

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

## 1 State of the Art and Preliminary Work

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.

PI=miko  
PI=gc  
site=jacu  
site=pcg  
acro=iPoWr  
ToDo:1

Done:1

### 1.1 List of Project-Related Publications

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.

ToDo:2

Done:2

#### 1.1.1 Peer-Reviewed Articles

##### Articles

[Koh+11] M. Kohlhasse 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 T<sub>E</sub>Xbook*. Addison Wesley, 1984.

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

3

EdN:3

1.1.2 Other Articles **None.**

1.1.3 Patents **None.**

## 2 Objectives and Work Programme

### 2.1 Anticipated Total Duration of the Project

Please state

- the project's intended duration <sup>1</sup> and how long DFG funds will be necessary,
- for ongoing projects: since when the project has been active.

ToDo:4

Done:4

### 2.2 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.

<sup>1</sup>To Do: from the proposal guidelines

<sup>2</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>3</sup>EdNOTE: 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.

<sup>4</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

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

### 2.3 Work Programme Including Proposed Research Methods

$\LaTeX$  is the best document markup language, it can even be used for literate programming [Knu92; Lam94; Knu84]

*review the state of the art in the and your own contribution to it; probably you want to divide this into subsubsections.*

*For each applicant*

*Please give a detailed account of the steps planned during the proposed funding pe-riod. (For experimental projects, a schedule detailing all planned experiments should be provided.)*

*The quality of the work programme is critical to the success of a funding proposal. The work programme should clearly state how much funding will be requested, why the funds are needed, and how they will be used, providing details on individual items where applicable.*

*Please provide a detailed description of the methods that you plan to use in the project: What methods are already available? What methods need to be developed? What as- sistance is needed from outside your own group/institute? Please list all cited publications pertaining to the description of your work programme in your bibliography under section 3.*

The project is organized around two large-scale work areas which correspond to the objectives formulated above. These are subdivided into five work packages, which we summarize in Figure 1. Work area **WA1** will run over the whole project<sup>7</sup> duration of iPoWr. All three work packages in **WA2** will and have to be covered simultaneously in order to benefit from design-implementation-application feedback loops.

WA/P	Title	JacU RM	JacU RAM	PCG RM	PCG RAM	total RM	total RAM
<b>WA1</b>	<b>Management</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10</b>
WP1.1	Project Management	2	8	2		4	8
WP1.2	Dissemination and Exploitation		2	8		8	2
<b>WA2</b>	<b>System Development</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>10</b>
WP2.1	Class	12	8	12	2	24	10
WP2.2	Template	12				12	0
WP2.3	A work package without tasks					0	0
<b>totals</b>		<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>20</b>

R(A)M  $\hat{=}$  Researcher (Assistant) Months; WP lead efforts light gray italicised

Table 1: Work Areas and Work Packages

#### Work Area 1: Management, Support & Sustainability

This work-group corresponds to Objective **O1** and has two work packages: one for management proper (**WP1.1**), and one each for dissemination (**WP1.2**)

This work group ensures the dissemination and creation of the periodic integrative reports containing the periodic Project Management Report, the Project Management Handbook, an Knowledge Dissemination Plan (**WP1.1**), the Proceedings of the Annual iPoWr Summer School as well as non-public Dissemination and Exploitation plans (**WP1.2**), as well as a report of the iPoWr project milestones.

Work Package 1.1	Site	JacU	PCG	all
Project Management	Effort (RM+RAM)	2+8	2+	4+8

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 **T1.1.1**
- T3** ;To control quality and timing of project results and to resolve conflicts
- T4** ;To set up inter-project communication rules and mechanisms

<sup>5</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>6</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>7</sup>EdNOTE: come up with a better example, this is still oriented towards an EU project

To Do:5

To Do:6

Done:6

EdN:7

id=mansub

id=manage

lead=jacu

id=foo

wphases=0

req=dissem

wphases=1

id=dissem

lead=pcg

Work Package 1.2	Site	JacU	PCG	all
Dissemination and Exploitation	Effort (RM+RAM)	+2	8+	8+2

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 ;sdfkjsdf
- T3 ;sdfkjsdf
- 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 Area 2: System Development

This workarea does not correspond to O2: Supporting Reviewers, but it has two work packages: one for the development of the L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X class (WP2.1), and for the proposal template (WP2.2)

This work group coordinates the system development.

Work Package 2.1	Site	JacU	PCG	all
A LaTeX class for EU Proposals	Effort (RM+RAM)	12+8	12+2	24+10

We plan to develop a L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X class for marking up EU Proposals

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

- T1 ;sdfsdf
- T2 ;sdfsdf
- T3 ;sdfsdf
- T4 ;sdfsdfd

Work Package 2.2	Site	JacU	PCG	all
Proposal Template	Effort (RM+RAM)	12+	+	12+0

We plan to develop a template file for iPoWr proposals

We abstract an example from existing proposals

- T1 ;sdfsdf
- T2 ;sdfsdf

Work Package 2.3	Site	JacU	PCG	all
A work package without tasks	Effort (RM+RAM)	+	+	0+0

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




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

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

<sup>8</sup>EdNOTE: MK: we need to schedule more things in the first 6 months

## 2.4 Data Handling

The iPoWr project will not systematically produce research data. All project results will be published for at least  $x$  years at our archive at <http://example.org>.

## 2.5 – 2.7 (Other Information / Explanations on the Proposed Investigations / Information on Scientific and Financial Involvement of International Cooperation Partners) n/a

## 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:9  
Done:9

[Knu92] D. E. Knuth. *Literate Programming*. The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

## 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 <sup>10</sup>

EdN:10

- 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 <sup>11</sup>

EdN:11

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

#### 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

The travel budget shall cover:

BOP:12

- 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 €)

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).

EOP:12

<sup>9</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>10</sup>EdNOTE: compute amount in elan and copy here

<sup>11</sup>EdNOTE: students with BSc.

<sup>12</sup>OLD PART: rework

### 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

### 5.1 Employment Status Information

**To Do:**<sup>13</sup> 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).

### 5.2 First-time Proposal Data

**To Do:**<sup>14</sup> 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:**<sup>14</sup>

### 5.3 Composition of the Project Group

**To Do:**<sup>15</sup> 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.

**Done:**<sup>15</sup> Please list separately the individuals paid by your institution and those paid using other third-party funding (including fellowships).

#### 5.3.1 JacU: JACOBS UNIVERSITY BREMEN

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

**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.

#### 5.3.2 PCG: POWER CONSULTING GMBH

Power Consulting GmbH is the leading provider of semantic document solutions. Dr. Senior Researcher leads an applied research group consisting of

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

The group has access to seven programming slaves specializing in web development and document transformation techniques

### 5.4 Cooperation with other Researchers

#### 5.4.1 Planned Cooperations

**To Do:**<sup>16</sup> Researchers with whom you have agreed to cooperate on this project

**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.

<sup>13</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>14</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>15</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

<sup>16</sup>To Do: from the proposal template

#### 5.4.2 Scientific Collaborations in the past Three Years

*Researchers with whom you have collaborated scientifically within the past three years*

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

ToDo:17  
Done:17

#### 5.5 Scientific Equipment

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 n/a

### 6 Additional Information

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

---

<sup>17</sup>To Do: *from the proposal template*