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1. If either of these boxes is ticked, the report should reflect these and any remedial actions taken.
1. PUBLISHABLE SUMMARY

As indicated on the web-site of the project (http://hands-project.eu), HANDS is a project that aims to improve quality of life for teenagers with an autism diagnosis by providing a mobile ICT toolset (the HANDS toolset) designed to support them in many daily situations, in particular in various difficult situations. The HANDS toolset will be designed to help improving the social skills and self-management skills of the teenagers, in order to facilitate or assist their social integration and independence.

The project started June 1, 2008. During the second year of the project, i.e. from June 1, 2009 to May 31, 2010, the following project objectives can be mentioned. These partial goals within the project have all been reached during the reporting period.

- Prototype 1 of the HANDS toolset has been implemented and made available at the four partner schools.
- Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset has been tested at the schools as seen from three different perspectives (cognitive psychology, learning and education studies, persuasive technology).
- Based on the tests of Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset at the schools requirements have been formulated for Prototype 2 of the toolset as seen from three different perspectives (cognitive psychology, learning and education studies, persuasive technology).
- The system requirements for Prototype 2 from the three perspectives mentioned above have been discussed among the partners and an agreement has been reached regarding the coordinated requirements which should be used for formulation of the specifications of Prototype 2 (due to August, 2010).
- The implementation of the first prototype of the HANDS toolset has begun, and the first releases have be presented and discussed among the partners. The full implementation of prototype 1 will be ready in August 2009.
- The ethical problems related to HANDS have been studied partly from a theoretical point of view and partly based on the experiences obtained at the schools and in the Ethical Board (EB).

10 partners from 6 EU countries

The HANDS project is an EU commissioned project involving 10 partners in different areas, all contributing with different qualifications to make this project work.

Aalborg University, Denmark (Persuasive Technology and ICT Ethics)
Aalborg University (AAU) coordinates the HANDS project. This partner is responsible for creating a design experiments and tests, which can be used for evaluation of the HANDS
tools conceived as Persuasive Technology (PT). AAU is also responsible for designing credibility measurement tools for the practicians, so that they can get a view of the actual value of the Mobile Persuasive ICT tools. AAU is responsible for the development of methodology according to which value sensitive design is brought into the process of designing software.

In the reporting period AAU has carried out the tests of Prototype 1 which have been based on the PT perspective. The results are reported in deliverable D6.3.1, “Prototype 1 - test Results”, which is just the collection of data without any further analysis. The interpretative analysis of the data is included in the deliverable, D4.3.1, “PT Test evaluation of Prototype 1 and PT Requirements for Prototype 2.” As indicated in the title, this deliverable also includes the requirements for Prototype 2 which are suggested on the basis of the Prototype 1 tests which are been carried out based on the PT perspective. In addition, AAU is responsible for the co-ordination and the management part of the project. In this co-ordination work it has been necessary to deal with a numbers of challenges, which will be discussed in some details in the present deliverable. The co-ordination work of project also includes the responsibility for the cooperation of the Ethical Board (EB). The work in EB is reported in the deliverable, D1.5.2, “Report II from the Ethical Board”.

Wirtek, Denmark (Mobile software development)
This partner is responsible for developing software for mobile devices used by young people with autism and software for work stations used by teachers. The software is based on the highly flexible architecture of Microsoft Dynamics Mobile 2008, which enables modular and configurable applications that match the needs and demands of the HANDS Project.

In the reporting period Wirtek, Denmark, has collaborated with Wirtek, Romania, and Edvantage Group as well as with AAU, SBU and ELTE in order to establish the system requirement for Prototype 2. In addition Wirtek, Denmark, has had the responsibility for maintaining a website for the HANDS-project. Finally, Wirtek, Denmark, has worked together with AAU in creating a “Socio-economical business model” (D8.1).

Wirtek, Romania (Mobile software development)
Wirtek Srl is a software development house with core qualifications within embedded software, mobile applications, web applications and infrastructure for mobile communications. The Wirtek Srl software development site in Cluj, Romania, was established in 2006 through an acquisition of a Romanian software house.

In the reporting period Wirtek, Romania, has worked together with Wirtek, Denmark, and Edvantage Group on the implementation of Prototype 1 of the HANDS toolset. This work is documented in the deliverable, D5.2.1, “Prototype 1 software and documentation”. In addition, Wirtek, Romania, has been working with system support in relation to the use of the software at the four schools and the three universities involved in HANDS. Finally
Wirtek, Romania, has collaborated with Wirtek, Denmark, and Edvantage Group as well as with AAU, SBU and ELTE in order to establish the system requirement for Prototype 2.

**Edvantage Group, Norway** (Learning requirements)
This partner is involved in the development of the HANDS toolset. In particular Edvantage Group is working with interaction design and user interfaces. This work is carried out in close cooperation with Wirtek, Romania.

In the reporting period Edvantage Group, has worked together with Wirtek, Denmark, and Wirtek, Romania on the implementation of Prototype 1 of the HANDS toolset. This work is documented in the deliverable, D5.2.1, “Prototype 1 software and documentation”. In addition, Edvantage Group has collaborated with Wirtek, Denmark, and Wirtek, Romania as well as with AAU, SBU and ELTE in order to establish the system requirement for Prototype 2.

**ELTE University, Hungary** (Cognitive Psychology)
This partner is responsible for designing a sound scientific test in order to measure the efficiency of the Personal Mobile ICT tools. This test will be carried out involving 40-50 individuals with autism from the age of 10 to 18.

In the reporting period ELTE has carried out the tests of Prototype 1 which have been based on the perspective of cognitive psychology. The results are reported in deliverable D6.3.1, “Prototype 1 - test Results”, which is just the collection of data without any further analysis. The interpretative analysis of the data is included in the deliverable, D2.4.2, “Report on Prototype 1 test and Report on Prototype 2: The cognitive psychology requirements on software design & content”. As indicated in the title, this deliverable also includes the requirements for Prototype 2 which are suggested on the basis of the Prototype 1 tests which are been carried out based in the perspective of cognitive psychology.

**London South Bank University, UK** (Learning Environment)
This partner (LSB) is responsible for research considering how the use of the HANDS toolset can be integrated in the learning environment, both in special schools and in mainstream settings. Applicability in Learning Environment will focus on how the typical working habits of schools will necessarily influence the design of the HANDS toolset.

In the reporting period SBU has carried out the tests of Prototype 1 which have been based on the perspective of the Applicability in the Learning Environment (ALE). The results are reported in deliverable D6.3.1, “Prototype 1 - test Results”, which is just the collection of data without any further analysis. The interpretative analysis of the data is included in the deliverable, D3.4.1, “Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2”. As indicated in the title, this deliverable also includes the requirements for Prototype 2 which are suggested on the basis of the Prototype 1 tests which are been carried out based in the perspective of ALE.
**Helen Allison School, NAS, UK** (School for children with autism)
As well as acting as a test school, the staff at the Helen Allison School will work with researchers from the academic institutions as part of the evaluation of the applicability of the personal mobile ICT tools in the classroom and wider environment. During the reporting period this partner has been deeply involved in the tests of Prototype 1.

**Egebakken, Denmark** (School for children with autism)
This partner will act as a test site/test school. The HANDS toolset will be tested with the pupils in their ordinary school environment and in a number of daily situations. In particular, these tests will evaluate the persuasiveness of the toolset. The toolset will be tested twice. During the reporting period this partner has been deeply involved in the tests of Prototype 1.

**Svedenskolan, Sweden** (Independent school for children with autism)
This partner will act as a test site/test school. The HANDS toolset will be tested with the pupils in their ordinary school environment and in a number of daily situations. In particular, these tests will evaluate the persuasiveness of the toolset. The toolset will be tested twice. During the reporting period this partner has been deeply involved in the tests of Prototype 1.

**Autism Foundation, Hungary** (School for children with autism)
Autism Foundation plays an essential role in research activities labelled as ‘Cognitive Psychology’ taking crucial part in the preparation of the two rounds of prototype testing, and efficiency testing of the project. These tasks are to be performed in close cooperation with ELTE University, Budapest, and - especially in efficiency testing - with all test sites involved in the project. The specific research tasks of Autism Foundation include methodological preparations, collecting, analyzing and summarising data from all involved partners, and, finally, participation in detailed reporting on all (cognitive psychology) test phases. During the reporting period this partner has been deeply involved in the tests of Prototype 1.

**Ethics**
The HANDS project aims at empowering young people diagnosed with autism. Although this may seem as a rather noble goal, we, within the HANDS project, are also striving to make sure that the means used in empowering the young people are ethically acceptable. In order to achieve this, the HANDS project has incorporated an Ethical Board (EB) with representatives from different fields of academia, schools and parents of young people with autism. The EB has, more specifically, been given the task of discussing general ethical questions related to HANDS, of ethically to evaluate the requirements of the systems which are supposed to be tested and used by children and young people with an autism diagnosis, as well as all tests and experiments involving children and young people with an autism diagnosis.
One important question that has been discussed by the EB is the possible coercive nature of the instructions, advices, or help offered by the handheld devices to the young people with an autism diagnosis. The handheld devices are supposed to help young people with autism 'navigate'. As such the devices are clearly supposed to influence the behaviour of the young people. This, in turn, raises the question of whether the influence exerted upon the behaviour of the young people is ethically acceptable - or whether it amounts to coercion in an unjustifiable manner.

During the year 2009-10 the partners have formulated the applications from the partners describing the test program which has been planned. The Ethical Board has discussed the applications and suggested some changes which have been incorporated in a revised test plan. The work in EB is reported in the deliverable, D1.5.2, “Report II from the Ethical Board”. The theoretical considerations regarding the ethical problems, which are relevant in relation to HANDS, will be reported in the deliverable, D7.4.1, which is part of the Y3 of the project.

**Actual results in the reporting period and expected final results and their potential impact/use (incl. socio-economic and societal implications so far)**

The partners have published a number of research papers discussing and analyzing the design principles and the theoretical ideas discussed and used in the project. In addition, a number of deliverables have been produced according to the work plan. The public deliverables and the research papers have been listed in section 3 of this report and can be found on the HANDS web-site. 23 research papers have been listed.

One of the major themes in the research papers and in the deliverables is the description of how the HANDS project may lead to results which are useful for teenagers with autism in their everyday life. The expectation and the goal of the project is that teenagers with autism will be able to benefit a lot from software systems like the HANDS tools in their daily routines and that the proper use of such tools can contribute significantly to the integration of young people with autism in society. It is, however, still an open question to which extent such goals (including the obvious socio-economic and societal implications of their realisation) can in fact be obtained. From a more general point of view, it is the expectation that the HANDS project will lead to a deeper understanding of the potential in using software tools for such social purposes.
2. PROJECT OBJECTIVES FOR THE PERIOD

The HANDS project has five scientific and technological objectives. The project should:

1. develop a HANDS toolset that enables high-functioning young people diagnosed with autism to improve their social skills and self management skills.
2. evaluate the improvement of the social skills and self management skills using the HANDS toolset,
3. evaluate the ethics of the HANDS toolset and the test program,
4. evaluate the usefulness of the HANDS toolset,
5. contribute to the future research and development agenda for accessible and inclusive ICT.

All of these five objectives have been relevant during the reporting period. What follows is an overview of the aspects of these objectives which have been relevant during the reporting period.

The work has been reported in the deliverables and in the research papers. An overview of the work will be given in the following sections:

2.1 Test and evaluation of Prototype 1 (objectives 2 and 4)
2.2 Further developments of the Hands Toolset. Requirements for Prototype2 (objective 1)
2.3 Discussion of Ethical problems related to HANDS (objective 3)
2.4 Contribution to the future research agenda for accessible and inclusive ICT (objective 5).

2.1 Test and evaluation of Prototype 1 of the HANDS toolset

In August 2009 the Prototype 1 software and documentation was finished by WIRU. However, it turned out to be more complicated than expected to implement the software on the AAU server and to make the toolset available at the schools. In fact, this caused a delay of about two months. However, during October 2009 or early November 2009 the schools were to ready to carry out the second objective of the HANDS project, according to which the challenge is to find ways to evaluate how the use of the HANDS toolset can influence the daily lives of the young people with an autism diagnosis, with respect to social skills and self management skills. The test programs planned in the year 2008-9 have been carried out by the partners. These tests have been designed out from three different perspectives (cognitive psychology, learning and education studies, persuasive technology), and they have been established in cooperation with the Ethical Board (see the annual report from year 1, D1.3.2).
The purpose of the tests has mainly been to evaluate the potential in improving the social skills and the self management skills for the teenagers by using the HANDS toolset. Contributions to the test plans have been produced by the partners ELTE, LSBU and AAU. These contributions have been carefully coordinated at a meeting in May 2009 (see D.1.3.2). Leading researcher, Joseph Mintz, from LSBU has taken care of the practical coordination of the tests. The group has carried out its work in close co-operation with the Ethical Board of Hands. Further details regarding the tests of prototype 1 of the HANDS tools have been reported in the following deliverables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D6.3.1</th>
<th>Prototype test 1 Results.</th>
<th>SBU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2.4.2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2 – in the perspective of Cognitive Psychology.</td>
<td>ELTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4.1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2 – in the perspective of ALE (the Applicability in the Learning Environment).</td>
<td>SBU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3.1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2 – in the perspective of PT (Persuasive technology).</td>
<td>AAU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The deliverable D6.3.1 contains all test results that were available by the end of January 2010. However, because of the delay it was decided to continue the testing after Feb.1, when D6.3.1. These additional test results should be reported in the other deliverables, D2.4.2, D3.4.1, and D4.3.1, which should also contain presentations of the analysis of the test result as seen from three different perspectives. Furthermore, it was decided to ask the project officer, Giogio Zoia, for an extended deadline of these deliverables in order to have more time for the analysis. A new deadline of July 15, 2010, was accepted by an e-mail from the project officer on May 3, 2010.

2.2 Further developments of the Hands Toolset.
Requirements for Prototype 2.

It is the first objective of the HANDS project is to develop a set of software components based on Persuasive Technology which meets five important sub-objectives: a) an efficient tool for the young person to improve social skills and self management skills or to manage social activities, b) an efficient tool for the teachers to design and customise the tools for the young person, c) an efficient tool for the teachers to measure the progress of the improvements in the social skills and self management skills, d) a software design which makes exchange of experiences and software components easy, e) tools for the teachers to
predict the costs and benefits of using the tools in their work with the young people with an autism diagnosis.

In the present reporting period, the purpose has been to take the first steps towards the development of such a toolset. Based on the tests of Prototype 1 the Hands partners have formulated requirements for an improved version of the Hands toolset. The three university partners (ELTE, LSU and AAU) have, in close cooperation with the partner schools, formulated system requirements of the Prototype 2 of the HANDS toolset. This have been done as seen from three different perspectives: Cognitive psychology (mainly ELTE), learning and education studies (mainly LSB), and persuasive technology (mainly AAU). These system requirements have been coordinated in close cooperation with the three partners involved in the practical system development (Wirtek-Denmark, Wirtek-Romania and Edvantage Group). The practical coordination of the requirements was carried out in the following way: The co-ordinator has established a group consisting of representatives from each of the HANDS partners. The chairman of this group was leading researcher Morten Aagaard, AAU. The purpose of this work has been to establish a list of requirements (selected from the requirements mentioned in D2.4.2, D3.4.1, and D4.3.1. This list should in the beginning of year 3 of the project period be transformed by Wirtek-Romania as into a detailed system specification of Prototype 2 of the HANDS toolset.

