

Project Management Service – Business case and evaluation of management structures

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to build the business case for the proposed PM service which will identify the costs, income streams and financial investment that the university will need to commit for creating a sustainable service. In addition, the financial analysis will define the financial model which will demonstrate how the service will develop and evolve over the next seven years under different management structures.

2.0 Service provision

The service provision process was defined in the document “Project Management – Service Provision”.

The PM service will be offered at different stages of the project life cycle (see document on ‘Project Management – role and responsibilities’.

The PM service will include the provision of project management support at the Proposal preparation, Negotiation and Audit stages of a project’s life cycle. The cost of project management support at these stages will not be recovered from grant awards and will therefore be incurred by the university.

In addition, project management will be offered at the Kick-off & Implementation and Completion stages and the cost of project management effort will be recovered from the project’s budget.

3.0 Financial analysis

The financial analysis of the proposed PM service aims to identify the costs, income streams and the financial investment that the university will need to commit in order to create and sustain the service. This analysis is based on a number of assumptions:

1. Demand profile

The demand for the proposed PM service will depend on the number of successful proposals that will be led and coordinated by UNIMAN. The development of the demand profile was based on the expectation that the future number of coordinated projects will increase and exceed the number that were achieved in FP7. It is expected that the PM service will encourage more academic staff to coordinate projects and contribute to a greater number of

successful applications than in FP7. In FP7, UNIMAN led and coordinated 19 collaborative projects which varied in size, level of funding and duration.

The financial analysis is based on two demand scenarios:

- (a) The modest scenario which assumes that the service will undertake to coordinate a total of 24 projects over a seven year period.
- (b) The optimistic scenario which assumes that the service will coordinate a total of 33 projects over a seven year period.

In both scenarios the greater number of successful projects will occur halfway through the Horizon 2020 programme as academic researchers will become familiar with the funding programme and also feel confident about using the UNIMAN PM service.

2. Project management functions and cost recoverability

The PM service will provide support to academic staff the cost of which will not be recovered from grant awards. These costs include:

- The PM service support (0.2 FTE) for advising and assisting the PIs during the proposal preparation and the project negotiation stages.
- All PMs (0.05FTE) will provide administration support a few months after the end the projects e.g. settling of final payments and assist with audits.
- It is also expected that the project management team will require 0.10FTE for team management and supervision.

3. Economies of scale

The financial analysis assumes that pooling together all of the project management requests will create significant economies of scale that will benefit the PM service by making it more efficient. It was therefore assumed that 'large' projects, €5,000,000 total EC contribution, will require 0.45FTE for project management as opposed to 'small' projects, € 2,000,000 EC contribution, which will require 0.25FTE. Currently, the majority of UNIMAN coordinated projects are allocated one FTE. In order to understand the costs and risks that the university will be exposed to by offering an in-house PM service, it is also assumed that demand for project management will be met by university employed staff i.e. external consultancy support will not be taken into account.

4. Recoverable project management cost

For the purpose of simplicity, the business case includes only personnel cost as part of the recoverable project management cost and this comes to approximately 3% of the total EC contribution. In EC funded projects, the budget for management is also expected to include costs for travel, consumables, equipment and audit certificates. When contingency and other costs are added, it is expected that the management cost will exceed 3% of the total EC contribution and be preferably less than the EC recommended figure of 7%. Appendix 5 provides a list of FP7 UNIMAN coordinated projects and their respective management budgets. A number of projects are noted for their relatively high management costs. This is attributed to the higher than expected

travel and consumable costs and the inclusion of the indirect cost rate of 60% of total direct costs.

The final outcome of the financial analysis is the calculation of the total university investment that will be required in order to implement the PM service under that specific demand profile. The university investment will cover for bridging funding and other operational costs such as non-recoverable support costs, travel and consumables.

The details of all the assumptions made for the financial analysis are shown in Appendix 2.

4.0 Risk analysis

There are a number of risks that are associated with the proposed PM service. Further analysis of the risks and the development of mitigation strategies are shown below:

4.1 Capacity inefficiency due to the underutilisation of PM staff

Underutilization may occur either when a time lag occurs between a project that is completed and another one is ready to start or when there are not new successful projects coming in to utilize the existing capacity of PMs. In the financial analysis, the university expenditure includes the cost element of bridge funding to cover for the FTE effort that remains underutilized due to the gradual uptake of new projects in the first 3 years and the subsequent decline of successful projects towards the end of the framework programme.

The business case did not take into account any measures that can potentially be taken in order to reduce or eliminate this underutilization. The PM service could consider the following:

- The EC guidelines stipulate that the management cost should not exceed 7% of the total EC contribution for a project. The financial model uses a conservative assumption with regard to the allocation of PM effort per project. It is assumed that a PM will spend 25%FTE on the management of a €2.5M, three year project. The PM cost as a percentage of the total EC contribution comes to approximately 2.9%. There is therefore the flexibility to further increase the PM effort per project. In this example if the PM effort is increased to 0.35FTE, the management cost is 3.9% of the total EC contribution. Therefore, provided that the PM service achieves economies of scale and operates efficiently, there will be the flexibility to include some contingency in its budget and cover for potential underutilization. It needs to be noted however that none of the PM FTEs employed by the service can be charged in excess of 100% to projects.

- There will be cases in EC funded projects when the PM service not only executes the management workpackage but also undertakes the execution of the dissemination workpackage. This will generate additional revenue for the service.
- The PM team could use underutilized capacity to manage non-EU funded projects and generate new income streams.
- The PM service can assess future demand and make a strategic decision to make use of external consultants in order to meet excess demand instead of recruiting additional resources which will not be fully utilized.

4.2 Failure to achieve economies of scale.

The creation of a critical mass in the number of managed projects is key in achieving economies of scale. A relatively large volume of project management requests will enable the PM team to enjoy certain benefits and cost efficiencies that will otherwise not exist if there is only a small number of projects that require project management.

