project Related Publication Expenses / Instrumentation)** n/a

5 Project Requirements (Voraussetzungen für die Durchführung des Vorhabens)

5.1 Employment status information (Angaben zur Dienststellung)

ToDo:11 *For each applicant, state the last name, first name, and employment status (including duration of contract and funding body, if on a fixed-term contract).*
Done:11

5.2 First-time proposal data (Angaben zur Erstantragstellung)

ToDo:12 *Only if applicable: Last name, first name of first-time applicant.*
If this is your first proposal, reviewers will consider this fact when assessing your proposal. Previous proposals for research fellowships, publication funding, travel allowances, or funding for scientific networks are not considered first proposals. If you are submitting a “first-time proposal” and it is part of a joint proposal, please note that your independent project must be distinct from the other projects.

If you have already submitted a proposal as an applicant for a research grant and have received a letter informing you of the funding decision, or if you have led an independent junior research group or project in a Collaborative Research Centre or Research Unit, you are no longer eligible to submit a “first proposal”. If you have submitted a “first-time proposal” and it was rejected, you may resubmit the application, in revised form, as a first-time proposal for the same project.

Done:12

5.3 Composition of the project group (Zusammensetzung der Projektarbeitsgruppe)

ToDo:13 *List only those individuals who will work on the project but will not be paid out of the project funds. State each person’s name, academic title, employment status, and type of funding.*

Please list separately the individuals paid by your institution and those paid using other third-party funding (including fellowships).

Done:13 The KWARC (Knowledge Adaptation and Reasoning for Content) research group headed by Michael Kohlhase for has the following members

¹⁰OLD PART: rework

¹¹TO DO: from the proposal template

¹²TO DO: from the proposal template

¹³TO DO: from the proposal template

Dr. N.N. is the ... She has a background in ...

Additionally, the group has attracted about 10 undergraduate and master's students that actively take part in the project work and various aspects of research.

5.4 Cooperation with other researchers (Zusammenarbeit mit anderen Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftlern)

5.4.1 Researchers with whom you have agreed to cooperate on this project (Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler, mit denen für dieses Vorhaben eine konkrete Vereinbarung zur Zusammenarbeit besteht)

Prof. Dr. Super Akquisiteur (Uni Paderborn) knows exactly what to do to get funding with DFG, we will interview him closely and integrate all his intuitions into the iPoWr templates.

Prof. Dr. Habe Nichts (Uni Hinterpfuiteufel) has never gotten a grant proposal through with DFG, we will try to avoid his mistakes.

Dr. Sach Bearbeiter (DFG) will consult with the DFG requirements to be met in the proposals.

Dr. Donald Knuth (Stanford University) is so surprised that we want to do grant proposals in $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}/\text{L}^{\text{A}}\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ that he will help us with any problems we have in coding in this wonderful programming language.

5.4.2 Researchers with whom you have collaborated scientifically within the past three years (Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler, mit denen in den letzten drei Jahren wissenschaftlich zusammengearbeitet wurde)

14

This information will assist the DFG's Head Office in avoiding potential conflicts of interest during the review process.

EdN:14

~~To Do:15~~

5.5 Scientific equipment (Apparative Ausstattung)

Jacobs University provides laptops or desktop workstations for all academic employees. Great Consulting GmbH. is rolling in money anyways and has all of the latest gadgets.

5.6 Project-relevant interests in commercial enterprises (Projektrelevante Beteiligungen an erwerbswirtschaftlichen Unternehmen)

Not applicable.

6 Additional Information

Funding proposal XYZ-83282 has been submitted prior to this proposal on related topic XYZ.

¹⁴EDNOTE: Anmerkung Jens: Etwas unklar, was die DFG hier möchte. Die Liste der Personen kann sehr lang sein, also ist es wahrscheinlich besser nur die wichtigsten Projekte und Kontakte zu listen.

¹⁵TO DO: from the proposal template