Two problems regarding prototype 2 have been discussed separately at the London meeting in May:
   a) A possible Social Actor in the Hands toolset
   b) A possible GPS functionality in the Hands toolset

These problems have also been considered by the Ethical Board (see deliverable D1.5.2) and in WP7 (see deliverable D7.4.1).

A Social Actor in the Hands toolset?
Due to the fact, that users (and in particular teenagers with an autism diagnosis) do not necessarily want to follow advices from a computer, the early idea in the consortium was that the HANDS toolset should be designed as a personalised coach system. It should be possible for the teacher to give the tools a kind of an identity and personality that the teenager could relate to and rely on. A kind of a social actor was imagined. An example of a social actor is shown in the figure shown here. (This figure was used in the original project application, Annex 1.)
This personalisation may in some cases support the persuasive function of the HANDS tools.

Obvious, such a tool if implemented in the toolset will only be used in relation to participants of the HANDS project, if there are teachers who find this tool relevant in relation to the teenagers they are working with.

However, in relation to Prototype 1 it was discussed whether the HANDS toolset should support this kind of personalisation at all. This was also discussed from an ethical point of view: Are the serious ethical problems involved in imitating a personality of a tool implemented on a smart phone? Are there other ethical problems involved in using this kind of social agents as part of the HANDS tools? – Although it was concluded that the ethical arguments against the social actor would only be strong some very special cases, it was decided to base the personalisation of pedagogical efforts involved in the use of Prototype 1 tools on close cooperation between the teacher and the individual teenager without implementing a so-called social actor in the software. However, the idea of an interface assistant feature in the software was not dropped as a possible part of Prototype 2. The partners discussed this again at the general Hands meeting in London in May 2010. The partners are aware of the fact that such a feature might give rise to serious ethical and pedagogical considerations if it were to be implemented and used in the communication with the teenagers with an autism diagnosis. The conclusion at the London meeting was that the development of a special social actor for Hands should not be given high priority in Prototype 2.

The functionality will involve logging location data of the smart phone. It will be logged whenever the smart phone is close to one of the specified locations, and it will also be

A GPS Functionality in the Hands Toolset?

Using the GPS technology in the smart phones it is possible to implement a functionality based on the information regarding the location of the smart phone.

Some examples: "When standing at the bus stop a prompt appears telling you what to do; When going to the grocery store alone a reward is given; When entering the playground a social-SSSI appears with information".

The functionality could be applied whenever the location of the smart phone (and its user) is close to certain locations relevant for the individual teenager and specified by his or her teacher.

This functionality will involve logging location data of the smart phone. It will be logged whenever the smart phone is close to one of the specified locations, and it will also be
logged whether or not the user interacts with the functionality implemented on the phone when help is offered from the system.

The log data on the HANDS server will at least be available to the teacher and to the HANDS researchers. In every specific case the teenager and the parents will be asked to give informed consent on the basis of precise information about the individually tailored functionality.

The question regarding a possible GPS functionality as part of the Hands toolset was carefully discussed at the May meeting in London 2010. Later the discussion has continued as part of the virtual discussion within the Hands project. The outcome of these discussions has been that the Ethical Board has been asked to comment on the ethical problems related to a GPS functionality as part of the Hands toolset. In addition, it has been decided to include a simple GPS functionality is integration trial which has to be produced as a consequence of the recommendations from the year 1 evaluation (see section 2.4 below). Among the partner there has also been a strong wish to implement a GPS functionality in Prototype 2 as soon. However, due to extra limitations the recommendations from the year 1 evaluation has put on the resources for development within Hands, it has been decided not to implement this functionality as a proper part of Prototype 2, but to consider the possibility again if it turns about to economically realistic to develop this functionality.

**Open Source issues regarding the development of the Hands Toolset**

As can be seen from the text in “HANDS – Annex I – Description of work”, section 1.1.3, 2.4, 3.2 and 3.2.2, the Open Source concept was planned to be used in 3 areas:

- **Support a community of “Open Source” content developers (section 3.2.2).** This is already started in the project. The HANDS project has introduced a concept of “templates” to allow reuse of content (e.g. SSSI’s, PT’s, HIPD Calendar appointments and more) within the HANDS application server. This allows all users of the HANDS server to discuss, share, reuse and develop content together. For more information on how we strive to build a community supporting content development for the HANDS toolbox, please see D5.1.1.
- **“The software development will use standard tools in continuation of the open source concept” (section 2.4).** The software development is using standard tools with one exception. Please see D5.1.1 for more information on the development tools used.
- **HANDS project includes (in WP8) a development of an Open Source inspired business model.** The deliverable D8.2.1 (Socio-economical business model) is a significant contribution in this regard.
For further information on the use of ideas from Open Source and Open Source communities, we may also refer to D5.1.1 which is part of the deliveries in year 1 in HANDS project.

2.3 The evaluation of the ethics of the HANDS toolset and the test program.

Successful implementation of tools using Persuasive Technology with young people with an autism diagnosis entails a series of ethical issues, which need to be carefully addressed. Persuasive Technology may prove to be a very efficient tool in changing behaviour or attitude, but this must be done with due consideration to the rights of individuals with autism, in order to maintain their integrity and independence, and to ensure that they remain in control of their own lives to an extent comparable to, or higher than, when not using the HANDS toolset.

In the present reporting period, we have carried out a number of preliminary discussions concerning which ethical themes are relevant.

On Nov. 18, 2008 Aalborg University organized a research seminar within the field of computer ethics during which there was a special emphasis on HANDS related issues. This has been done in order to form a theoretical basis for the ethical evaluation of the HANDS toolset. The work may be seen as a preparation of the work which is going to be carried out in WP7 of the project.

An important contribution to WP7 will be the work of LSB in conjunction with schools and academic partners in coordinating and developing the ethics applications and liaising with the EB, which - although to some extent part of WP6 - are also clearly part of WP7, and which also overlap with the study of the theoretical aspects.

The first part of the theoretical investigation of the ethics of Hands took the form of a paper by Anders Albrechtslund, “Surveillance in Mixed Spaces: Persuasion and Resistance”. This paper was included as an appendix to D4.2.1.

Furthermore, several ethical problems related to Hands have been investigated by the Ethical Board (see the deliverables D1.5.1 and D1.5.2).

Finally, several theoretical problems related to Hands carefully examined in the deliverable D7.4.1. Among other problems, in this deliverable the authors deal with important questions regarding informed consent, persuasion versus manipulation, surveillance versus privacy, and the possible addiction of the Hands tools.
On Dec. 1, 2009 Aalborg University organized a HANDS research seminar mainly dealing with credibility issues in ethical perspective.

2.4 The contribution to the future research and development agenda for accessible and inclusive ICT

The HANDS project is indeed targeted exploratory research and it has many implications for other marginalised people. In general the Hands partners are interested in the implications regarding the use of ICT in the broader perspective for the benefit of marginalised people in general. For this reason the Hands partners have are open to communicate with other researchers and projects dealing with similar problems.

On June 11, 2010 there is a meeting in Brussels regarding future support to the area of marginalised young people within the e-inclusion programme. Morten Aagaard participated on behalf of Hands.

In September two conferences take place. One in Brussels, ICT research 2010, including special sessions presenting the European Union's funding priorities for the 2.8 Billion Euros of EU funding available for ICT research and development during 2011-2012; and one in Leuven, INCLUSO 2010, within the area of e-inclusion, marginalised young people. Morten Aagaard participates in both meetings on behalf of Hands. All EC Consortiums working with problems related to marginalized young people have been invited to INCLUSO 2010.

Regarding the possible use of the Hands toolset and the results of the project after the end of the project period a Socio-economical business model (D8.1) has been developed. As it has turned out the present platform will not be available on a long term basis, another possible platform has been suggested. As a result of the Year 1 evaluation the Hands project has been told to use some of the resources originally meant for development of Prototype 2 for the purpose of an integration trial. In chapter 5 below, we shall deal with this issue.
3. WORK PROGRESS AND ACHIEVEMENTS DURING THE PROJECT PERIOD

The HANDS partners have followed the work plan stated in Annex I, and have not failed to meet any of the objectives or deadlines mentioned in Annex I.

In addition, the HANDS partners have published a number of scientific papers and presented the HANDS issues at various international peer reviewed conferences:


What follows is a concise description of the work carried out within each work package, with reference to the objectives and tasks stated in Annex 1 for the present reporting period.

**Work Package 1: Consortium and project management**

The purpose of WP1 is to establish and run robust and responsive project management of the Hands project. The consortium management will be placed at Aalborg University (AAU):

- To organize a discussion of the ethical problems related to the empirical research and the system development of HANDS
- Implement and maintain an effective administrative and management infrastructure of HANDS throughout all phases.
- Ensure the delivery of the project on time and on budget.
- Coordinate the technological and scientific orientation of the project.
- Secure the quality of the work to be undertaken and of the delivered documents and software.
- Management of knowledge
- To formulate practical guidelines and advices regarding the ethical aspects of HANDS.
- Setting up and supporting the Ethical Board (EB)
- Risk management and contingency planning

Within WP1 it is the obligation to implement clear reporting procedures to ensure high quality of financial reports & statements, progress report and management reports.

- Manage delivery of additional reports and all project management documentation for the EC, for example quarterly or semi annual management reports.
- Ensure on time distribution of funds.
- Guidance and coordinating in all legal and financial issues.
- Ensure on time submission of all yearly reports, including activity report, management report, report on the distribution of the Community’s contribution, planning for the next period, and all partners’ contribution to these reports and their financial reports.
- Financial Management: In the beginning of the project the cost calculations and financial procedures will be updated, and checked during the first month of the project. The management team will submit interim management reports to the EC as supplementary information.
- Support of the Ethical Board (EB). Organisation of the appointment of the member of the EB. Organisation of the EB meeting. Support of the production of the annual reports from the EB.

T1.1 Project initiation: The effective initiation of the project involving e.g. kick-off meetings, Quality Plan, Web-site and the Consortium Agreement.
T1.2 Operational project management: The co-ordinating partner will conduct the operational management of the project on a day-to-day basis.
T1.3 Project reporting: The formal project reporting deliverables, including final project report.
T1.4 Management of work packages is covered by this task.
T1.5 Support the Ethical Board in providing the annual reports.
In the reporting period the consortium and project management has been carried out according to these objectives, tasks and ideas. As described in deliverable D1.1.1 the co-ordinator (Peter Øhrstrøm) and the assisting co-ordinator (Henrik Schärfe) should take care of the Quality Assurance. This has been done by organizing co-operations etc. to support the production of scientific papers (see the list in section 3) and by making sure the project deliverables have a high quality. In order to ensure the necessary high standards of quality of the deliverables, the Partners have been asked to submit a draft of the deliverable to the Project Coordinator some weeks before deadline of the deliverable according to individual agreement. The review process then lies in the hands of the project coordinator (Peter Øhrstrøm) and the assisting coordinator (Henrik Schärfe), who in cooperation fulfil the project role as Knowledge Manager. In the process they may involve others to the extend that further expertise is required.

A substantial part of the project management work in WP1 using a Moodle system as a platform designed for internal communication with in the project. This is done in order to leverage synergies, ensure transparency, and promote cross-partner communication within the Consortium. This system has been a valuable tool in discussing important issues among the consortium partners as well as keeping track of these discussions. This site is organised and maintained by Aalborg University, in close co-operation with the Project Coordinator and the assisting co-ordinator.

It has been an important part of the work within WP1 to support The Ethical Board of Hands (EB). Details regarding the work of EB can be found in deliverable D1.5.2. The co-ordinator and the EB chairman, prof. Soren Holm, Manchester (earlier Cardiff), has been working in order to establish good ethical procedures. Prof. Soren Holm has taken part in the project board meetings.

The coordinator organised two regular project board (PB) meetings during year 1. Minutes from these meeting are included in the present report. In addition, some PB negotiations have been carried out using the Moodle platform.

Special problems regarding project management – including risk management and the special issue on the co-ordination of the work on test planning and on the work on requirements to Prototype 2 – will be discussed in section 5.

Problems regarding the so-called integration trial and related issues will be discussed in section 6.

Experienced administrative project managers at Aalborg University (AAU) have been designated to the HANDS project from the beginning to handle the project management. The financial issues are treated in the last part of this deliverable i.e. section 7-9.
The implementation of Prototype 1
The software for Prototype 1 was produced on time. However, some unexpected technical problems occurred when the software was installed at the server at Aalborg University. It took some weeks to fix these problems. The result was a delay of about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities. This also meant that test plans at schools had to be revised. Although the partners were working hard with the tests during January and February 2010, it became evident during March a longer period for the tests would be important to have. The co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.

It should be mentioned that this way of handling the problem is very close to the recovery action mentioned in the below section on Project Risk Management under Risk 14 in the risk matrix in D1.3.2.

The Use of Microsoft Dynamics Mobile in Hands
In 2008 Microsoft had kindly given Microsoft has given the consortium permission to use Microsoft Dynamics Mobile as a framework within the Hands project without having to pay anything for it. It was also accepted that Microsoft Dynamics Mobile can be used by the Hands schools after the project period without any license payments.

Early in 2010 Microsoft unexpectedly removed Microsoft Dynamics Mobile from the market. However, the consortium was informed that the offer from Microsoft to use Hands for projects purposes would be unchanged.

This means that Microsoft’s decision does not affect the Hands project as such. But the new status of Microsoft Dynamics Mobile clearly means that if there is going to be a commercial version of the Hands toolset after the project period, the system probably has to be transformed to some other platform. The co-ordinator mailed this information to the project officer on Feb 17, 2010.

It should be mentioned that this way of handling the problem is very close to the recovery action mentioned in the section on Project Risk Management under Risk 15 in D1.3.2.

The Review of Period 1
The year 1 evaluation was a very time consuming process for several of the HANDS partners. The evaluation meeting was organised in Brussels on Sept. 21, 2009, based on the 12 deliverables reporting the work done in the Hands project during year 1. The result of the evaluation was communicated to the co-ordinator Nov. 6, 2009. The result letter included 10 recommendations. Actions have been taken according to these recommendations. According to recommendation 1-5 five of the deliverables from year 1...
has to be revised. Recommendations 6-10 are of a more general nature. The consortium was given 2 months to carry out this work. The Hands partners responded carefully on Dec. 22, 2009 by submitting the five revised deliverables and a detailed document explaining the actions taken. The final result letter was sent to the co-ordinator on Feb. 19, 2010. During the evaluation period the payments were stopped (according to the rules).

The result letter of Feb. 19, 2010, included two new recommendations:

**Recommendation 1:** The consortium will have to provide a plan for the HANDS software development, to be compatible with other software framework more sustainable than the MS Dynamics Mobile framework. This is expected as an appendix to the next periodic report. This plan will have to also include a technical comparison for alternatives to the MS Mobile Dynamics platform. Both open source and commercial solutions may be considered and pros and cons will need to be clearly justified.