A relatively large number of projects will potentially result in the following economies of scale:

- The PM team will achieve a greater degree of efficiency by managing a large number of projects through the repeated use of standard methods and project management practices e.g. resolve problems and issues, apply templates across multiple projects, apply knowledge and lessons learned to other projects.
- It will be cost effective for the PM team to invest in software tools that will improve the management and monitoring of its projects.
- The cost of managing the PM team will be relatively lower.
- The PM team will be able to diversify into projects of other funders.
- The service will be able to recruit PM staff with specialist knowledge and experience on funding programmes or sectors.

The risk of failing to achieve economies of scale can be managed by deploying different strategies to build a critical mass of projects that require UNIMAN coordination. One such strategy will be to aggregate all PM service requests into a single demand pipeline. Another strategy will be to invest and improve further the funding development and application support e.g. EU Funding & Development in order to increase the number of successful project applications that will require UNIMAN coordination.

4.3. Inconsistent development of processes and application of best PM practices and varied service quality across the faculties.

The team leadership/management of the PM service will be responsible for developing, implementing and maintaining best practice project management methods and high quality standards of project management across the whole university. The lack of coordination and good communication between the project management team members increases the likelihood of developing processes, methods and project management practices of varying degrees and service quality.

4.4. Inability to increase PM service capacity in response to new service requests.

Planning and committing project management resources is only made possible when the EC announces the successful UNIMAN grant awards that will require coordination. It is crucial that the proposed PM service, when needed, is given a degree of flexibility to increase its capacity in a relatively short period of time (3- 6 months). The decision on whether to expand the capacity of the service will depend on the existing utilization of the service, expectations of future demand, service budget and on any specific project or programme requirements. In order to reduce the probability of the above risk occurring, it will require the PM service to develop a single management decision making process and service strategy that will be implemented across all four faculties.

4.5. Failure to build a consistent service track record and credibility with external and internal stakeholders.

In the eyes of external stakeholders the PM service will always be seen as a single entity i.e. a UNIMAN PM service. It is important that the UNIMAN PM service builds its credibility with external stakeholders like the EC, partner universities and industry in order to become the preferred and trusted provider of project management. In addition, building a track record and credibility for managing projects will be equally important in order to persuade the UNIMAN academic staff to make use of the service.

The PM service will need to build a track record of successful managed projects and demonstrate that it possesses the skills, knowledge and experience to offer a high quality PM support. Building a service track record and credibility for the whole UNIMAN PM service will require the implementation of a service management process that will ensure that the PM service performance is of a high standard and consistent across all faculties and that it is promoted to external stakeholders as a single PM service.

4.6. Failure to integrate the PM service with the other faculty support teams.

In order for the PM service to be sustainable and effective it is essential that it integrates its processes and activities with the support functions of RSS, EU Funding and Development, Finance and Regional and Economic Affairs (ERDF). Mitigation against the above risk can be achieved by adopting an appropriate governance structure for the proposed service which will ensure that the integration of the service with all the university support structures is formally defined and agreed. The governance of the PM service will provide an accountability structure for management and determine how the service is developed, implemented and shared across the university in line with the existing EU support structure.

5.0 Management structures

At UNIMAN, research support services are offered under different management support structures. Research support services, like Research Contracts, are provided as a shared service by a single team as part of the Research and Business Engagement Support Services (RBESS). Other research support services such as the EU Funding & Development are offered through the Faculty RSS support teams. The business case will consider and evaluate the deployment of the PM service under different management structures.

The management structure of the proposed PM service is concerned with the day-to-day operation of the service, compliance of project management with EC rules and regulations, implementation of best project management practice and the review of performance and development of PM service staff.

The business case has considered the following PM service structures:

5.1 Option 1

The first option involves the placement of the PM service in the current RSS distributed structure. The RSS distributed support teams support European funding projects by providing project costs and handling of financial claims for UNIMAN.

The current Faculty RSS structure consists of four Heads of Faculty Research and Support Services (HoFRSSs) with their respective research support teams. In addition, two EU Funding & Development Managers support the faculties by providing funding intelligence information, contract negotiation, advice on contractual issues, information on financial regulations and assistance with financial audits. One EU Funding & Development manager is responsible for providing support to EPS and Humanities and reports to the HoFRSS in Humanities. The other EU Funding & Development Manager provides support to the faculties of MHS and FLS and is line managed by the HoFRSS in FLS.

The introduction of the proposed PM service will require the RSS to devise an appropriate management structure to accommodate the new service. The options that the business case will consider are as follows:

Option 1.1: Develop a PM team for each of the four faculties i.e. four teams of project managers. A senior PM will manage each of the four teams and will report directly to the HoFRSS.

Option 1.2: Develop two teams, each individually managed by a senior PM who will report to two of the HoFRSS. This management structure will mirror the recently devolved structure of the EU Funding & Development Managers.

5.2 Option 2

An alternative option will be to implement a PM service which will consist of a single team of staff who will work across all faculties. The PM service will operate as a cross-faculty shared service (similar to the Research Contracts service that is currently offered by RBESS). This will require the service to be managed by a senior member of the PM team who will act as the Head of the PM service.

5.3 Financial evaluation

A financial analysis was undertaken to evaluate all of the above options using the modest and optimistic demand profiles and the assumptions that are listed in Appendix 2. The tables below demonstrate the incremental growth of the PM service and the university financial support that will be required on an annual basis. A full detailed breakdown of the evaluation of the options below is shown in Appendix 3.

Table 1: Option 1.1 (aggregate) - Modest scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	7	13	14	15	11	
No. of Project Managers	3	3	5	7	8	8	8	
Total expenditure pa	£184k	£327k	£467k	£534k	£621k	£614k	£672k	£3,418k
Total revenue pa	£0	£68k	£127k	£232k	£272k	£290k	£282k	£1,271k
Balance	(£184k)	(£259k)	(£340k)	(£302k)	(£349k)	(£323k)	(£389k)	(£2,147k)

Table 2: Option 1.2 (aggregate) - Modest scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	7	13	14	15	11	
No. of Project Managers	2	2	4	7	7	7	7	
Total expenditure pa	£145k	£181k	£267k	£517k	£537k	£548k	£575k	£2,770k
Total revenue pa	£0	£68k	£127k	£232k	£272k	£290k	£282k	£1,271k
Balance	(£145k)	(£113k)	(£141k)	(£285k)	(£264k)	(£258k)	(£292k)	(£1,499)

Table 3: Option 2 – Modest scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	7	13	14	15	11	
No. of Project Managers	1	2	3	6	6	6	6	
Total expenditure pa	£47k	£167k	£237k	£448k	£458k	£467k	£472k	£2,295k
Total revenue pa	£0	£68k	£127k	£232k	£272k	£290k	£282k	£1,271k
Balance	(£47k)	(£99k)	(£110k)	(£216k)	(£185k)	(£177k)	(£189k)	(£1,024k)

Under the modest scenario, the financial analysis demonstrates that over a seven year period, the implementation of a PM service under options 1.1 and 1.2 will require university investment of £2,147k and £1,499k respectively. Under option 2, the PM service will require university investment of £1,024k.

The above exercise is repeated for option 1.2 and option 2, assuming a more optimistic demand scenario where the number of coordinated projects over the seven year period increases from 24 to 33.

Table 4: Option 1.2 (aggregate) - Optimistic scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	9	18	18	20	15	
No. of Project Managers	2	2	6	9	9	9	10	
Total expenditure pa	£145k	£217k	£439k	£654k	£695k	£697k	£813k	£3,659k
Total revenue pa	£0	£118k	£207k	£323k	£391k	£420k	£377k	£1,836k
Balance	(£145k)	(£99k)	(£232k)	(£330k)	(£304k)	(£277k)	(£436k)	(£1,823k)

Table 5: Option 2 – Optimistic scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	9	18	18	20	15	
No. of Project Managers	1	3	5	8	8	8	8	
Total expenditure pa	£47k	£233k	£371k	£597k	£624k	£617k	£635k	£3,123k
Total revenue pa	£0	£118k	£207k	£323k	£391k	£420k	£377k	£1,836k
Balance	(£47k)	(£115k)	(£165k)	(£273k)	(£233k)	(£197k)	(£258k)	(£1,287k)

The financial analysis for the optimistic scenario demonstrates that over a seven year period, the university will need to invest £1,823k under option 1.2 as opposed to £1,287k under option 2 i.e. the total cost to the university is 42% higher under option 1.2 than option 2.

Under both the modest and optimistic scenarios option 1 carries a higher total expenditure than option 2. This is attributed to the higher underutilization of the employed staff (bridge funding). The cost of responding to changes in demand tends to be higher in option 1 as the demand pipeline is split into four teams in option 1.1 and into two teams in option 1.2.

The additional investment that is required for bridge funding will potentially be put into other productive use by assigning other duties to underutilized staff and deploy some of the mitigation strategies that were identified in section 4.1.

5.4 A revised financial evaluation of Option 2

Table 6: Financial Model - Modest scenario

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	TOTAL
no. of 'live' coordinated projects	0	3	7	13	14	14	11	
No. of Project Managers	1	1	3	5	5	5	5	
Total expenditure pa	£42k	£58k	£213k	£339k	£347k	£356k	£359k	£1,716k
Total revenue pa	0	£71k	£142k	£261k	£307k	£333k	£324k	£1,438k
Balance	(£42k)	£13k	(£72k)	(£78k)	(£40k)	(£23k)	(£36k)	(£303k)

In the above example it was assumed the PM service will set aside 0.20 FTE/year for every project manager employed for providing support in proposal preparation. However instead of running the model with a guaranteed commitment of 0.20 FTE/year for every project manager employed, the aggregate effort is spread over a six year period (2014-20) with the exception of 2013-14 when all of the project management activity will be allocated towards supporting academic staff in preparing research proposals and setting up the PM service.

Although the aggregate effort for proposal preparation is the same as the example in Table 5, the spread of the effort over six years mitigates against the risk of creating underutilized project management capacity. In the above example, the University will employ five projects managers and the university support will amount to £318k over a seven year period.

It was also assumed that 0.05 FTE per project will be charged for administration support. This cost will be recoverable.

5.5 Assessment of management structures

Further to the above financial comparison of the two management structures, the business case has identified a number of advantages and disadvantages that are associated with each of the options. In addition, the above management structures are assessed against the risks that were identified in section 3 – the risk assessment is shown in Appendix 4.

The above two options have the following advantages and disadvantages:

5.5.1 Option 1

Advantages

- The deployment of a PM service within RSS will integrate its processes and activities with those applied by the recently devolved EU Funding & Development function.
- PM service could be developed and implemented in line with the overall RSS structure and exploit the current close working relationships with academic staff and researchers.
- The faculties have the flexibility to absorb and redeploy any underutilized PM service capacity to other research support functions.

Disadvantages

- The service will not benefit from economies of scale e.g. recruitment of project managers with special expertise and experience, share of team management costs, scale advantages due to the repeated use of standard methods and practices that allow the PM team to achieve a greater degree of efficiency.
- PM service staff will be utilized less efficiently as their effort will not be shared between faculties and spread across projects.

- It will be difficult to extend the PM service to other non-EU funded projects if the service is already embedded solely within the existing faculty EU funding support structure.
- Lack of communication that may occur between the separate PM service teams could cause the development of inconsistent processes across the faculties and therefore the opportunity to develop best practice will be lost.
- It will be difficult to build a good track record and develop a reputation for high PM service quality, as this will be dependent upon four or two separate PM teams. This may prove crucial if the PM service wishes to extend its offering to projects that UNIMAN participates as a partner.
- Additional burden and overhead will arise from duplicating responsibility for managing the service.
- May be less clear to monitor the effectiveness and impact of the PM service due to the consequences of highly flexible redeployment practices outside the remit of the PM service.