**Recommendation 2:** The technical feasibility of the porting of HANDS Platform to the new software framework of choice needs to be demonstrated. This demonstration should have the form of an "Integration Trial". The consortium is free to decide the framework of this trial (functional and technological), as long as a new or existing functionality is demonstrated to integrate the HANDS Platform with the new software framework of choice.

The work with these two new recommendations is reported as the appendix in section 6 in the present report. This work was not originally included in the Annex 1. The same holds for the development work which will have to be carried out by the HANDS partners. It is obvious that there are economical consequences of this. The estimate is that the economical equivalent of the number of man months needed for this work will be 20,000 Euro. If the work described in Annex 1 is still going to be carried out, it seems that more funds are needed for the project. It is, however, likely that some of the partners will have unused funds, which may be transferred to the development and implementation of the integration trial. Still, it is unlikely that the whole problem can be solved in this manner. It seems that the work with the recommendations mentioned above means that we have to cut about 15,000 Euro on the budget for development of the Prototype 2 functionalities.

**Work Package 2: Cognitive Psychology**

The major objective is to carry out psychological preparatory and test research on the HANDS software. The more specific objectives of Cognitive Psychology WP are the following:
(1) elaborate detailed research methodology and to coordinate test preparations (such as baseline measurements);
(2) specify design and content principles on the basis of experimental evidence and cognitive psychological expertise;
(3) run exploratory tests on first prototype of HANDS software to reveal strengths and weaknesses and to make suggestions for further product development;
(4) coordinate extensive tests on the effectiveness of the final prototype software (in terms of expected change in social and self-management skills);
(5) elaborate a Future Research Plan on mobile ICT for socially marginalised young people.

The major tasks in relation to WP2:

**T2.1 Test design and test preparations**
Designing research methodology, coordinating research preparations such as selection of test and control groups of subjects, and baseline assessments (in cooperation with Test Site partners). Specifying demands for the electronic behaviour registration (electronic footprints), in cooperation with Persuasive Technology and Software Development partners.

**T2.2 Design and specification of software**
Formulating elaborated design and content principles for the HANDS Software on the basis of current scientific insights of cognitive psychology and evidence-based treatment strategies for autism/ASD. Methodologically, it is to carry out via (1) review of the up-to-date scientific literature on cognitive ability patterns in young adults and adolescents with autism/ASD; (2) analyzing the cognitive characteristics of existing software designed specifically for, and/or used preferably by adolescents and young adults with autism/ASD; (3) using eye-tracking technique in experimental settings; and (4) analyzing the applicability of existing evidence-based psycho-educational treatment principles and strategies in a mobile ICT context.

**T2.3 CP Test evaluation of Prototype 1**
Partly conceptual, partly empirical evaluation of the first prototype. Running experimental (eye-tracking) and real-life tests to reveal strengths and weaknesses of the first prototype of the software.

In the reporting period, the project partners working with psychological research have concentrated on test of Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset and the requirements for Prototype 2 as seen in the perspective of Cognitive Psychology. The standards and methods described in the year 1 reports have been applied. The partners working with psychological research have co-operated with all four partner schools, but in particular with Autism Foundation, Hungary. This work has been partly reported in deliverable D6.3.1. However, this deliverable only report the raw data obtained until Feb., 2010. The analysis of the data and
the further work with the tests and the requirements has been reported in deliverable D2.4.2. In addition, the partners have participated actively in the preparation of a common project description of the requirements for Prototype 2 which can give rise to the formulation of the specifications for Prototype 2. The work regarding the requirement was carried out during May and June 2010 (see section 5 in this report).

As explained under WP1 the implementation of the software for Prototype 1 delayed for about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities. This also meant that test plans at schools had to be revised. Although the partners were working hard with the tests during January and February 2010, it became evident during March a longer period for the tests would be important to have. The co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.

**Work Package 3: Applicability in the Learning Environment**

The more specific objectives of WP3 are the following:

1. Specify the needs of teachers and young people in the classroom context, providing input to development of the functional specification of the HANDS toolset.
2. Evaluate the applicability of the HANDS toolset in the school environment.
3. To elaborate a Future Research Agenda for ICT tools for socially marginalised young people.

The major tasks in relation to WP3:

**T3.1 ALE PT Requirements of Prototype 1**
This task involves the elucidation of key information on the applicability of the HANDS toolset in the classroom environment.

**T3.2 Develop Implementation and Evaluation Guide**
This task involves the production of guidelines for implementing the HANDS toolset in the classroom setting.

**T3.3 ALE Test/evaluation of Prototype 1**
The first test is primarily a conceptual test. The evaluation focuses on the concepts and the very positive and the very negative test results.

In the reporting period, the project partners working with educational studies have concentrated on test of Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset and the requirements for Prototype 2 as seen in the perspective of ALE (the Applicability in the Learning Environment). The standards and methods described in the year 1 reports have been applied. The partners working with educational studies have co-operated with all four partner schools, but in particular with the Helen Allison School. This work has been partly reported in deliverable
D6.3.1. However, this deliverable only report the raw data obtained until Feb., 2010. The analysis of the data and the further work with the tests and the requirements has been reported in deliverable D3.4.1. In addition, the partners have participated actively in the preparation of a common project description of the requirements for Prototype 2 which can give rise to the formulation of the specifications for Prototype 2. The work regarding the requirement was carried out during May and June 2010 (see section 5 in this report).

As explained under WP1 the implementation of the software for Prototype 1 delayed for about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities. This also meant that test plans at schools had to be revised. Although the partners were working hard with the tests during January and February 2010, it became evident during March a longer period for the tests would be important to have. The co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.

**Work Package 4: Persuasive Technology**

The more specific objectives of WP4 are the following:

- To carry through a design experiment using Persuasive Technology as foundation.
- To elaborate a future research agenda for ICT technology supporting socially marginalised young people.

The major tasks in relation to WP4:

**T4.1 Design the experiment.**

The focus in the experiment is on model layer, credibility and motivation. The task focuses on how to collect data about the credibility of the HANDS toolset and the actual motivation. Furthermore the measurement of the persuasive efficiency of the model layer tools should be designed. The answers will be a mix between quantitative and qualitative data sources: log of users, questionnaire, interviews of users and interviews of teachers.

**T4.2 PT Requirements of Prototype 1.**

The ambition is to design the HANDS toolset for high functioning teenagers with an autism diagnosis.

**T4.3 PT Test evaluation of Prototype 1.**

The first test is primarily a conceptual test. The evaluation focuses on the concepts and the very positive and the very negative test results. The experimental setup will be evaluated too.

In the reporting period, the project partners working with persuasive technology have concentrated on test of Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset and the requirements for Prototype
2 as seen in the perspective of persuasive technology. The standards and methods described in the year 1 reports have been applied. The partners working with persuasive technology have co-operated with all four partner schools, but in particular with Egebakken and Svedenskolan. This work has been partly reported in deliverable D6.3.1. However, this deliverable only report the raw data obtained until Feb., 2010. The analysis of the data and the further work with the tests and the requirements has been reported in deliverable D4.3.1. In addition, the partners have participated actively in the preparation of a common project description of the requirements for Prototype 2 which can give rise to the formulation of the specifications for Prototype 2. The work regarding the requirement was carried out during May and June 2010 (see section 5 in this report).

As explained under WP1 the implementation of the software for Prototype 1 delayed for about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities. This also meant that test plans at schools had to be revised. Although the partners were working hard with the tests during January and February 2010, it became evident during March a longer period for the tests would be important to have. The co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.

**Work Package 5: Software Research & Development**

The major objective of WP5 is to provide the specified software for HANDS validation activities. The major tasks in relation to WP5:

**T5.1 Requirements selection**

A first set of requirements with different perspectives are developed in each of the three Work Packages, WP2, WP3, and WP4. This task takes the requirements and discusses the similarities, differences, and inconsistencies (if any), and it also adds a more technical software development perspective (taking platform, time, and resource constraints into account). The output is a final set of requirements to be met by the developed software. The workload of this task shall be very compact in time, but all important stakeholders in the project shall be represented at a dedicated project meeting. The exact methodology to be used to capture requirements is the Wirtek “Requirements Management” process, in particular the “Requirements Establishment” part. Wirtek has several variants of the “Requirements Establishments” process. The variant to be used in HANDS is the SCRUM variant, where requirements are identified through “user stories”.

**T5.2 Storyboard development**

To create a unity of the modules described in T5.3 – T5.8 and especially to secure user oriented modules in SSSI and TT (T5.4. and T5.5) a storyboard is set up through the authoring tool CourseBuilder. The storyboard will connect the software development and the research made in WP2, WP3, and WP4. It describes and illustrates how the
different modules can be used and set up, the dilemmas between the technical possibilities, and the user requirements selected for implementation in T5.1. The storyboard gives important information to all the different aspects of software development and in all the development phases. Thus, it forms a solid design of the human-computer interaction.

**T5.3 Software module HIPD**
The *Handy Interactive Persuasive Diary* (HIPD) module is the combined calendar and diary function of the HANDS toolset, enabling the pupil and his/her teacher to set up a well-defined structure of the day. The module will utilize ideas from the research field of Persuasive Technology, including situational awareness to adapt to the current state of the pupil (relaxed, stressed, tired, etc.).

**T5.4 Software module SSSI**
The *Simple-Safe-Success Instructor* (SSSI) module is a practical tool to help the pupil solving daily tasks that could cause problems (like getting on the bus, and handling situations where the bus does not show up on time). The toolset shall to a large extent be based on state-of-the-art pedagogical methods for instructing autism-diagnosed young people.

**T5.5. Software module TT**
The *Travelling Trainer* (TT) module is a simulation environment enabling the pupil to practice situations from everyday life anytime, anywhere. Simulations are used to improve skills where the pupil currently has problems, typically related to social integration. The module will utilize ideas from the research field of Persuasive Technology to ensure maximum impact of the training. In particular, it is critical to reach a high level of realism through 3D animation.

**T5.6 Software module SPo**
The *SharingPoint* (SPo) module offers a function to match profiles against other users’ profiles. All users are identified with a very accurate psychological and interest profile which makes it possible for the users to meet (virtually or physically) or to allow teachers to share experiences when they teach pupils with the same profile. With an open interface, the HANDS toolset is able to communicate with other HANDS servers worldwide and query profiles (without revealing the identity of the pupil). We expect to identify more ways of utilizing this function when the toolset is demonstrated to practitioners – like with GPS it provides some data which can be used in many ways. It is a goal to define open interfaces in order to make it easy for anyone with a good idea to build an application on top.
T5.7. Software module TIN

*The Individualiser* (TIN) is a configuration module to adapt the HANDS toolset to the pupil. In order to make the pupils motivated to use the HANDS toolset it is a very important property that it is customisable and aesthetically pleasing as well as functional. Furthermore, the teacher of the pupil is able to customise the functionality too – even from a PC at the school when the pupil is on the move.

T5.8. Software module CoMe

The *Credibility-o-Meter* (CoMe) is a function enabling the teacher to know how credible the HANDS toolset is currently experienced by the pupil. This is important, since no credibility means no influence on the pupil in the desired direction. The Credibility-o-Meter is based on the electronic footprints left by the user on the mobile device during normal use. Statistical classification algorithms shall be used to monitor credibility in this way.

The implementation process began at March 1, 2009. Every three to four weeks, a partial implementation has been released, hence the SCRUM methodology for agile software development.

Prototype 1 was ready in August 2009 and it contains the main components of the HANDS Toolset. However, some unexpected technical problems occurred when the software was installed at the server at Aalborg University. It took some weeks to fix these problems. The result was a delay of about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities.

The partners working with software development have participated actively in the preparation of a common project description of the requirements for Prototype 2 which can give rise to the formulation of the specifications for Prototype 2. The work regarding the requirement was carried out during May and June 2010 (see section 5 in this report).

The partners working with software development have also been closely together with the co-ordinator in order to respond qualified to the recommendations of Feb. 19, 2010, mentioned in WP 1. This includes preparing the practical work with the so-called integration trial (see section 6 in this report).

**Work Package 6: Test**

The major objectives of WP6 are the following:

1. The testing procedures of the software
2. Establishing the prerequisites for the testing procedures at the test schools

The major tasks in relation to WP6:
T6.1 Preparing the test schools for the testing
Making the users comfortable with the hardware and software platform.

T6.2. Establishing the scientific test prerequisites
The Cognitive Psychology group’s work on test procedures will lead to a baseline for each test person and a comparable control group, as set out in WP2 above. For example, the baseline could be an identification of symptoms and a quantification of their severity (ADOS) and a measurement of psychometric data (IQ and Vineland). As part of the task, appropriate baseline tests will be established for each individual young person with autism using the ICT tools.

In the present reporting period, the partners have carried out various tests of Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset.

The deliverable D6.3.1 contains all test results that were available by the end of January 2010. However, because of the delay it way decided to continue the testing after Feb.1, when D6.3.1. These additional test results should be reported in the other deliverables, D2.4.2, D3.4.1, and D4.3.1, which should also contain presentations of the analysis of the test result as seen from three different perspectives. Furthermore, it was decided to ask the project officer, Giogio Zoia, for an extended deadline of these deliverables in order to have more time for the analysis. A new deadline of July 15, 2010, was accepted by an e-mail from the project officer on May 3, 2010.

Work Package 7: ICT Ethics
The major objectives of WP7 are the following:

(1) To assist in applying to the local ethical committees for the clinical trials within the HANDS project whenever such applications are needed.
(2) To analyze general ethical problems in relation to the use of ICT tools which make high functioning young people with an autism diagnosis able to improve their social skills and self management skills based on Persuasive Technology.
(3) To evaluate the HANDS toolset developed in the project from ethical perspectives reflecting on the reports from the Ethical Board.
(4) To develop procedures which can facilitate ethical awareness as an integrated part of the construction of ICT tools based on principles from Persuasive Design theory.
(5) To elaborate a future research agenda for ICT technology supporting socially marginalised young people

The major tasks in relation to WP7:
T 7.1
To assist researchers in HANDS in preparing applications to the local ethical committees, in order to obtain permissions to perform clinical trials and experiments. In particular WP 7 should contribute to the ethical considerations needed in such applications.

T 7.2
To analyze the fundamental ethical problems to which the use of the HANDS tools may give rise, taking the experiences from the Ethical Board into account. These problems include the ethical aspects of the distinction between persuasion and manipulation as well as the ethical aspects of allowing young people with an autism diagnosis to relate personally to a technological system.

T 7.3
To identify other ethical problems related to the use of persuasive technology in order to improve the social skills of teenagers with an autism diagnosis and provide a sound and qualified analysis of these ethical problems. The risk of addiction to the devices in question should be analyzed.

T 7.4
To develop a methodology based on a so-called value sensitive design in order to make sure that relevant ethical considerations are integrated in the design process as such and in the system development.

The partner working with the tasked mentioned above have worked closely together with the Ethical Board (EB) of Hands.

One important question that has been discussed by the EB is the possible coercive nature of the instructions, advices, or help offered by the handheld devices to the young people with an autism diagnosis. The handheld devices are supposed to help young people with autism 'navigate'. As such the devices are clearly supposed to influence the behaviour of the young people. This, in turn, raises the question of whether the influence exerted upon the behaviour of the young people is ethically acceptable - or whether it amounts to coercion in an unjustifiable manner.