5.5.2 Option 2

Advantages

- The PM service will be able to collect, evaluate and prioritise all project management requests across all four faculties.
- As the volume of on-going coordinated projects increases, there will be an adequate critical mass to achieve economies of scale.
- The single PM team will be run more efficiently as it will be easier to make single key management decisions e.g. allocation of staff to projects, apply a set of criteria for accepting/rejecting to manage projects. The Head of the PM service will be able to maximise the utilisation of the service by allocating staff to projects across all faculties.
- The PM service will be accountable to the university as a single team for its performance and achievement of management objectives, allowing greater clarity in evaluating the success of the model.
- The PM service will have greater flexibility to be offered to projects other than those that are funded by the EU.

Disadvantages

- The PM service could become detached from the existing RSS structure. There is the risk that the service will become isolated from both support and academic staff if an integrated interface is not maintained (as described in Appendix 1).
- The PM service will have to build, develop and maintain multiple links with the support structures of each faculty.
- Inefficiencies could occur, as the PM service staff will have to work with faculty support structures which adopt different support processes and procedures.
- The PM service will not have the flexibility to redeploy any underutilized staff to other faculty research support functions.

Appendix 1: Proposed internal (UNIMAN) process for PM provision

In most cases the provision of the PM service to PIs in UNIMAN will follow the steps listed below:

1. The PI has a project idea and wants to develop it into a European project proposal.
2. First point of contact for guidance and advice is the Faculty European Development team.
3. The PI seeks guidance and advice from the Faculty EU Funding & Development team.
4. When the PI decides that UNIMAN will coordinate a project, the European & Development Manager will make aware to the PI of the UNIMAN Project Management service.
5. Should the PI wish to consider the UNIMAN PM service the PI should contact the service. When?? Timing is crucial for planning purposes.
6. UNIMAN PM service will provide details of the activities it will undertake to perform.
7. PI discusses details of the proposal with PM service and EU Funding & Development team and a decision is made on whether the UNIMAN PM service will be used or consider other options e.g. an external consultancy or recruit a project manager specifically for that project.
8. If the UNIMAN PM service will be used, the PM service assesses the proposal and provides an estimate of the PM effort required and a copy of the Project agreement (details the tasks and responsibilities that the PM service will undertake).
9. The PI may contact the PM service for advice (see PM tasks / activities in 'PM role and responsibilities).
10. An internal Project agreement will be signed with PI and PM service outlining PM cost and effort to be allocated.
11. Should the proposal be successful, the PM service will allocate the execution of the agreed management tasks to a member of the PM team.

Appendix 2: Financial analysis - assumptions

1. Total no. of projects to be offered PM service – Modest scenario: 24
Total no. of projects to be offered PM service – Optimistic scenario: 33
2. Duration of projects: 3 years
3. Size of coordinated projects
 - Large project: £3,906,250
 - small project (incl. MC ITNs): £1,953,125
4. PM Service staff
 - Head of PM service and project managers modelled at Grade 7
 - Clerical support: Grade 5 in financial evaluation in section 5.3.
Grade 3 in financial evaluation in section 5.4.

5. Effort (FTE)

	Project mgmt. Small project	Project mgmt. Large project	Proposal prep. & Negotiation	Closure & Audit	Team mgmt.
Head of PM service	25%	45%	20%	5%	10%
Project Manager	25%	45%	20%	5%	

6. Salary cost

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
Salary cost (G7)	£54,358	£55,580	£56,692	£58,109	£59,561	£61,051	£61,694
Indirect (20%)	£10,872	£11,116	£11,338	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339
Total eligible cost	£65,230	£66,696	£68,030	£69,731	£71,473	£73,261	£74,033

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7
1 FTE salary cost for 3 year project	£0	£204,457	£209,234	£214,465	£218,767	£222,106	£224,445

e.g. Year 2: £66,696+£68,030+£69,731=£204,457

7. Administrative support:

In the financial evaluation in section 5.3 it is assumed that administrative support will be Grade 5 and the whole of the salary cost will be non-recoverable.

8. Administration support (revised financial analysis Option 2):

The revised financial evaluation of Option 2 in section 5.4 assumes that 5% of administration support effort will be charged per 'live project' i.e. this cost is recoverable. The remainder of the administration support effort is non-recoverable.

9. Project management (Subtotal A) only includes personnel cost. It does not include other costs such as travel, consumables, equipment and audit certificates.

10. Exchange rate: £1 = €1.28

11. Travel and training

Financial evaluation in section 5.3 assumes:

- 8 trips to Brussels per year/PM: 8 x £700=£5600/year/PM
- 10 UK trips per year/PM: 10 x 250=£2500/year/PM
- Consumables: £1,500 per project manager
- Training: £2,600 per project manager

Revised financial evaluation (Option 2) in section 5.4 assumes:

- Travel: £1000 per project manager
- Consumables: £500 per project manager
- Training: £1000 per project manager

12. PM Service Income

- 3 reporting periods
- Pre-financing: 35% of total EC contribution
- 20% of EC contribution for reporting periods 1 and 2.
- 25% of EC contribution for reporting period 3.

Appendix 3a: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.1: EPS

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	1	3	6	6	5	3	
EPS large	0	1		1		1		3
EPS small	0		2	2	1		1	6
FTE effort	0.2	0.65	1.45	2.60	2.40	2.35	1.45	
no. of PMs	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£25,011	£53,857	£110,407	£101,254	£100,734	£58,609	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£22,677	£34,865	£35,737	£36,631	£37,016	
Project closure					£2,978	£6,105	£9,254	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£36,127	£76,534	£145,273	£139,968	£143,470	£104,880	
Administration support		£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt		£0	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)		£34,704	£41,141	£42,094	£43,146	£44,225	£44,691	
Travel		£6,400	£12,800	£19,200	£19,200	£19,200	£19,200	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£3,000	£4,500	£4,500	£4,500	£4,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£7,900	£15,800	£23,700	£23,700	£23,700	£23,700	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£5,200	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£32,615	£19,453	£31,181	£23,244	£35,737	£39,683	£95,625	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£44,869	£100,784	£169,856	£242,110	£250,351	£258,878	£276,696	£1,343,544
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£32,202	£55,017	£110,634	£103,815	£112,823	£101,502	£ 515,994
Balance	£44,869	£68,582	£114,839	£131,476	£146,536	£146,055	£175,194	£827,550

Appendix 3a: Financial Analysis- Modest scenario

Option 1.1 - Humanities

	Nov 2014-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	
Humanities large								0
Humanities small	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	4
FTE effort	0.2	0.45	0.45	0.70	0.75	0.95	0.75	
no. of PMs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£13,895	£14,173	£14,527	£14,890	£15,263	£15,423	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£11,338	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339	
Project closure					£2,978	£3,053	£3,085	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£25,011	£25,511	£26,149	£29,781	£30,526	£30,847	
Administration support		£3,470	£3,547	£3,628	£3,719	£3,812	£3,852	
PM Service mgmt		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)		£3,470	£3,547	£3,628	£3,719	£3,812	£3,852	
Travel		£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£40,769	£30,569	£31,181	£17,433	£14,890	£3,053	£15,423	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£53,022	£69,550	£70,739	£57,710	£58,890	£47,890	£60,623	£418,424
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£17,890	£10,223	£28,989	£42,644	£41,096	£35,448	£ 176,289
Balance	£53,022	£51,660	£60,516	£28,721	£16,246	£6,794	£25,175	£242,135

Appendix 3a: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.1: MHS

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	1	3	6	6	5	3	
MHS large	0		1		1		1	3
MHS small	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
FTE effort	0.2	0.45	1.35	1.70	2.35	1.90	2.35	
no. of PMs	1	1	2	2	3	3	3	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£13,895	£53,857	£69,731	£98,276	£73,261	£101,795	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£22,677	£23,244	£35,737	£36,631	£37,016	
Project closure					£2,978	£6,105	£3,085	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£25,011	£76,534	£92,974	£136,990	£115,997	£141,896	
Administration support		£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt		£0	£0	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)		£34,704	£35,472	£42,094	£43,146	£44,225	£44,691	
Travel		£6,400	£12,800	£12,800	£19,200	£19,200	£19,200	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£3,000	£3,000	£4,500	£4,500	£4,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£7,900	£15,800	£15,800	£23,700	£23,700	£23,700	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£5,200	£5,200	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£32,615	£30,569	£36,850	£17,433	£38,715	£67,156	£40,101	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£44,869	£100,784	£169,856	£173,501	£250,351	£258,878	£258,188	£1,256,426
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£17,890	£61,485	£58,281	£106,393	£97,401	£110,126	£ 451,576
Balance	£44,869	£82,894	£108,371	£115,220	£143,958	£161,477	£148,062	£804,850

Appendix 3a: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.1: FLS

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	
FLS large				1				1
FLS small	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
FTE effort	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.65	0.65	0.90	0.50	
no. of PMs	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£0	£0	£14,527	£14,890	£15,263	£15,423	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£11,338	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339	
Project closure							£3,085	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£11,116	£11,338	£26,149	£26,802	£27,473	£30,847	
Administration support		£0	£0	£3,628	£3,719	£3,812	£3,852	
PM Service mgmt		£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)		£0	£0	£3,628	£3,719	£3,812	£3,852	
Travel		£0	£0	£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	£6,400	
Consumables	£0	£0	£0	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	£1,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£0	£0	£0	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	£7,900	
Training subtotal (D)	£0	£0	£0	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	£2,600	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£32,615	£44,464	£45,354	£20,338	£20,846	£6,105	£30,847	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£40,769	£55,580	£56,692	£60,616	£61,868	£47,890	£76,046	£399,460
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£0	£0	£33,778	£19,302	£38,736	£35,233	£ 127,049
Balance	£40,769	£55,580	£56,692	£26,837	£42,566	£9,154	£40,813	£272,411

Appendix 3a: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.1 - All Faculties (aggregate)

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
-small projects	0	2	3	4	3	3	2	17
								0
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	3	7	13	14	14	11	
no. of PMs	3	3	5	7	8	8	8	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt	£0	£52,801	£121,888	£209,192	£229,310	£204,521	£191,251	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£32,615	£44,464	£68,030	£81,353	£95,298	£97,682	£98,710	
Project closure	£0	£0	£0	£0	£8,934	£15,263	£18,508	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£32,615	£97,265	£189,918	£290,545	£333,542	£317,465	£308,469	
Administration support	£0	£72,878	£74,491	£79,823	£81,818	£83,864	£84,747	
PM Service mgmt	£0	£0	£5,669	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£0	£72,878	£80,160	£91,444	£93,730	£96,074	£97,086	
Travel	£0	£19,200	£32,000	£44,800	£51,200	£51,200	£51,200	
Consumables	£4,500	£4,500	£7,500	£10,500	£12,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£4,500	£23,700	£39,500	£55,300	£63,200	£63,200	£63,200	
Training subtotal (D)	£7,800	£7,800	£13,000	£18,200	£20,800	£20,800	£20,800	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£138,613	£125,055	£144,565	£78,447	£110,188	£115,997	£181,997	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£183,528	£326,698	£467,143	£533,937	£621,460	£613,536	£671,552	£3,417,854
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	£0	£67,982	£126,725	£231,682	£272,154	£290,056	£282,308	£1,270,908
Balance	£ 183,528	£ 258,716	£ 340,418	£ 302,254	£ 349,306	£ 323,481	£ 389,244	£ 2,146,946