During the year 2009-10 the partners have formulated the applications from the partners describing the test program which has been planned. The Ethical Board has discussed the applications and suggested some changes which have been incorporated in a revised test plan. The work in EB is reported in the deliverable, D1.5.2, “Report II from the Ethical Board”. The theoretical considerations regarding the ethical problems, which are relevant in relation to HANDS and mentioned above, have been reported in the deliverable, D7.4.1, which is part of the Y3 of the project. In addition, some of the research in the ICT ethics related to Hands has been presented at the conference Frontiers in E-learning, Tromsø
University, Norway, in January 2010. At the conference, *Persuasive Technology 2010*, Copenhagen May 2010, two research papers from WP7 have been presented:

Bertel, Lykke Brogaard: "The Use of Rewards in Persuasive Design".

Anne Gerdes & Peter Øhrstrøm, “Issues of credibility in developing mobile solutions for autism-diagnosed teenagers”.

The papers are listed with the complete references in section 3.

**Work Package 8: Dissemination**

The major objectives of WP8 are the following:

1. Dissemination of the project results
2. To create a business model for project output from a socio-economical perspective.
3. To provide inputs for a future research agenda on ICT helping young people socially marginalized by an autism diagnosis.

The major task in relation to WP8 during the first period was:

T8.2 Project web site.

The web site shall serve as an efficient means for sharing up-to-date public information about the project throughout the project duration. The project web page shall be made available for at least two years after the end of the project.

During the first period the partners established a public website for the HANDS project: [http://www.hands-project.eu](http://www.hands-project.eu). All public deliverables can be downloaded from the public HANDS website. During the present reporting period this site has been maintained and further developed.

In addition, we have established an internal communication platform (based on the Moodle system) for the use of the partners in our collaborative communication.

As a status for dissemination and exploitation of HANDS project results a number of actions can be mentioned:

- The project deliver resources to guide a group of merchant students, which are using HANDS marketing strategies as study object for a large assignment running autumn 2009.

- Studies and talks are ongoing to get a proper understanding of how tools like HANSD toolbox are currently sold in the markets in the different countries. This
turns out to be very different from country to country, partly based on very different rules for public support of aids for young people with autism diagnose.

- The HANDS external webpage is up and running (http://www.hands-project.eu/) , sharing the (public) results from the project so far. Statistics show that the page has roughly 15 unique visitors per day.

- Project management is maintaining an updated list of papers and conference submissions that are related to HANDS. (See section 3 on “Work Progress and Achievements during the period”).

- Regarding the possible use of the Hands toolset and the results of the project after the end of the project period a Socio-economical business model (D8.1) has been developed.

- As it has turned out the present platform will not be available on a long term basis, another possible platform has been suggested and a so-called integration trial has been planned (see section 6 in this report). This integration trial will actually be implemented – not as a consequence of the work described in Annex 1, but as a consequence of the recommendation of Feb. 19, 2010.
### 4. DELIVERABLES AND MILESTONES TABLES

**Deliverables (excluding the periodic and final reports)**

The following table lists the deliverables which are mentioned in Annex I for the reporting period in question. As mentioned in WP1 the co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer. The deliverables of HANDS during the reporting period are listed in the following table, in which the two deliverables due to July and August 2010 also have been included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Del. no.</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>WP no.</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
<th>Estimated indicative person month</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Delivery Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D5.2.1</td>
<td>Prototype 1 software and documentation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WIRU</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Aug 1, 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6.3.1</td>
<td>Report on test methodology and research protocols</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ELTE</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>Feb 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D8.2</td>
<td>Socio-economical business model</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>WIDK</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>Mar 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2.4.2</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2 (cognitive psychology perspectives)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ELTE</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>June 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3.4.1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2. (ALE perspectives)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>June 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4.3.1</td>
<td>Evaluation of Prototype 1 and Requirements for Prototype 2. (PT perspectives)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>June 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.5.2</td>
<td>Report II from the Ethical Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>June 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1.3.3</td>
<td>Annual report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>June 1, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D5.3.1</td>
<td>Specifications to prototype 2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>WIRU</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Aug 1, 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D7.4.1</td>
<td>Ethics of Hands: Report on important theoretical, empirical and methodological aspects.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>PU</td>
<td>July 1, 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Milestones
In Annex I, two Milestones are specified regarding the reporting period in question. As can be seen, both Milestones have been achieved, either on time, or within the accepted delay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestone no.</th>
<th>Milestone name</th>
<th>Due achievement date from Annex I</th>
<th>Achieved Yes/No</th>
<th>Actual / Forecast achievement date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prototype 1 evaluation</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2010</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Feb 1, 2010</td>
<td>This milestone depends on the test data reported D6.3.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prototype 2 Specification</td>
<td>Jun 1, 2009</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>July 15, 2010</td>
<td>The consortium has applied for permission to delay the deliverables related to this milestone until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The purpose of this section is to summarise the management of the consortium activities during the reporting period.

**Project planning and status**

During the reporting period the main goals have been to test Prototype 1 of the Hands toolset and to prepare the development of Prototype 2 of the HANDS toolset. Prototype 1 was supposed to be ready at schools by August 1, 2009.

The software for Prototype 1 was produced on time. However, some unexpected technical problems occurred when the software was installed at the server at Aalborg University. It took some weeks to fix these problems. The result was a delay of about 6 weeks before the systems could be used in a satisfactory manner from all the users at the partner schools and at the universities. This also meant that test plans at schools had to be revised. Although the partners were working hard with the tests during January and February 2010, it became evident during March a longer period for the tests would be important to have. The co-ordinator applied for permission to delay the deliverables due to June 1 until July 15. This permission was given by the project officer.

It should be mentioned that this way of handling the problem is very close to the recovery action mentioned in the below section on Project Risk Management under Risk 14 (see below).

In order to achieve the above, the co-ordinator and researchers acting on his behalf have organised some face to face meetings and a number of on-line meetings within the consortium. The three university partners in the Consortium (ELTE, LSB, AAU) have been asked to describe reasonable requirements in close cooperation with the partner schools (AF, NAS, EGE, UPAB) and the software companies in the project (WIDK, WIRU, EDG). ELTE has listed the psychological requirements; LSB has listed the pedagogical requirements; and AAU has listed the persuasive technology requirements. The three sets of requirements have been discussed at so-called consortium development meeting organised by researcher Morten Aagaard on behalf of the co-ordinator. The issue was also discussed at the Project Board Meeting in London in May 2010.

The following decision was made at the meeting regarding the final phase of the work which should lead to the specification for Prototype 2: “Consortium Development Meeting (CDM) on June 1 and WIRU receives prioritised list of priority 1 components, fully specified. One week after, WIRU will have calculated the expected use of man months, which will be available in HANDS MOODLE by June 9. The HANDS Project Board (PB) will make a decision on, which components will be included in P2, based on the prioritised list of Priority I components as well as the calculation of man months from
WIRU. PB will have an on-line PB-meeting on June 14 at 14.00 CET. It is decided that the Social Agent will not be a part of P2." – The work was carried out according to this plan and on this basis a specification for Prototype has been produced (deliverable D5.3.1).

**Project Risk Management**

Below is the updated risk matrix for HANDS project. Risks are monitored frequently by project leader (AAU), and any recovery action needed is evaluated on a Project Board (PB) meeting. In case of urgency the recovery action is discussed between the partners on a phone meeting, to allow actions to be initiated immediately. Risk matrix is updated by project leader as needed, and presented on PB meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>How likely?</th>
<th>How serious?</th>
<th>Attention</th>
<th>Recovery action – updated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>One validation partner does not manage to establish valuable tests.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>All validation partners seem to be on track on establishing valuable tests, but the delay in getting teachers trained is putting amount of data we can gather at stake. All 3 universities have agreed that they will use available data to produce first set of results on promised date for prototype 1, but all will continue working with data gathered after the report deadline as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is a strong mismatch between the specifications from the users and the SW-budget size.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>There is currently a mismatch regarding Prototype 2 development, because the consortium has been asked to use resources for the development of an integration trial. The price has been estimated to 5 MM. This means that we currently have to cut the ambitions regarding Prototype 2 – unless we can obtain other funding. It is currently being investigated whether at least a part of this problem can be solved by unused resources from other partners. The Project Officer has also been contacted regarding this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Central project members leave the project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This risk is lowered from Attention 6 to Attention 3, since a good part of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ethical committee in one country does not accept the HANDS tests.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No longer monitored for Prototype 1 – relevant Ethical committees in all countries have accepted the HANDS tests of Prototype 1. Later monitoring will be needed regarding HANDS test of Prototype 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The teenagers feel so uncomfortable with the HANDS software that they do not want to use it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This is monitored closely, and a lot of support is given to the schools to help the teachers adapt the software to each pupil. Attention is raised from 3 to 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Disagreement regarding Intellectual Property Rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>This problem, and all relevant problems of this kind, should be foreseen in the CA, including rights to access of background knowledge (CA, Section 9). No problems so far. Will monitor more closely when dissemination is discussed in more details during year 2. The IPR question has been carefully discussed at the London Meeting in May 2010. Experts in IPR from LSBU participated. No problems are foreseen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Partners do not deliver periodic reports, cost statements, etc. on time. Unclear project vision and goals creates an inefficient project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All partners are working well together, and the administrative support from AAU seems to be working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bankruptcy of a partner in the project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Project Board decides whether a new partner should be found, or if any of the other Project partners can take over the tasks. Not relevant so far.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The project gets a bad press.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>If the project gets a bad press, it will probably be due to some journalistic misunderstanding of what the HANDS researchers would do for the young people with an autism diagnosis. In most cases, the right solution will be to contact the journalists in a friendly and open atmosphere and to explain the objectives and procedures of the project carefully. It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The representatives from the various partners do not collaborate very well.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The project is running well, and all partners seem to be collaborating well and progress in solving the planned tasks are seen from all sides. Collaboration between universities and schools (LSB and HA, ELTE and AF, AAU and Egebakken + Swedanskolen) seems to be working well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Unclear project visions and goals make the project work less effective.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Project Board is responsible for the overall common vision for the project and it is a main task for the Project Board to secure a common understanding of visions and goals in the project. So far a shared vision seems to be understood and working well. Project will monitor this closely in the period where schools are introducing the smartphones and the first interviews of teenagers with an autism diagnosis are being performed by researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>The EB is not functioning in the expected way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>It is important that members of the Ethical Board are dedicated to the work of the board. If there are problems in this regard, new members should be appointed instead of those who are not participating as expected. The partners will be asked to give a list of potential members who would be interested in the work of the EB and who will be qualified. This has already been discussed with the chairman of the EB. There will be a salary for the chairman who will make sure that the annual reports from the EB will be produced. EB has delivered good results and challenged the project partners during the first year. Attention lowered to 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The demands to test documentation are too high (amount, content)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>This is a real problem, and the result is that teachers are not reading all that is not needed. Project is giving more support in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and language) and thus not manageable for the test sites.

| 12 | The practitioners are not educated, scientific personnel and the quality of the experiments and the documentation is poor. | 3 | 1 | 3 | Practitioners are being trained and have direct access to call the researchers to raise question at all times. Still monitored. |
| 13 | The need for customisation of the HANDS components is much higher than the level of development possible at the test sites. | 3 | 1 | 3 | Customization of the toolbox to each pupil is possible in a high degree even already on Prototype 1. More wishes from practitioners are being developed with releases each month to cover their needs. This is monitored closely by project management. |
| 14 | The estimated software test periods are too short to experience change in behaviour or attitude among the users. | 2 | 1 | 2 | The tests have been slightly redesigned to take a shorter period into account. Researchers will continue to work with the larger amounts of data that will arrive after first delivery of reports based on data from Prototype 1 tests. |
| 15 | The MS Dynamics Mobile Framework is changed or its license rules are changed. | 3 | 1 | 3 | Early in 2010 Microsoft unexpectedly removed Microsoft Dynamics Mobile from the market. However, the consortium was informed that the offer from Microsoft to use Hands for projects purposes would be unchanged. This means that Microsoft's decision does not affect the Hands project as such. But the new status of Microsoft Dynamics Mobile clearly means that if there is going to be a commercial version of the Hands toolset after the project period, the system probably has to be transformed to some other platform. The co-ordinator mailed this information to the project officer on Feb 17, 2010. |
Meetings in HANDS:

The agreement is that a general meeting (GM) and at least one additional project board meeting (PBM) should be held each year. Besides some of the partners have met for workshops etc. and they have communicated frequently using the HANDS communication platform established using the Moodle system.

During year 2 of the Hands project the following project meetings have been organised.

Virtual Project Board Meeting, March 10, 2010.
Seminar on Autism, Inclusion and Research Methods: London, May 26, 2010

In addition, it should be mentioned that there has been a close cooperation with the Ethical Board (EB). The EB members have been invited to the GMs. There have been separate EB meetings during the GMs.

Minutes from the PBMs are included below.
Minutes from the Project Board meeting in Stockholm, June 2-4, 2009

Agenda:
1. Briefing about actual consortium issues
2. The Mobile Phone issue
3. Budget Revision
4. Payment of previous meeting
5. Costs related to translation
6. Economy matters/organisation of CP test at the schools
7. Collaboration with Ethical Board
8. Specification of lead teacher at every school
9. Evaluation Year 1
10. Revision of test plan
11. Scheduling future meetings

Minutes:
0. First it was established that every partner has one vote no matter the number of participants at the meeting.

1. Briefing about actual consortium issues
New Project Officer (PO): Mr. Giorgio Zoia. The PO is happy that all deliveries have been handed in on time.
Annual report: Draft will be written by Coordinator, will be sent to the consortium for comments and contributions shortly – during the month of June.
Review: PO has postponed the review a little, he will get back to that over the Summer. [JVM: It was later planned for September.]

2. The Mobile Phone issue
The coordinator got the advice to ensure that the PO accepted the set-up for using mobile phones, which resulted in a request for a description of the model for each participating school on how to ensure that the costs are all relevant to the HANDS-project, as no private phone call expenses can be financed by the EC.
The UK partners are setting an example and have already had their description approved. The other schools can use the UK-description as template.
The descriptions should be made ready for approval as soon as possible in order for the project to move forward as planned.
A few phones can be covered within the budget in case of theft or destruction. These issues should be taken into consideration though.

3. Budget Revision
EDG will, together with AAU, write a detailed description of subcontractors and the tasks. [JVM: this turned out to be unnecessary, as the tasks could be carried out within the organization itself and thus no budget revision was needed.]

4. Payment of previous meeting
The coordinator (JVM) will calculate costs related to previous meetings paid by AAU on behalf of the consortium once all invoices from the Stockholm meeting has been paid. JVM sends calculations to partners for acceptance and on the basis of this an internal reallocation of the funds will take place.

5. Costs related to translation
Translation is needed regarding web, test and evaluation instruments, and support systems. The task will be carried out according to the following list.
Translation into DK: MA + SM
Translation into SE: MA + TB
Translation into HU: 2 x staff (MG)

Translation is also needed regarding the cognitive psychological test from original language to local language (forward translation) and back (back translation). The forward translation will be done by the partners. The back translation will be financed by LSBU. D6.3.1 consists of a report on “raw data” in local languages. The amount of translation should be estimated by each partner. WIRU and WIDK offer system support in English.