Appendix 3b: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.2: MHS + FLS

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	1	3	5	6	6	6	
MHS large	0		1		1		1	3
FLS large	0			1				1
MHS small	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
FLS small						1		1
FTE effort	0.20	0.45	1.45	2.35	2.80	2.60	2.60	
no. of PMs	1	1	2	3	3	3	3	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£13,895	£53,857	£95,880	£125,078	£115,997	£117,218	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£22,677	£34,865	£35,737	£36,631	£37,016	
Project closure					£2,978	£6,105	£6,169	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£25,011	£76,534	£130,745	£163,793	£158,733	£160,404	
Administration support	£16,970	£17,352	£17,736	£18,142	£18,595	£19,060	£19,261	
PM Service mgmt		£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£16,970	£22,910	£23,405	£23,952	£24,551	£25,165	£25,430	
Travel		£6,400	£12,800	£19,200	£19,200	£19,200	£19,200	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£3,000	£4,500	£4,500	£4,500	£4,500	
Expenses subtotal (C)	£1,500	£7,900	£15,800	£23,700	£23,700	£23,700	£23,700	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£5,200	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	£7,800	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£43,486	£30,569	£31,181	£37,771	£11,912	£24,420	£24,678	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£72,710	£88,990	£152,120	£223,969	£231,756	£239,818	£242,012	£1,251,374
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£17,890	£61,485	£92,060	£125,694	£136,137	£145,358	£ 578,625
Balance	£72,710	£71,100	£90,635	£131,909	£106,062	£103,681	£96,653	£672,750

Appendix 3b: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.2 - EPS + Humanities

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	2	4	8	8	8	5	
EPS large	0	1		1		1		3
EPS small	0		2	2	1		1	6
Humanities small	0	1		1	1	1		4
FTE effort	0.20	0.90	1.70	3.30	3.10	3.30	2.15	
no. of PMs	1	1	2	4	4	4	4	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£38,906	£28,346	£139,462	£131,034	£146,522	£89,456	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£22,677	£46,487	£47,649	£48,841	£49,355	
Project closure					£5,956	£6,105	£12,339	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£50,022	£51,023	£185,949	£184,639	£201,468	£151,150	
Administration support	£16,970	£17,352	£17,736	£18,142	£18,595	£19,060	£19,261	
PM Service mgmt		£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£16,970	£22,910	£23,405	£23,952	£24,551	£25,165	£25,430	
Travel		£6,400	£12,800	£25,600	£25,600	£25,600	£25,600	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£3,000	£6,000	£6,000	£6,000	£6,000	
Expenses subtotal (C)	£1,500	£7,900	£15,800	£31,600	£31,600	£31,600	£31,600	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£5,200	£10,400	£10,400	£10,400	£10,400	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£43,486	£8,337	£19,842	£40,676	£53,605	£39,683	£114,134	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£72,710	£91,769	£115,270	£292,578	£304,795	£308,317	£332,714	£1,518,152
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£50,092	£65,240	£139,623	£146,459	£153,919	£136,950	£ 692,283
Balance	£72,710	£41,677	£50,030	£152,955	£158,336	£154,398	£195,764	£825,869

Appendix 3b: Financial Analysis - Modest scenario

Option 1.2 - All Faculties (aggregate)

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
-small projects	0	2	2	3	2	3	2	14
MC ITNs	0		1	1	1			3
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	3	7	13	14	14	11	
no. of PMs	2	2	4	7	7	7	7	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt	£0	£52,801	£82,203	£235,341	£256,112	£262,519	£206,674	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£16,307	£22,232	£45,354	£81,353	£83,385	£85,471	£86,371	
Project closure	£0	£0	£0	£0	£8,934	£12,210	£18,508	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£16,307	£75,033	£127,557	£316,694	£348,432	£360,201	£311,554	
Administration support	£33,940	£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt	£0	£11,116	£11,338	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£33,940	£45,820	£46,810	£47,905	£49,102	£50,330	£50,860	
Travel	£0	£12,800	£25,600	£44,800	£44,800	£44,800	£44,800	
Consumables	£3,000	£3,000	£6,000	£10,500	£10,500	£10,500	£10,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£3,000	£15,800	£31,600	£55,300	£55,300	£55,300	£55,300	
Training subtotal (D)	£5,200	£5,200	£10,400	£18,200	£18,200	£18,200	£18,200	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£86,973	£38,906	£51,023	£78,447	£65,517	£64,104	£138,811	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£145,420	£180,759	£267,390	£516,546	£536,551	£548,135	£574,725	£2,769,527
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	£0	£50,092	£65,240	£139,623	£146,459	£153,919	£136,950	£692,283
Balance	£ 145,420	£ 130,667	£ 202,150	£ 376,923	£ 390,092	£ 394,216	£ 437,775	£ 2,077,244

Appendix 3c: Financial Analysis - Modest Scenario

Option 2

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
-small projects	0	2	3	4	3	3	3	17
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	3	7	13	14	14	11	
no. of FTEs	0.3	1.45	2.85	5.35	5.75	5.80	4.95	
no. of PMs	1	2	3	6	6	6	6	
G7	0	1	2	5	5	5	5	
G7 (HoPM service)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£52,801	£121,888	£235,341	£256,112	£262,519	£206,674	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,456	£22,232	£34,015	£69,731	£71,473	£73,261	£74,033	
Project closure					£8,934	£12,210	£18,508	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,456	£75,033	£155,903	£305,072	£336,520	£347,991	£299,215	
Administration support		£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt	£5,436	£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£5,436	£40,262	£41,141	£42,094	£43,146	£44,225	£44,691	
Travel		£12,800	£19,200	£38,400	£38,400	£38,400	£38,400	
Consumables	£1,500	£3,000	£4,500	£9,000	£9,000	£9,000	£9,000	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£15,800	£23,700	£47,400	£47,400	£47,400	£47,400	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£5,200	£7,800	£15,600	£15,600	£15,600	£15,600	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£28,538	£30,569	£8,504	£37,771	£14,890	£12,210	£64,779	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£46,529	£166,864	£237,048	£447,937	£457,556	£467,426	£471,685	£2,295,045
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£67,982	£126,725	£231,682	£272,154	£290,056	£282,308	£ 1,270,908
Balance	£46,529	£98,882	£110,323	£216,255	£185,402	£177,370	£189,376	£1,024,137