6. Economy matters/organisation of CP test at the schools
The cognitive psychology tests seem to be more expensive than expected. A compromise was suggested by MG. Schools could postpone recruitment for ADOS and ADI to the beginning of prototype II, which will mean that ADOS is reduced to one. If the child already has done the ADI test, that will do. The result will still be reliable and publishable. New calculations on the price will be made by EGE, ELTE and AF for further discussion. PB – Part II (Wednesday)
EGE has calculated the price again and accepts the decision of the PB - Part I.

7. Collaboration with Ethical Board
The EB had a slow start, but the EB members are aware of the problem. An expected turnaround time will be suggested.

8. Specification of lead teacher/person at every school
One person at each school who is responsible for coordinating the testing, transfer of data etc. must be appointed. Also the universities must appoint one responsible academic person for each. This must be decided by Thursday.
9. Evaluation Year 1
The evaluation will be based on Annual Report. Any critical issues should be discussed at the PB meeting. No critical issues were addressed.

10. Revision of test plan
Revised plan:
Pre-Prototype II – ADOS tests. ADOS is cancelled in Prototype I.
ADI-R should be carried out at anytime, but should start no later than August 10.
WISC-results will be presented for parents. This should be presented to the EB.
Urgent matters:
Recruitment for WISC
ADI-R tests – the earlier the better
SRS: just before Prototype I (august/September); as soon as possible after Prototype I. The same goes for Prototype II
ADOS: Just before and after Prototype II
VABS: Just before and after Prototype II
MG prepares a draft for circulation on details of schools’ work.
SRS are available in the following languages: DK and UK.
HU: no, but is in press; SE: not sure.
Licenses: ADOS (clinical and research): SE only has clinical license. Psychologist can be trained by Hungarian school partner. This will be discussed between the two partners.
11. Scheduling future meetings
PB-meeting in DK, Dec. 1-3, 2009
GM-meeting in UK, May 25-27, 2010
PB-meeting, Nov/Dec 2010
Final GM-meeting in DK, May/June 2011
Minutes from Project Board Meeting, Aalborg, DK, December 2-3, 2009

Agenda:
1. Up-date - main activities since last meeting (Peter)
   a. Review of implementation WP6 - training issues, engagement etc
   b. Technical review incl. security and platform issues and add
   c. Additional application (EC funds directed to platform developments)
   d. Publications.
2. Deliverables during the next six months (Peter).
3. Testing the Hands Toolset. Issues for deliverable D6.3.1 and June deliverables (D2.4.2; D4.3.1; D3.4.1). – (Joe)
4. When and How requirements for Prototype 2 are gathered (Anca).
5. Forward planning for Prototype 2 implementation and evaluation incl. ethics planning.
6. Post Hands - further project possibilities. Towards the development of a business model.
7. Economical status of Hands (Joan)
8. The Y1 Review of HANDS. Brief reports regarding the re-submissions.
9. Discussion on HANDS Review (continued)
10. Summary and final remarks (Peter)

Wednesday, December 2

Welcome and introduction - AAU (POE)
If a vote will be necessary each partner has one vote.
The Agenda is still open for new issues/topics? No new agenda issues at the moment.
Minutes from June meeting – approved with no comments.
The coordinator hopes to finish the above agenda today, which will give time for informal meetings tomorrow.

Introduction of new HANDS participants: Corinne – LSBU – has been working with HANDS for three months now. She is at NAS one day per week. Claire – NAS - primary HANDS-person in the school – works with Corinne among others. Welcome!

1. Activities since last meeting
   a. Review of implementation of WP6 - training issues, engagement etc
      POE informs that the rules on buying phones were complicated, but is happy to inform everybody that all choices are now accepted. The schools may proceed.
      The implementation process suffered a delay of two months, related to transfer between servers in Romania/Aalborg.

   b. Technical review incl. security and platform issues
      Training – organization:

      EGE – started tests a week ago, before that they had training sessions with staff. They experienced a good start. The experience was a variety in perception and worry about the
reactions from the kids. They are on track most staff are positive towards HANDS. Kids’ reactions: new to them, very motivated after a long wait, anxious to start, all in all a positive start. The actual testing started last week. AAU personnel are eager to receive results. Thanks to WIDK for support.

SV - started the pupil preparation in September. They received the phones two weeks ago. SV teachers visited EGE which was very good for them. SV has experienced good support from WIDK. All pupils have worked with appointments, the timer, Personal Trainer. Not SSSI yet. HANDS is a heavy workload for the teachers. SV presented some nice material for introduction, which will be sent to the rest of the consortium too.

All schools should send preparation material to AAU (JVM). SV stresses that the thought is that every pupil is important, with or without phones. SV experience no “envy” problem – yet.

NAS – Has done a lot of preparation since last meeting as well as a lot of training. The thought of HANDS is not new, which is rather difficult to get the teachers to understand. Every child has basic rules on how to avoid misuse – e.g. no phone calls, no internet etc. when not agreed.

NAS experienced some problems synchronizing, but hope that things are now working. The general impression is that a lot has been achieved in spite of some problems. LSBU did a lot of work within the class – getting to know the pupils. NAS held a meeting with parents and pupils, where they chose which numbers would be important – any other numbers are blocked.

Can phone within Orange network for free, but pupils may not want the other pupils to phone them, therefore there are individual lists.

AF (represented by Miklós, ELTE) – Began testing 2-3 weeks ago. Have had session with teachers which seem to be enough. They experienced many technical problems. Three weeks ago the testing began in spite of problems. Some kids have used phone for three weeks with success, but they need to be patient as software underperforms some kids’ expectations. AF communicates with WIRU regarding technical problems. AF included one extra and now has five kids. Continuation consists of managing technical problems. Another challenge is the kids’ willingness to use the phones and to combine the phone with family relations.

Comments: Thanking schools for their hard work. The schools have been good at using provided instructions/guidance. There was a significant delay due to technical issues, which was a setback – now it is important to make the best of the time left for Prototype I. Schools are now responsible for the implementation.

Technical issues: A technical team has been formed to help out when technical problems occur : AAU (MA), WIRU (AR), WIDK (HD). If the schools are not passed the technical problems, please contact the technical team right away – don’t wait. The reply will arrive within 24 hours – use MOODLE for everybody to see.

Discussions on security: This is a high priority subject for the next SPRINT.
Everybody is grateful to WIRU, who offers quick help and support.

c. Additional application (EC funds directed to platform developments)
An additional application has been sent, due to Microsoft taking the framework we use off the market and offers no more support. It will not affect this project – all licenses are in place – also after end of project.
Comments: Consortium agrees that it was a good idea, but should have been informed at an earlier stage.

d. Publications
AAU (POE) has made a list – supplements should be sent to AAU (JVM). When list is updated, JVM e-mails list to WIDK (HD) for the HANDS homepage. There will be time for discussing ideas for future publications on day 2.

2. The list of deliverables during the next six months was discussed.

3. Testing the Hands Toolset.
Issues for deliverable D6.3.1 and June deliverables (D2.4.2; D4.3.1; D3.4.1)
D6.3.1: Prototype I results in Feb. Enter as many raw-data as possible in order to deliver on time. The testing will continue after D6.3.1 which will mean more data for the following deliverables (Ds 2.4.2+4.3.1), which will be based on data from 6.3.1, but also on data collected after Feb. 2010.
PB decision: The consortium will stick to the time table if possible. D6.3.1 will be based on the existing data at the time. If no quality data, the decision will be revised. Data will be listed in a raw form. Final decision is postponed until after Jan.15, the consortium put the final decision in the hands of JM and POE. Partners will send as much as possible to JM by Jan 15, who will consider whether there are enough data or not. POE would not like to apply for delay during the evaluation process. SH doesn't think it will be a problem to ask for a delay in January.
D8.1 Socio-Economic business model – WIDK
D1.5.2 – Report from EB – will cover Stockholm meeting.
D1.3.3 – Annual Report
D7.4.1 - Work has started

4. When and How requirements for Prototype 2 are gathered (Presentations: WIRU (AR) and EDG (TC) Anca - presentation on HANDS prototype I – Past, Present and Future (prototype II).
PB should make priorities for the next month. Every month development meetings are announced in MOODLE. All are welcome. For how long should Prototype I be maintained? PB decision: stop maintenance (meaning no new features) by March 2010. Will be kept functional, with support in case of break down.
When can specifications for Prototype II be expected? (proposal: March-July 2010).
When should the development work on Prototype II start? (proposal: Final specifications by July 2010). Deliverable – Prototype II – October 2010.

A group, who will be in charge of time plan (as last year), is formed. First obligation will be to decide on timing in detail. The plan should be accepted by all partners via internet. Group members: AR, MA, TC, HD (chair), JM – will work closely with the schools.

Presentation: Thomas Christiansen – Integration of Flash in Prototype II

Graphical user interface will be partly implemented into Prototype II – it can be launched from the frontpage of the HANDS software. The basic stuff will be ready by Feb. 1.

If possible technically there will be a choice for each pupil between the current interface or the flash interface.

5. Forward planning for Prototype 2 implementation and evaluation incl. ethics planning.

Psycholoical-testing:

Post-testing around March, as late as possible. Data should be available in time for June Deliverable, though. The schools will do SRS test at the end of March. ADOS testing will need to be done just before Prototype II. The planning of the psychological tests will be discussed in day 2 of the PB.

Prototype II testing:

Documentation will be ready by October 1. Do not foresee any delay this year. P-II tests ready in March. Discuss possible improvements of this. All test plans should be ready for the London meeting in May 2010. A group is formed in order to present final plan for decision in May 2010: ELTE (MG - chair), SV (SE), EGE (SM/EP), NAS (JE), AF (KG), LSBU (JM), AAU (NN)

Cooperation with EB:

Deadlines for applications to the EB: a couple of weeks before London-meeting. The EB will be present at the London meeting. Only part of the applications can be made this spring, more applications will follow during the Summer.

6. Post Hands - further project possibilities. Towards the development of a business model. (HD)

Post-HANDS?? Based on March 2010 Deliverables – Socio-Economic Business Model (WIDK in charge). So far MA is working with Business School students, who are looking into the market possibilities in Denmark. There will be differences from country to country. The market consists mainly of schools, but parents too. How is educational software sold and presented to schools? At the moment there is nothing like the HANDS-software at the market. Awaiting feedback from students on this. The consortium expect some kind of collaboration after the end of HANDS. The purpose of this WP is to work out if it will be possible to establish a company based on HANDS – NOT to actually establish the company.
7. Economical status of Hands (JVM)
Presentation addresses the reporting issues as well as when to expect the payment from the EC. Important issue: during reporting periods, make sure that there is at least one person available at all partner institutions allowed to sign officially for the institution. Quote P.O.: “People go on vacation, legal entities do not”.

8. The Y1 Review of HANDS. Brief reports regarding the re-submissions.
Yesterday we received note on format. We will have to send three different files per Deliverable: a “track changes” version, a “clean” version, and an addendum stating which changes have been made.
Some comments are due to misunderstandings, the Coordinator has contacted some of the partners in charge of Deliverables regarding comments. There doesn’t seem to be a rule for the time frame regarding the review of resubmitted Deliverables. Send files – 3 per Deliverable – in .doc format to AAU (JVM)
D1.2.3 (AAU) – Annual Report – comments and corrections are received. Must add an updated List of Publications for Y1.
D1.1.1 (AAU-MA) – Work proceeds – MA will send the file within one week for comments.
Ethical Report (EB-SH) – POE would like the addendum regarding changes. SH will send next week.
D3.3.1 (LSBU-JM) – comments on implementation guide are not yet detailed enough. M8 was basically too soon. JM will finish the work before Dec. 18th.
D5.1.1 (WIRU-AR) – Up-date is ready. Will send “track changes” version.

9. A.o.b.
Planning of meetings for tomorrow:
• MG/JM - meeting with schools – 9.00-9.45
• Short meeting – publication possibilities - MG/HS/POE – 10.00
• SH/JM/HS/POE – “theoretical stands” – Wednesday afternoon 14.45
• AR/JM/MA/HD/HS meeting on planning of Prototype II – 10.00
PB-meeting, Nov/Dec 2010: Budapest – MG will get back to us on date (either Nov 30 or Dec1)

10. Summary and final remarks
One issue on communication – The EDG initiative for a stronger graphical interface should have been communicated to the consortium at an earlier stage. EDG will use resources working out how many resources will be needed (hours); WIRU will look into the technical possibilities – first impression is that it will be feasible. A more modern “look” would be nice... New design will be a side-track to Prototype II, it will be possible to chose between the current design and the new one. Be careful introducing new issues during testing phase. It will certainly be an advantage for schools and pupils in the future. No new tests are possible, it is only a matter of making the software more attractive. Parts of the HANDS-toolset may be changed into the new design.
WIRU will use most resources implementing Prototype 1. EDG will lead the Flash-process. WIRU will ensure the possibility for plugging-in the Flash interface within the context of the group formed yesterday. The result may be that this is not possible, but bear in mind that user perception is important to the evaluation.

**PB Decision:** Set aside resources as quickly as possible to investigate if it is possible to integrate the Flash-possibility or maybe an “in-between” solution. What could be implemented from the beginning? EDG will present the result of the investigation to the consortium.
Minutes from Virtual Project Board Meeting, March 10, 2010.

Agenda:
1) The Commission’s recommendations in the Y1 evaluation (Peter/Joan)
   - 1.a Economical consequences
   - 1.b Formation of a work group to deal with the recommendations
2) Status regarding the tests at the schools of prototype 1 - including possible revisions of the test plans (Joe and others)
3) Excess phone charges at Helen Allison School (Jaap and others)
4) About the London meeting (Joe, Joan and others)

Minutes:
Welcome and introduction
If a vote will be necessary each partner has one vote.
The resubmitted Deliverables have been accepted – with two recommendations, though.
JVM received notice from the EC, the First Interim Payment is expected within the month of March.

1) The Commission’s recommendations in the Y1 evaluation
Recommendations:
   - 1) A plan for HANDS software development, compatible with other – and more sustainable
   - software framework, including technical comparisons between both Open Source and Commercial solutions should be sent as an appendix to next periodic report
   - 2) Plan for a demonstration of technical feasibility of the porting of HANDS Platform to new software framework – appendix to next periodic report – and the actual demonstration within the lifespan of the project.

1.a Economical consequences
WIDK sees two solutions – one where the consortium develops a completely new system, which was what the HANDS II application was about. This solution will cost app. 50 man months. The other solution could be to use another existing framework. WIDK has received some offers, which will be sent to everybody after the meeting. There will be a one time fee involved as well as a price for a monthly subscription related to this solution.

It is a serious problem, that we do not have extra money for the implementation. This will mean that we are forced to chose a solution as limited as possible.
WIRU is looking into the cost of the second solution (MM).
EDG is in dialogue with WIDK, but awaits decision on technical solution.

1.b Formation of a work group to deal with the recommendations
A work group was appointed in order to work with recommendation 1: Morten Aagaard (chair - AAU), Anca Rarau (WIRU), Henrik Dalsgaard (WIDK), John Tørring (EDG).
Decision: The group will have a draft ready for the meeting in May.