Appendix 3d: Financial Analysis - Optimistic Scenario

Option 1.2 - EPS Humanities

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	2	6	11	11	10	6	
EPS large	0	1	1	2		1		5
EPS small	0		2	2	1		1	6
Humanities small	0	1	1	1	1	2		6
FTE effort	0.20	0.90	2.60	4.65	4.45	4.20	2.40	
no. of PMs	1	1	3	5	5	5	5	
G7	0	0	2	4	4	4	4	4
Grade 7(HoPM service)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£38,906	£107,715	£206,287	£199,529	£189,258	£104,880	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£34,015	£58,109	£59,561	£61,051	£61,694	
Project closure					£5,956	£9,158	£21,593	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£50,022	£141,730	£264,396	£265,046	£259,467	£188,166	
Administration support	£16,970	£17,352	£17,736	£18,142	£18,595	£19,060	£19,261	
PM Service mgmt		£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£16,970	£22,910	£23,405	£23,952	£24,551	£25,165	£25,430	
Travel		£6,400	£19,200	£32,000	£32,000	£32,000	£32,000	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£4,500	£7,500	£7,500	£7,500	£7,500	
Expenses subtotal (C)	£1,500	£7,900	£23,700	£39,500	£39,500	£39,500	£39,500	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£7,800	£13,000	£13,000	£13,000	£13,000	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£43,486	£5,558	£22,677	£20,338	£44,671	£48,841	£160,404	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£72,710	£88,990	£219,312	£361,187	£386,768	£385,973	£426,500	£1,941,440
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£50,092	£116,502	£202,694	£195,054	£229,271	£172,183	£ 965,796
		£50,092						
Balance	£72,710	£38,898	£102,810	£158,493	£191,714	£156,702	£254,318	£975,644

Appendix 3d: Financial Analysis - Optimistic Scenario

Option 1.2 - MHS + FLS

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	3	5	7	7	8	9	
MHS large	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
MHS small	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
FLS large	0				1			1
FLS small						1	1	2
FTE effort	0.20	1.45	2.35	3.25	3.45	3.70	4.15	
no. of PMs	1	1	3	4	4	4	5	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£52,801	£93,542	£136,556	£151,881	£170,943	£188,166	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,154	£11,116	£34,015	£46,487	£47,649	£48,841	£61,694	
Project closure					£8,934	£6,105	£6,169	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,154	£63,917	£127,557	£183,043	£208,464	£225,889	£256,030	
Administration support	£16,970	£17,352	£17,736	£18,142	£18,595	£19,060	£19,261	
PM Service mgmt		£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£16,970	£22,910	£23,405	£23,952	£24,551	£25,165	£25,430	
Travel		£6,400	£19,200	£25,600	£25,600	£25,600	£32,000	
Consumables	£1,500	£1,500	£4,500	£6,000	£6,000	£6,000	£7,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£7,900	£23,700	£31,600	£31,600	£31,600	£39,500	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£2,600	£7,800	£10,400	£10,400	£10,400	£13,000	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£43,486	£30,569	£36,850	£43,582	£32,759	£18,315	£52,440	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£72,710	£127,896	£219,312	£292,578	£307,773	£311,369	£386,399	£1,718,037
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM (verification)	0	£67,982	90109.296 £90,109	£120,684	£195,930	£190,808	£204,676	£ 870,189
Balance	£72,710	£59,914	£129,203	£171,894	£111,843	£120,561	£181,724	£847,848

Appendix 3d: Financial Analysis - Optimistic Scenario

Option 1.2 - All Faculties (aggregate)

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	2	2	3	2	2	1	12
-small projects	0	3	3	3	2	4	3	18
MC ITNs	0		1	1	1			3
no. of coordiinated projects (live)	0	5	11	18	18	20	15	
no. of PMs	2	2	6	9	9	9	10	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt	£0	£91,707	£201,257	£342,843	£351,410	£360,201	£293,046	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£16,307	£22,232	£68,030	£104,596	£107,210	£109,892	£123,388	
Project closure	£0	£0	£0	£0	£14,890	£15,263	£27,762	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£16,307	£113,939	£269,287	£447,439	£473,510	£485,355	£444,196	
Administration support	£33,940	£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt	£0	£11,116	£11,338	£11,622	£11,912	£12,210	£12,339	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£33,940	£45,820	£46,810	£47,905	£49,102	£50,330	£50,860	
Travel	£0	£12,800	£38,400	£57,600	£57,600	£57,600	£64,000	
Consumables	£3,000	£3,000	£9,000	£13,500	£13,500	£13,500	£15,000	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£3,000	£15,800	£47,400	£71,100	£71,100	£71,100	£79,000	
Training subtotal (D)	£5,200	£5,200	£15,600	£23,400	£23,400	£23,400	£26,000	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£86,973	£36,127	£59,527	£63,920	£77,429	£67,156	£212,844	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£145,420	£216,886	£438,624	£653,764	£694,541	£697,342	£812,900	£3,659,477
Revenue		£118,074		£323,378				
EC contribution for PM	£0	£118,074	£206,612	£323,378	£390,984	£420,079	£376,859	£1,835,985
Balance	£145,420	£98,812	£232,012	£330,386	£303,557	£277,263	£436,041	£1,823,492

Appendix 3e: Financial Analysis - Optimistic Scenario

Option 2

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	2	2	3	2	2	1	12
-small projects	0	3	3	3	2	4	3	18
MC ITNs	0		1	1	1			3
								33
TOTAL ('live projects')	0	5	11	18	18	20	15	
FTE effort	0.3	2.35	4.65	7.60	7.60	7.80	6.25	
no. of PMs	1	3	5	8	8	8	8	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt	0	£91,707	£201,257	£342,843	£351,410	£360,201	£277,622	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation	£8,456	£33,348	£56,692	£92,974	£95,298	£97,682	£98,710	
Project closure					£14,890	£18,315	£21,593	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£8,456	£125,055	£257,949	£435,818	£461,598	£476,198	£397,925	
Administration support		£34,704	£35,472	£36,283	£37,190	£38,120	£38,521	
PM Service mgmt	£5,436	£5,558	£5,669	£5,811	£5,956	£6,105	£6,169	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£5,436	£40,262	£41,141	£42,094	£43,146	£44,225	£44,691	
Travel		£19,200	£32,000	£51,200	£51,200	£51,200	£51,200	
Consumables	£1,500	£4,500	£7,500	£12,000	£12,000	£12,000	£12,000	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£1,500	£23,700	£39,500	£63,200	£63,200	£63,200	£63,200	
Training subtotal (D)	£2,600	£7,800	£13,000	£20,800	£20,800	£20,800	£20,800	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£28,538	£36,127	£19,842	£34,865	£35,737	£12,210	£107,964	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£46,529	£232,944	£371,432	£596,777	£624,480	£616,633	£634,580	£3,123,376
Revenue			£206,612					
EC contribution for PM	0	£118,074	£206,612	£323,378	£390,984	£420,079	£376,859	£ 1,835,985
					£390,984			
Balance	£46,529	£114,870	£164,820	£273,399	£233,496	£196,554	£257,722	£1,287,391

Appendix 3f: Financial Analysis - Modest Scenario

Revised Option 2

	Nov 2013-Jul 2014	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	Total
no. of new coordinated projects								
- large projects	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	7
-small projects	0	2	3	4	3	3	2	17
		3	4	6	4	4	3	24
no. of coordinated projects (live)	0	3	7	13	14	14	11	
no. of PMs	1	1	3	5	5	5	5	
UNIMAN Expenditure								
Kick-off & Implementation mgmt		£52,801	£128,982	£258,925	£282,145	£289,203	£227,861	
Proposal prepar & Negotiation& closure	£40,769	£2,779	£48,188	£55,204	£41,693	£42,736	£101,795	
Project Management subtotal (A)	£40,769	£55,580	£177,170	£314,129	£323,838	£331,939	£329,656	
Administration support	0	£0	£28,378	£12,699	£11,157	£11,436	£17,335	
Other operational costs subtotal (B)	£0	£0	£28,378	£12,699	£11,157	£11,436	£17,335	
Travel		£1,000	£3,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	
Consumables	£500	£500	£1,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	£2,500	
Expenses subtotal ('C)	£500	£1,500	£4,500	£7,500	£7,500	£7,500	£7,500	
Training subtotal (D)	£1,000	£1,000	£3,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	£5,000	
Bridge funding subtotal (E)	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	£0	
Total expenditure (A+B+C+D+E)	£42,269	£58,080	£213,048	£339,328	£347,495	£355,875	£359,491	£1,715,585
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Year 6	Year 7	
Revenue								
EC contribution for PM	0	£70,815	£141,538	£261,430	£307,270	£333,124	£323,667	£ 1,437,844
Balance	£42,269	£12,735	£71,510	£77,898	£40,225	£22,751	£35,824	£303,211

Appendix 4: Risk analysis of PM service management structures

Option 1.1

DESCRIPTION OF RISK	LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)	RISK RATING
1. Capacity inefficiency due to the underutilisation of PM staff	5	4	20
2. Failure to achieve economies of scale.	4	3	12
3. Inconsistent development and application of best PM practices and varied service quality across the faculties.	4	4	16
4. Inability to increase PM service capacity in response to new service requests.	4	4	16
5. Failure to integrate the PM service with the other faculty support teams.	2	5	8
6. Failure to build a consistent service track record and credibility with external and internal stakeholders.	4	3	12

Option 1.2

DESCRIPTION OF RISK	LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)	RISK RATING
1. Capacity inefficiency due to the underutilisation of PM staff	4	4	16
2. Failure to achieve economies of scale.	3	3	9
3. Inconsistent development and application of best PM practices and varied service quality across the faculties.	3	4	12
4. Inability to increase PM service capacity in response to new service requests.	3	5	15
5. Failure to integrate the PM service with the other faculty support teams.	2	5	10
6. Failure to build a consistent service track record and credibility with external and internal stakeholders.	3	3	9

Option 2:

DESCRIPTION OF RISK	LIKELIHOOD (1-5)	IMPACT (1-5)	RISK RATING
1. Capacity inefficiency due to the underutilisation of PM staff	3	4	12
2. Failure to achieve economies of scale.	2	3	6
3. Inconsistent development and application of best PM practices and varied service quality across the faculties.	2	4	8
4. Inability to increase PM service capacity in response to new service requests.	2	5	10
5. Failure to integrate the PM service with the other faculty support teams.	4	5	20
6. Failure to build a consistent service track record and credibility with external and internal stakeholders.	2	3	6

Appendix 5: Examples of FP7 coordinated projects – management budget

Project name	Faculty	No. of partners	Duration (months)	EC contribution (€)	Total management budget (€)	UNIMAN management budget (€)	UNIMAN mgmt. % EC Contr.
BIONEXGEN	EPS	17	36	7,774,833	246,016	218,416	2.81%
REPLIXCEL	MHS	4	48	2,591,172	77,735	75,235	2.90%
AMBIOCAS	EPS	7	42	2,574,792	131,404	114,704	4.45%
IKNOW	HUM	8	38	839,861	76,674	39,353	4.69%
GLYCOBIOM	EPS	6	60	5,199,099	377,103	300,148	5.77%
INFORM	EPS	17	36	1,699,994	168,978	108,747	6.40%
NIMBLE	MHS	8	36	5,396,993	511,263	369,132	6.84%
SANDERA	HUM	9	24	599,758	60,362	41,110	6.85%
SEDETEXT	MHS	7	42	2,449,461	194,336	191,936	7.84%
FARHORIZON	HUM	4	24	217,874	23,896	17,576	8.07%
CRE8TV	HUM	11	36	2,499,168	340,567	234,099	9.37%
EURO-URHIS2	MHS	21	48	2,915,121	291,505	291,505	10.00%
LINNEAUS	MHS	7	48	2,461,250	268,507	268,507	10.91%