2) Status regarding the tests at the schools of prototype 1 - including possible revisions of the test plans NAS (represented by Joe Mintz, LSBU):
JM informs the consortium of the status of the significant technical issues at NAS, but in spite of this, there are results to work with. The technical issues do result in a delay regarding the testing, though, which will have to be postponed for about 6 weeks. This will influence the work with future Deliverables.

EGE (represented by Henrik Schärfe, AAU):
There have been a few problems; the work is moving forward, but quite slow as the pupils are not using the phones enough. The results are not as good as hoped and this will influence Prototype II.

SE (represented by Gun-Marie Wicksén):
The testing is moving forward as planed, but SE has experienced the same issues as at EGE. Mainly the pupils have used the phones enough though. Things are going well in general.

AF (represented by Kristina Gy. Stefanik):
The timing is fine from an AF point of view. The testing is hard, though, even though the pupils have used the phones. The question is whether to move forward with the existing deadlines? NAS test result cannot be ready until beginning/mid May and at least one month is needed for preparing the Deliverable.
Decision: Coordinator will ask for a delay regarding the Deliverables D1.3.3, D2.4.2, D3.4.1, D4.3.1, which means that the deadline will be moved until July 15, if this is accepted by the EC. The deadline for sending the Deliverables to the coordinator will be end of June.
SE and AF are moving forward according to planed; NAS will send results to ELTE early/mid May. The consortium does not expect that the above delay will influence the Prototype II plan.

3) Excess phone charges at Helen Allison School (JM)
In spite of the contract with Orange, NAS was presented with an excess charge of £5000, this has at the time being been negotiated and the offer from Orange is now to pay only half the charges (£2500). As the excess charges do not seem to be based on HANDS updates, AAU (HS) offers to go to the UK to negotiate the Orange issue on behalf of the HANDS consortium together with NAS.
Decision: Henrik Schärfe, AAU, will contact NAS to make arrangements.
4) About the London meeting (Joe, Joan and others)

JVM thanks the London team (Corinne and Joe) for their hard work finding a suitable venue for the meeting. Formal invitation, questionnaire and further details will be sent during the month of March.

Registration deadline will be April 19th – important as we will pay cancellation fees in case of cancellations within the final 4 weeks before the meeting.
Minutes from Project Board Meeting, London, UK

May 25-27, 2010

Participants: Peter Øhrstrøm (POE), Morten Aagaard (MA), Henrik Schärfe (HSch), Søren Holm (SH), Daniel Rucareanu (DR), John Torring (JT), Henrik Dalsgaard (HD), Miklós Győri (MG), Krisztina Gy. Stefanik (KS), Joseph Mintz (JM), Jaap Erasmus (JE), Søren Madsen (SM), Gun-Marie J-Wicksén (GMW), Susanne Eriksson (SE), Joan Vuust (JV)

Agenda:

1. Decisions regarding the Y1 Recommendations
2. The use of the Hands toolset at the schools
3. Plans for Prototype 2 Implementation
4. After HANDS Business Model
   a. IPR, v/Julia Power
   b. post HANDS generally
   c. possible future projects in FP7 or otherwise
5. Regarding the Y2 evaluation
6. Planning of the next PB-meeting (dates: 30/11-3/12 or 7/12-10/12)
7. Planning of the final GM

Welcome and introduction. If a vote will be necessary each partner has one vote. POE welcomes Daniel Rucareanu, who is representing WIRU. Minutes from last meeting approved – no comments. Agenda approved.

1. Decisions regarding the Y1 Recommendations. HD and DR presented a draft of the text which should be included in the next annual report. The draft suggested that Android should be the alternative platform for HANDS. It was also suggested that the requested integration trial should be based on Child Logger (CL). PB discussed whether an integration trial involving CL would be acceptable for the commission. Some members argued that in order to be satisfactory the integration trial would have to refer more precisely to some HANDS functionality. The partners agreed that the solution should be as cheap as possible which means that it should only involve one-way communication with the HANDS server.
Decision: PB accepts Android as the alternative platform for HANDS. The coordinator will as soon as possible suggest an integration trial involving a simple HANDS functionality. This solution should be realistic and also as cheap as possible. PB will be asked to decide on the suggestion. When PB has made the decision, HD and DR will update the text which will be included in the annual report.

2. **The use of the Hands toolset at the schools.** The question was how researchers can make requests towards the schools on which tests to make. The PB agrees that it is not a PB role to decide which tests the schools should carry out.

The discussion shows, though, a huge need for teacher motivation, parents’ education, and to choose the “right” pupils for testing P2. The HANDS consortium as such will support this. In order to motivate it is important to share experiences – especially the success stories – focus has mainly been on what has not been a success.

Decision: The UPDG (User Participatory Design Group) continues its work and will gather experiences from the schools to be shared with the rest of the consortium.

3. **Plans for Prototype 2 implementation.** There was some discussion about the GPS component. The consortium was not able to agree whether the GPS component should be part of P2 on the basis of the information available at the time. Integration of GPS component requires approval from the Ethical Board.

The arguments were: The sum of all priority 1 components add up to take longer time than is actually left for software development, the GPS could be rather time consuming and thus other components will have to be left out, the GPS component is the only completely new thing in HANDS as different calendar solutions etc. have been made beforehand. It was suggested that the GPS system would be turned on only if the user presses a “I’m in trouble button”. Also a triangulation solution was discussed.

WIRU requests specifications in order to be able to calculate a more precise use of man months related to the GPS solution.

The suggestions above did not raise questions or comments from the Ethical Board (EB). It was made clear, though, that policies will have to be made at all schools related to parental access to logged information due to a possible GPS component. It is important that all schools make only one policy for all pupils, but not that all schools have the same policy. The EB will provide templates for these policies.

Decision: Consortium Development Meeting (CDM) on June 1 and WIRU receives prioritised list of priority 1 components, fully specified. One week after, WIRU will have calculated the expected use of man months, which will be available in HANDS MOODLE by June 9. The HANDS Project Board (PB) will make a decision on, which components will
be included in P2, based on the prioritised list of Priority I components as well as the calculation of man months from WIRU. PB will have an on-line PB-meeting on June 14 at 14.00 CET. It is decided that the Social Agent will not be a part of P2.

4. After HANDS Business Model. This meeting is considered a preparation meeting for a decision, which will be made at the next PB meeting in Budapest, December 2010. WIDK and AAU (MA) will prepare a detailed description in due time before the meeting. It is pointed out that the deliverable is merely a theoretical business model. In case of an actual implementation of the business model, this will be after HANDS has finished and participation from partners will be at a volunteer basis.

4a. IPR (Sheila Grace, IP and Commercialisation Manager at LSBU, joins the PB) According to the Consortium Agreement it is possible for some partners to move forward regarding a commercialisation in case some partners do not wish to participate. According to SG the C.A. does not provide a precise definition of IPR. When IPR has been defined more precisely a decision will have to be made on whether partners are willing to deposit their IPR in e.g. an external organisation. It has already become clear that neither WIDK, WIRU or EDG will go for a copyright regarding the HANDS system.

WIDK and AAU (MA) will include the IPR definition in the Business Model paper. This will be done on the basis of questions formulated for the partners on their legal position on this. Final decision will be made in December 2010 in Budapest.

4b and c. Post HANDS generally and possible future projects in FP7 or otherwise. The consortium partners are generally interested in project collaboration after HANDS as it seems to be a good and well-functioning consortium.

On June 11, there is a meeting in Brussels regarding future support to the area of marginalised young people within the e-inclusion programme. It would be a good idea if the consortium is well represented at this meeting. MA participates and all partners wishing to participate may contact MA in order to join.

In September two conferences take place. One in Brussels, ICT research 2010, including special sessions presenting the European Union’s funding priorities for the 2.8 Billion Euros of EU funding available for ICT research and development during 2011-2012; and one in Leuven, INCLUSO 2010, within the area of e-inclusion, marginalised young people. MA will participate in both conferences, but the conferences are open to everybody. Please refer to: [http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/events/ict/2010/conference/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/events/ict/2010/conference/index_en.htm) and [http://www.incluso.org/conference](http://www.incluso.org/conference)

If, after P2, the HANDS consortium believes HANDS to be ready for commercialisation, the (new) consortium will apply for funding e.g. in FP7.

5. Regarding the Y2 evaluation. POE has suggested the following dates for Y2 review to the Project Officer: Sept. 14, 21 or 22, but has not yet received any reply. The lead authors
on the deliverables from Y2 as well as deliverables handed in up until the date of review will be expected to participate. Other partners are more than welcome to join.

6. Planning of the next PB-meeting (dates: 30/11-3/12 or 7/12-10/12) Decision: Next PB-meeting will be in Budapest on December 7-9 2010.

7. Planning of the final GM. Decision: Final General Meeting and Project Board meeting will take place in Denmark May 3-5, 2011.
6. APPENDIX: PLAN FOR A NEW HANDS FRAMEWORK AND AN INTEGRATION TRIAL ON ANDROID

The year 1 evaluation of the evaluation of the HANDS project resulted in the following two recommendations from the first review:

Recommendation 1: The consortium will have to provide a plan for the HANDS software development, to be compatible with other software framework more sustainable than the MS Dynamics Mobile framework. This is expected as an appendix to the next periodic report. This plan will have to also include a technical comparison for alternatives to the MS Mobile Dynamics platform. Both open source and commercial solutions may be considered and pros and cons will need to be clearly justified.

Recommendation 2: The technical feasibility of the porting of HANDS Platform to the new software framework of choice needs to be demonstrated. This demonstration should have the form of an "Integration Trial". The consortium is free to decide the framework of this trial (functional and technological), as long as a new or existing functionality is demonstrated to integrate the HANDS Platform with the new software framework of choice.

This document is supposed to fulfill the Recommendation 1.

Technical comparison for alternatives to the MS Dynamics Mobile platform

From an IT architecture viewpoint, the HANDS system consists of a server and a mobile toolset. Both the server and the mobile toolset is an application running on top of an SQL database. The connection between the server and the toolset takes place as synchronizations between the database on a mobile and the server database.

MS dynamics Mobile framework is used to handle most of the synchronization between the databases. The main parts are to establish a stable connection, handle security and do the actual synchronization as a transfer of a number of XML documents.

If the project is to demonstrate that the MS Dynamics Mobile framework can be replaced, the trial must demonstrate:

- The ability to set up a stable connection between the server and a mobile. A one way connection is the lowest acceptance criteria on this subject, if this is feasible as a mean to keep the development costs of the integration trial as low as possible.
- The ability to handle security properly (including login on Windows at the server).
- The ability to encode and transfer information from a mobile database to the server database. Also in this case a one way transfer is the lowest acceptance criteria for an integration trial. This is due to the fact that demonstrating the ability to encode or
decode the XML format used by the HANDS database, is also a fair indication that the other way (decode or encode) is technically possible for the project.

Arguments for the chosen integration trial

There are a number of possible replacements for the MS Dynamics Mobile used in HANDS. First we could try to find another framework similar to MS Dynamics Mobile, and second we could try to move to a completely different platform. The current problems with MS Dynamics Mobile on Windows Mobile 6 are two-fold. First Microsoft has chosen to remove the MS Dynamics Mobile from the market, and the second problem is that Microsoft has announced their Windows Mobile 7, and stated that it will not be backwards compatible with programs written for Windows Mobile 6. This leaves HANDS project with the problem of both replacing the functionality of the MS Dynamics Mobile, but also the requirement to basically re-write the complete toolset for the new Windows Mobile 7 platform.

We have investigated the market, and found a number of alternative frameworks that are able to replace the MS Dynamics Mobile. Fx. ERP2mobile development platform (www.erp2mobile.com). But based on the current experience with the lifetime of such products, the project has chosen to follow the recommendation from the project reviewers and look into Android as a platform for an integration trial. I.e. not only replacing the framework, but also proof that the HANDS concept can be moved to another mobile operating system.

There are several reasons for choosing Android for the integration trial. Among the numbers of available mobile platforms, Android is currently the one which are growing mostly in the market. A quick overview of alternatives:

- iPhone: Very successful on the market, but too expensive for the schools, and schools in London and Hungary states that their pupils risk being attacked and have their phones stolen if they use an iPhone outside school premises. iPhone is also very expensive to develop on, since that require all developers to buy a Mac computer to be able to run the SDK (Software Development Kit) for the iPhone, and to pay for the SDK as well as an yearly fee to Apple.

- Symbian: By far the largest number of phones in the market, but it is a very difficult platform to develop applications for. Each developer will need at least 6 months of training before they’re able to write applications properly for that OS. That training would be too expensive for a project the size of HANDS, and is hence not an option.

- Blackberry (from Research in Motion): This is a very stable platform – both in terms of the evolution of the OS, and in the number of phones in the market. But the Blackberry phones is almost solely used in the business segment, where they have a fair success due to their excellent integration with mail systems and office programs. It is hence not designed with teenagers in mind, and would not have any “coolness” with the teenagers, which makes it much less useful as platform for
HANDS in terms of our main target group of teenagers with autism diagnosis.

- Android: An open source platform, where we have access to the source code of the operating system. This allows the project the possibility of changing things in the phones directly, should this ever be needed. The evolution of the platform is stable and open, with version 2.1 being on the market, and version 2.2 announced. The versions are backwards compatible, and is expected to stay backward compatible for several years, since the platform is modern (no old heritage) and successful. Version 2.2 will bring a speed upgrade of up to a factor 7 for the applications due to an upgrade in the Dalvik engine (execution environment for applications on Android) as the main change. Android is currently the fastest growing operating system in the mobile phone market.

The chosen functionality in the integration trial is described later in the document. The functionality is chosen based on the following priorities:

- The chosen functionality shall enable us to demonstrate an implementation that fulfills the two recommendations from the reviewers of HANDS.
- The chosen functionality shall fulfill the 3 success criteria’s in the chapter above.
- The chosen functionality shall be as small as possible to avoid sacrificing too much functionality in Prototype 2, since this could completely ruin the purpose of the whole HANDS project – both for the target group of young teenagers with autism, and for the universities and their research in the areas used in HANDS.
- The chosen functionality shall be usable for the project in some way, so that the resources used to implement the integration trial are not wasted in any way.

**Android: Introduction**

Android is an open source mobile phone platform developed by the Open Handset Alliance, a business alliance of 65 companies, led by Google, who is also the main developer of the operating system. The OS uses the Linux kernel, but provides a custom software stack on top of it.

Native Android applications are written mainly in Java, with the difference that the Java syntax is used, but the Android implementation is not fully compatible to Java SE. Also, the Dalvik Virtual Machine is used for running the applications, instead of the standard JVM.

The first Android handset, the HTC Dream, was released in August 2008. Since then Android has grown rapidly and is available on a wide variety of hardware from many of the big names in the mobile industry. The fact that Android is open source and can be used free of charge has encouraged many manufacturers to adopt it for their smartphone
offerings. Being open source also allows a great deal of flexibility into adapting the OS to best fit each device it runs on, and allows the manufacturers to differentiate their offerings not only in terms of hardware but also in terms of user experience.

Currently at version 2.1, and growing rapidly in market share and units shipped, the Android platform needs to be taken into account when developing for mobile phones. Its flexibility allows it to be successfully deployed even on “cheaper” hardware, such as the HTC Tattoo, which makes it possible to reach a wider audience than with platform destined only for high-end devices.

As stated above, development is done mainly in Java (with the possibility of using C++ for lower level system access), and Google provides an SDK and a suite of tools to aide application development.

A project such as HANDS can benefit from supporting Android mobile clients because it provides a lower adoption threshold due to the lower cost of the hardware. Moreover, Android is a modern OS designed with application interoperability in mind, which also benefits from a vibrant developer ecosystem. This environment can provide evolution opportunities beyond our current designs, based on the real-world usage.

### Android Look & Feel

Based on the Windows Mobile application, here are some mockups of what the Android app could look like.

The picture below is an example of the main view in an application, from where a tutor can log various actions.
The contents of each tab represent a page, and can be configured by the tutor from and edit view. The Android framework provides great flexibility in customizing the app UI. This is just a mockup, but the design can be further improved by a UI/UX expert.

Another important view is the configuration view. It allows the user to configure pages as well as events on a page. When adding a new page, the user needs to supply a name that will be the title of the corresponding tab in the tab widget.

Adding a new event needs a few more things besides the name:

Communication with the Hands Server

The communication between the mobile application on the android device and the current server will be done using a communication protocol. The protocol that is most suited for this is SOAP. For this we will use the kSOAP2 implementation. kSOAP2 is a SOAP library for J2ME, which is also available for Android. It uses the kXML pull parser internally (one of the most popular XML parsers in the J2me world). This library is used to generate the
outgoing XML from your data structures, as well as parse the incoming XML from the web service into objects.

So now we know that it is possible to work with a SOAP web service from Android, although somewhat cumbersome. However, the services used until now didn't require any form of authentication. This will complicate things, but Android offers the possibility of integrating the web browser into an app through the WebView widget. Authentication could be done just like for a web client, and then reuse that from our app. As simple as this sounds, it will represent the most significant development effort. Keep in mind that we're mixing technologies from two rival companies, both having different ways of doing things.

Another possible way of authenticating is using SOAP headers for each request. The kSOAP library allows this. It all comes down to what the server needs, and we can try to adapt the client.

A schema of the communication system is presented in the design and architecture section.

**Functionality to implement in integration trial: GEO-prompts**

**Intuition:** When the phone enters a predefined region, a function is activated on the phone. This can be:
- A HANDS prompt
- A button will appear on the screen, allowing the user to activate a geo-specific support system.

**Flow**

In COME, a teacher defines a geographical location or region (e.g. by means of a map), and assigns a HANDS function to that region. A location or region consists of a geographical point (latitude and longitude) and a radius. The function can be connected to the reward system.

On the mobile application, a student can respond to a prompt or other message.

The response of the student will be visible to the teacher in COME

**Examples:**
- When approaching home, a prompt is launched reminding the student to do certain things that he tends to forget: say hello, tend to food or medicine, perform certain routine. (“You are almost home. Remember to say Hi to mum”)

- When approaching a problematic area, a prompt is launched offering assistance in terms of phone numbers or PT / SSSI (“You are almost at the junction now. You will be safe if you follow these instructions: …”)
- When reaching an agreed destination, a reassuring message appears on the phone (“You made it J and you have earned 5 points. Hurrah”)

**Design and Architecture**

The GEO-prompt application and communication system between it and the current Hands server is made out of six main components:

- **GUI** – the user interface that provides the interaction mechanism between the user and the application.

- **Business logic** – provides all the data for the GUI using different algorithms. This handles all the logic of the application, the entities and the interaction between them.

- **Persistent data** – contains the report files, event pages and other data that needs to be stored and used by the application.

- **Communication component** – it is described above.

- **Web Service** – it exposes the data needed by Android application from the current Hands database. It responds to the requests made by the mobile device.

- **Hands Server** – is the current server for the application.

A rough schema of this architecture is presented in the image below.
Economical Estimates regarding the development of the Integration Trial

The estimation to this application is done by tackling every major component described above:

- Application UI - 4 weeks
- Server communication
  - Authorization against current application: 2 weeks
  - Communication module: 3 weeks
  - Designing and implementation of the data structures used for server communication: 1 week
  - Implementation of specific requests: 1 week.
- Persistence
  - Saving logs, event pages: 2 weeks
- Business logic: 5 weeks.
- Testing: 2 weeks.

This sums up to a total of 20 weeks of work.
7. **EXPLANATION OF USE OF THE RESOURCES**

The work during Y2 of the project has been carried out according to the description of work in Annex I apart from an accepted delay of six weeks regarding four Deliverables (D1.3.3 Annual progress report; D2.4.2 Prototype 1 test + requirements for Prototype 2; D3.4.1 Evaluation of Prototype 1 + requirements for Prototype 2; D4.3.1 PT Test evaluation of Prototype 1 + requirements for Prototype 2). The delay has some effect on the use of resources within the reporting period in question (Period 2), but the delay is not expected to affect the planned work in the following period of the project (Period 3).

On the following pages, in the Tables 3.1 to 3.11 below, the use of the resources for each partner in Period 2 of the project is explained. Following these another two tables have been added, showing the use of resources as “Man months per deliverable per partner” and per work package compared to the total man month budget of the entire project.

The differences in personnel costs between the actual expenditure and the budget for this reporting period (€ 60,414 less than budget) can mainly be explained by the above mentioned delay in preparing four Deliverables (primarily Beneficiary 1). The hours have been moved to and will be reported in the following period of the project. Other explanations are:

- Hours moved forward to year three of the project for the testing of prototype 2 (primarily Beneficiaries 8, 10)
- Re-planning due to Integration Trial, hours moved to year three (Beneficiary 2)
- Hours moved to year three due to technical issues (Beneficiary 7)

Two partners (Beneficiaries 3 and 6) have overspent according to budget due to hours pushed from year one to year two of the project. Please refer to D1.3.2, Annual Progress Report, Period 1, for further information.

One partner (Beneficiary 4) has moved hours from the year three budget to year two as the work package in question is slightly ahead of schedule.

Expenses declared as “Major cost items” are: Mobile phones (Beneficiaries 1, 3 and 10), camera equipment for field work interviews (Beneficiary 1), equipment in general (Beneficiaries 4 and 10), ADOS test (Beneficiary 10).

The expenses declared as “Remaining Costs” consist mainly of costs related to General Meetings, Project Board meetings, partner meetings, travel costs, conference fees as well as payment of mobile phone contracts. Three partners (Beneficiaries 6, 7 and 8) have declared costs related to the purchase of mobile devises under this headline.

One partner (Beneficiary 1) has subcontracting expenses of € 4,168 related to salary paid to Ethical Board chairman, Period 2, according to the budget.

The consortium as a whole has spent € 21,407 more on Other Direct Costs than budgeted this year. This is mainly due to the fact that most mobile phones have been bought during this reporting period and not in Period 1 as foreseen before project start. Please refer to D1.3.2, Annual Progress Report Period 1 for further information.

In total, the consortium has spent app. € 63,371 less than budgeted during the second year of the project.

Below please find one table per Beneficiary explaining the use of resources for each partner.

Please note that Beneficiary 1 has handed in Adjustment Form Cs related to Year 1 of the project. Explanations to the adjustment can be found in section 8, pp 77-78.
### Table 3.1 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 1 (AAU) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 4, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>143,797</td>
<td>In total 26 man months (mm) (Management: 8.16 mm; Research: 17.85 mm). Prof.: 2.1 mm; Assoc.Prof.: 2.3 mm; Assist.Prof.: 17.1 mm; Technical personnel: 1.1 mm; Admin.: 3.4 mm. We are app. €44,773 below budget which is mainly due to the fact that four Deliverables were postponed to Y3 and thus hours related to the final workload will be reported in the following period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>Ethical Board chairman salary, Y2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td>7,592</td>
<td>Mobile phones; camera equipment for field work interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>19,984</td>
<td>Travel expenses, conference fees, general meetings and project board meetings as well as partner meetings for some of which AAU has paid for the entire consortium, which is why we have overspent on this budget line for Y2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>175,541</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.2 Personnel, Subcontracting and Other Major Cost Items for Beneficiary 2 (WIDK) for the Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>28,447</td>
<td>Development in WP5, Test and support in WP6, Dissemination etc. in WP8. WIDK spent too many man months in year 1 of the project (2008-2009), and hence used app. €6,000 too much during the first year mainly due to performing tasks planned for year 2. This is now levelled out, and we have actually spent a little less than planned during Y2. This is due to some activities moved to Y3, and the need for re-planning some activities due to new tasks requested by the reviewers of Y1. The main task in that respect is an “integration trial” that has been requested on Android. These activities will be reported in Y3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Subcontracting | Major cost items | Remaining costs | 1,686 | Travel and meeting expenses. |

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C** 30,133

### Table 3.3 Personnel, Subcontracting and Other Major Cost Items for Beneficiary 3 (WIRU) for the Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 6</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>96,552</td>
<td>Salaries of 31 developers and 1 project manager during year 2 of the project - a total of 43 man months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontracting</th>
<th>Major cost items</th>
<th>Remaining costs</th>
<th>803</th>
<th>1 HTC DIAMOND and 1 HTC DESIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings Stockholm, Brussels, Aalborg, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C** 101,609
### Table 3.4 Personnel, Subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 4 (EDG) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>43,333</td>
<td>7.2 man months. 1.1 mm on D5.2.1 (hours were moved to Y1); 0.7 mm on D5.3.1; 5.4 mm on D5.4.1. As this WP has progressed faster than expected, hours related to D5.4.1 have been moved from Y3 to Y2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>2,043</td>
<td>Travel and meeting expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</strong></td>
<td>45,866</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.5 Personnel, Subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 5 (ELTE) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>11,893</td>
<td>Salaries of 1 researchers for 12 months, 1 researcher for 9 months, 1 research assistants for 6 months, 1 research assistant for 2 months and one administrative assistant for 12 months – according to HANDS productive hours – a total of 19,36 man months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>Travel and meeting expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</strong></td>
<td>20,842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.6 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 6 (LSBU) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>83,392</td>
<td>This spend comes in over budget, reflecting, as anticipated at end of Y1, additional work undertaken in Year 2 for a) the WP3 data analysis, including staff resources for transcription and translation costs and b) additional test coordination and implementation resources for WP6. Significant additional costs are expected in Year 3 for a) WP3 data analysis, b) WP8 dissemination and c) WP6 implementation of prototype 2, including development of guidance for teachers on links with pedagogic practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>13,045</td>
<td>Travel expenses for project meetings and mobile devices. This spend comes in over budget. As projected at end Y1, there have been increased costs for travel and subsistence, particularly in relation to data collection activities in WP3. Further, as projected at end of Year 1, there has been expenditure on mobile devices and other project equipment in Year 2, which was originally planned for Year 1. It is expected that there will be significant additional costs for WP8 – both for the Applicability in Mainstream Settings Task Deliverable and for the dissemination of the results of the prototype 1 and prototype 2 evaluations and proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C** 96,437
### Table 3.7 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 7 (NAS) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 6, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>41,758</td>
<td>Salaries costs (per hour) for Senior Education Psychologist, Assist Psychologist, Teachers and Bursar. Teachers’ time was not used as much as predicted due to technical problems with our telephone provided in the UK as well as the central server in Aalborg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>13,026</td>
<td>Telephones, contracts and assessment equipment. Travel and meeting expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</td>
<td></td>
<td>54,784</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.8 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 8 (AAK) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3, 6, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>51,446</td>
<td>Salaries for one headmaster, one head of department, one part-time teacher, 7 teachers and 7 assistants. App. 11 MM has been used in Year 2. We have saved 2.53 MM for Y3 for testing prototype 2, where we expect to recruit a few more pupils. Also we have hired a part-time teacher for the HANDS project. Besides we have to put some effort into the testing of the Android phone. In total we have 9.73 MM left for Y3, which we expect to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>Travel expenses for General Meeting in London. Purchase of mobile phones and payment of contracts. Visit from Svedenskolan and Helen Alison School in October 2009. Payment of psychologists, who performed tests during the fall 2009 and early spring 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</td>
<td></td>
<td>57,614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.9 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 9 for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beneficiary 9 left the consortium during the negotiation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3.10 Personnel, subcontracting and other major cost items for Beneficiary 10 (UP AB (SE)) for the period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Package</th>
<th>Item description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4, 6</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>37,358</td>
<td>Teachers, psychologist, Head Master – salaries. New students will participate in the testing of prototype 2 in Y3 and new personnel will be hired for the project during the following year, thus hours from Y2 have been moved to Y3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost items</td>
<td>7,815</td>
<td>PDAs, computer, ADOS test eq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>10,983</td>
<td>Travel and meeting expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</strong></td>
<td>56,156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Package</td>
<td>Item description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Explanations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 6, 8</td>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>43,174</td>
<td>Salaries of 10 professionals and 2 administrative from 1st June, 2009 until 31st May, 2010 according to their work-hours in the HANDS project – a total of 29.75 mm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Major cost item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remaining costs</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>Travel and meeting costs (Stockholm, Aalborg, London meetings); conference fees; computer parts, reparation costs, software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DIRECT COSTS AS CLAIMED ON FORM C</td>
<td>48,457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following two tables, Tables 4.1 and 4.2, show the use of resources expressed by Man Months per Deliverable per Partner compared to the total number of Man Months planned during the lifetime of the project.

**Table 4.1: HANDS Man months (MM) per Deliverable per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>AAU</th>
<th>WIDK</th>
<th>WIRU</th>
<th>EDG</th>
<th>ELTE</th>
<th>LSBU</th>
<th>NAS</th>
<th>EGE</th>
<th>UPAB/SV</th>
<th>AF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.2: Handover Man months (MM) per Deliverable per Partner**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WP</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>AAU</th>
<th>WIDK</th>
<th>WIRU</th>
<th>EDG</th>
<th>ELTE</th>
<th>LSBU</th>
<th>NAS</th>
<th>EGE</th>
<th>UPAB/SV</th>
<th>AF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
<td>MM Y1</td>
<td>MM Y2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP no.</td>
<td>Deliverable no.</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Budget</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Y1</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Y2</td>
<td>Total MM per WP Budget</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Y1</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Y2</td>
<td>Total MM per D. Y1+Y2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1.1</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3.1</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3.2</td>
<td>M12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3.3</td>
<td>M24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3.4</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5.1</td>
<td>M12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5.2</td>
<td>M24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5.3</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7,26</td>
<td>8,17</td>
<td>15,43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26,58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>M21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>28,36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43,68</td>
<td>34,86</td>
<td>78,54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
<td>M8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,52</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.4.1</td>
<td>M24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5.1</td>
<td>M34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11,52</td>
<td>11,8</td>
<td>23,32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1.1</td>
<td>M5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17,16</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3.1</td>
<td>M24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5.5</td>
<td>M34</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19,39</td>
<td>17,47</td>
<td>36,86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>M9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>M14</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40,4</td>
<td>14,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3.1</td>
<td>M26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.4.1</td>
<td>M28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,4</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>46,2</td>
<td>45,2</td>
<td>91,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2.1.</td>
<td>M11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11,99</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3.1</td>
<td>M20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4,33</td>
<td>31,54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4.1</td>
<td>M33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,75</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>18,07</td>
<td>40,84</td>
<td>58,91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4.1</td>
<td>M25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,21</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6,21</td>
<td>1,47</td>
<td>7,68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>M21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>M33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>M33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>M36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>7,25</td>
<td>11,55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total  | 438           | 156,63 | 167,06               | 438           | 156,63 | 167,06               | 323,69           |
8. FINANCIAL STATEMENTS – FORM C AND SUMMARY
FINANCIAL REPORT

Separate financial statements, Form Cs, from each beneficiary can be found in Annex A to this report as well as the Summary Financial Report.

Please note that two Beneficiary 1 has handed in an Adjustment Form C to Period 1 of the project.

Comments:
For the Beneficiary 1 the adjustments on Management is primarily concerned with the reporting of the salary for year one for the HANDS Ethical Board chairman (subcontracting €4,166), which was paid after the end of period one reported last year, re. D1.3.2 Annual Report, Period 1. Besides an additional amount of € 1,167 Personnel Costs has been reported as this amount was reported as RTD in the Year 1 report, but according to timesheets the amount relates to Management hours, thus corrected this year. Also additional €32 has been added to the Adjustment Form C, which are due to bank fees related to the transfer of the pre-financing not included in the year one report. The RTD-Adjustment of € -11,322 is due to a mistake in the calculation of the hourly rate, due to one person working more hours than the yearly rate (€ -10,365), thus the hourly rate has been recalculated. The amount left (€ -1,167) has been explained above. All corrections are related to findings discovered by either the Beneficiary or the independent Auditor. Please refer to the attached Certificate on the financial statements for further information. All corrections mentioned are now corrected in the financial system of the Beneficiary.

Further, the Adjustment Form C should consider the declaration of additional interest yielded by the pre-financing. This figure (€ 846) has been added to the Period 2 Form C, though, after consulting the NEF FAQ for guidance, as it was not possible to add the figure to the Adjustment Form C in the NEF tool system:

“You have to declare the adjustment in the Form C of the period you are working on: please indicate the cumulative of the current period and the adjustment you declare. Please ask to the coordinator to add short note in the "Other" documents of the periodic report to make Commission aware of this adjustment. In the future we will enhance this functionality.”


The auditor PricewaterhouseCoopers performed the audit of the first two years of the Beneficiary 1 HANDS financial statements and a Certificate on the financial statements is
provided in Annex B. The total price of the audit amounts to €6,640. This figure has been split in two, €3,320 on Adjustment Form C and equally €3,320 on the Period 2 Form C. This is due to the fact, that the NEF tool automatically duplicates the figure from one Form C to the other, and thus to avoid that the full amount is reported twice. This amount is not yet part of the financial statement; therefore this is only for information. The invoice has been paid after the end of Period 2 and hence will be reported with the Period three financial statement.
9. CERTIFICATES
List of Certificates which are due for this period, in accordance with Article II.4.4 of the Grant Agreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Organisation short name</th>
<th>Certificate on the financial statements provided?</th>
<th>Any useful comment, in particular if a certificate is not provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Covering Y1 and Y2 of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WIDK</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WIRU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>EDG</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ELTE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EGE</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UP AB</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex A – Form C from each partner

- Summary Financial Report
- Form Cs from each partner including Adjustment Form C from Beneficiary one
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>187,942</td>
<td>140,956</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,422</td>
<td>90,422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>278,364</td>
<td>231,378</td>
<td>231,378</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes (1)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>-18,451</td>
<td>-13,838</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12,367</td>
<td>-7,754</td>
<td>-7,754</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>WIDK</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>43,693</td>
<td>32,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,693</td>
<td>32,769</td>
<td>32,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>WIRU</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>159,526</td>
<td>119,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159,526</td>
<td>119,644</td>
<td>119,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>EDG</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>73,386</td>
<td>55,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73,386</td>
<td>55,039</td>
<td>55,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ELTE</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>33,347</td>
<td>25,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,347</td>
<td>25,010</td>
<td>25,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>SBU</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>154,299</td>
<td>115,724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,299</td>
<td>115,724</td>
<td>115,724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>87,654</td>
<td>65,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87,654</td>
<td>65,740</td>
<td>65,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AAK</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>92,182</td>
<td>69,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92,182</td>
<td>69,136</td>
<td>69,136</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>UP AB</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>89,849</td>
<td>67,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,849</td>
<td>67,386</td>
<td>67,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>CP</td>
<td>77,531</td>
<td>58,148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,531</td>
<td>58,148</td>
<td>58,148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>980,958</td>
<td>735,714</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,506</td>
<td>96,506</td>
<td>96,506</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,077,464</td>
<td>832,220</td>
<td>832,220</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project**

**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Funding scheme</th>
<th>Collaborative project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>HANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period from</th>
<th>Is this an adjustment to a previous statement ?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name</th>
<th>Participant Identity Code</th>
<th>Organization Short Name</th>
<th>Beneficiary nr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AALBORG UNIVERSITET</td>
<td>999904034</td>
<td>AAU</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</th>
<th>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate_SCALE of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>97,709</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46,088</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>143,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,168</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>19,755</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,821</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>70,478</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>187,942</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>278,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>140,956</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90,422</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>231,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)  

3. Declaration of interest yielded by the pre-financing (to be completed only by the coordinator)

Did the pre-financing you received generate any interest according to Art.II.19?  
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  
Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the auditor</th>
<th>Cost of the certificate (in €), if charged under this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the auditor</th>
<th>Cost of the certificate (in €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary's Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Gajhede</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date & signature
### Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>Collaborative project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Period
- **Period from**: 01/06/2009
- **To**: 31/05/2010
- **Is this adjustment to a previous statement?**: Yes
- **Adjustment relates to Period**: 1

#### Participant Identity Code
- **Participant Identity Code**: 999904034

#### Legal Name
- **Legal Name**: AALBORG UNIVERSITET

#### Organisation Short Name
- **Organisation Short Name**: AAU

#### Beneficiary number
- **Beneficiary number**: 1

#### Funding % for RTD activities (A)
- **Funding % for RTD activities (A)**: 75.0

#### Indicators and Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>-11,532</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-10,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>-6,919</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td>-18,451</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-12,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum EU contribution</strong></td>
<td>-13,838</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Requested EU contribution</strong></td>
<td>-13,838</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,084</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7,754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maximum EU contribution**: -13,838
**Requested EU contribution**: -13,838

#### Declaration of receipts

**Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II. 17 of the grant agreement?**
- **No**

#### Declaration of interest yielded by the pre-financing (to be completed only by the coordinator)

**Did the pre-financing you received generate any interest according to Art.II.19?**
- **No**

#### Certificate on the methodology

**Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?**
- **No**

**Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?**
- **No**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the auditor</th>
<th>Cost of the certificate (in €), if charged under this project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PricewaterhouseCoopers</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Certificate on the financial statements

**Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?**
- **Yes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the auditor</th>
<th>Cost of the certificate (in €)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Gajhede</td>
<td>Date &amp; signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**We declare on our honour that:**

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.
### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>28,447</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>13,560</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>43,693</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>32,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>32,769</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funding % for RTD activities (A)**: 75.0%

**If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %**: N/A

### 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II. 17 of the grant agreement?

If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

- **No**

### 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?

- **No**

### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?

- **No**

### 6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary's Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael Aaen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date & signature**
**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Funding scheme</th>
<th>Collaborative project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>224216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Acronym</th>
<th>HANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period from</th>
<th>01/06/2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is this an adjustment to a previous statement?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name</th>
<th>WIRTEK S.R.L.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Identity Code</th>
<th>999597708</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Short Name</th>
<th>WIRU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary nr</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</th>
<th>75.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flate-rate(scale of unit (in €))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>96,552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>5,057</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>57,917</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>159,526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>119,644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>119,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>119,644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum EU contribution</th>
<th>119,644</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requested EU contribution</th>
<th>119,644</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II. 17 of the grant agreement?

If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

- **No**

### 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1 ?

- **No**

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4 ?

- **No**

### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4 ?

- **No**

### 6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary's Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan Koblinska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date &amp; signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project**

**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>Collaborative project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period from</td>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this an adjustment to a previous statement?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Name</td>
<td>EDVANTAGE GROUP AS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identity Code</td>
<td>999633210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Short Name</td>
<td>EDG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary nr</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>43,333</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>27,520</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,386</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>73,386</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>55,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>55,039</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55,039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)  
**No**

### 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  
Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?  
**No**

### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  
**No**

### 6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary's Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Tørring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date &amp; signature</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>11,893</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>8,949</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>12,505</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>33,347</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>25,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>25,010</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II. 17 of the grant agreement?

If yes, please mention the amount (in €)

No

## 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?

Yes

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?

No

## 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?

No

## 6. Beneficiary's declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bartha, Edit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date & signature
**FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project**

**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period from</td>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rateSCALE of unit (in €)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>83,392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>83,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>57,862</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>154,299</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>115,724</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>115,724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Declaration of receipts**

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  **No**

**4. Certificate on the methodology**

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  **No**

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?  **No**

**5. Certificate on the financial statements**

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  **No**

**6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour**

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary’s Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K.A. Bowen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date &amp; signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project

**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>Collaborative project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period from</td>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Name</td>
<td>THE NATIONAL AUTISTIC SOCIETY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identity Code</td>
<td>999663086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Short Name</td>
<td>NAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary nr</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate scale of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>41,758</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>13,026</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>32,870</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>87,654</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>87,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>65,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>65,740</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II. 17 of the grant agreement? __No__

If yes, please mention the amount (in €) ____________

#### 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1? __No__

Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4? __No__

#### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4? __No__

#### 6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

**Beneficiary’s Stamp**

**Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement**

Jaci Ashton Smith

**Date & signature**

2010-08-31 12:07
**FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project**

Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>Collaborative project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period from</td>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this an adjustment to a previous statement?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Name</th>
<th>AALBORG KOMMUNE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identity Code</td>
<td>999652804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Short Name</td>
<td>AAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary nr</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</th>
<th>75.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>51,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>6,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>34,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>92,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>69,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>69,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Declaration of receipts**

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  
If yes, please mention the amount (in €)  

**4. Certificate on the methodology**

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  
Is there a certificate on the methodology provided by an independent auditor and accepted by the Commission according to Art.II.4.4?  

**5. Certificate on the financial statements**

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  

**6. Beneficiary’s declaration on its honour**

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary's Stamp</th>
<th>Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henrik Thomsen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date &amp; signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**FP7 - Grant Agreement - Annex VI - Collaborative project**

**Form C - Financial Statement (to be filled in by each beneficiary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>224216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Acronym</td>
<td>HANDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding scheme</td>
<td>Collaborative project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period from</td>
<td>01/06/2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>31/05/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Name</td>
<td>UTVECKLINGSPEDAGOGIK SVERIGE AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Identity Code</td>
<td>999601976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation Short Name</td>
<td>UP AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary nr</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding % for RTD activities (A)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If flat rate for indirect costs, specify %</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rate/scale of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>37,358</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37,358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>18,798</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>33,693</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>89,849</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>89,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>67,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td>67,386</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Declaration of receipts

Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  
No

### 4. Certificate on the methodology

Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  
No

### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  
No

### 6. Beneficiary's declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

**Beneficiary's Stamp**

**Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement**

Niklas Ahlström

Date & signature

2010-08-31 12:07
### 1. Declaration of eligible costs/lump sum/flat-rateSCALE of unit (in €)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Activity</th>
<th>RTD (A)</th>
<th>Demonstration (B)</th>
<th>Management (C)</th>
<th>Other (D)</th>
<th>Total (A+B+C+D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel costs</td>
<td>43,174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracting</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other direct costs</td>
<td>5,283</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>29,074</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total costs</td>
<td>77,531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>77,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum EU contribution</td>
<td>58,148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requested EU contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58,148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Declaration of receipts

- Did you receive any financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge from third parties or did the project generate any income which could be considered a receipt according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement?  
  - No

#### 4. Certificate on the methodology

- Do you declare average personnel costs according to Art.II.14.1?  
  - No

#### 5. Certificate on the financial statements

- Is there a certificate on the financial statements provided by an independent auditor attached to this financial statement according to Art.II.4.4?  
  - No

#### 6. Beneficiary's declaration on its honour

We declare on our honour that:

- the costs declared above are directly related to the resources used to attain the objectives of the project and fall within the definition of eligible costs specified in Articles II.14 and II.15 of the grant agreement, and, if relevant, Annex III and Article 7 (special clauses) of the grant agreement;
- the receipts declared above are the only financial transfers or contributions in kind, free of charge, from third parties and the only income generated by the project which could be considered as receipts according to Art.II.17 of the grant agreement;
- the interest declared above is the only interest yielded by the pre-financing which falls within the definition of Art.II.19 of the grant agreement;
- there is full supporting documentation to justify the information hereby declared. It will be made available at the request of the Commission and in the event of an audit by the Commission and/or by the Court of Auditors and/or their authorised representatives.

**Beneficiary's Stamp**  
**Name of the Person(s) Authorised to sign this Financial Statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dr. Anna Balázs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date &amp; signature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex B – Certificate on the financial statements

- Certificate on the financial statements, Beneficiary 1
To:
Aalborg University
Frederik Bajers Vej 5
9220 Aalborg Ø

For the attention of:
Joan Vuust Milborg
Kroghstræde 1, lokale 2-013m
9220 Aalborg Ø

Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs claimed under a Grant Agreement financed under the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7)

In accordance with our contract dated 1 May 2009 with Aalborg University ("the Beneficiary") and the terms of reference attached thereto (appended to this Report), we provide our Independent Report of Factual Findings ("the Report"), as specified below.

Objective

We, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Statsautoriseret Revisionsaktieselskab, established in Skelagervej 1A, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark represented for signature of this Report by Michael Stenskrog, State Authorised Public Accountant, have performed agreed-upon procedures regarding the total costs of EUR 589,118.85 declared in the Financial Statements of Aalborg University hereinafter referred to as the Beneficiary, to which this Report is attached, and which is to be presented to the Commission of the European Communities under grant agreement Helping Autism diagnosed young people Navigate and Develop So- cially, HANDS, 224216 for the following periods 1 June 2008 to 31 May 2009 and 1 June 2009 to 31 May 2010. This engagement involved performing certain specified procedures, the results of which the European Commission uses to draw conclusions as to the eligibility of the costs claimed.

Scope of Work

Our engagement was carried out in accordance with:
- the terms of reference appended to this Report and:
- International Standard on Related Services ("ISRS") 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as promulgated by the
International Federation of Accountants ('IFAC);

- the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IFAC. Although ISRS 4400 provides that independence is not a requirement for agreed-upon procedures engagements, the European Commission requires that the Auditor also complies with the independence requirements of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants;

As requested, we have only performed the procedures set out in the terms of reference for this engagement and we have reported our factual findings on those procedures in the table appended to this Report.

The scope of these agreed upon procedures has been determined solely by the European Commission and the procedures were performed solely to assist the European Commission in evaluating whether the costs claimed by the Beneficiary in the accompanying Financial Statement has been claimed in accordance with the Grant Agreement. The Auditor is not responsible for the suitability and appropriateness of these procedures.

Because the procedures performed by us did not constitute either an audit or a review made in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, we do not express any assurance on the Financial Statements.

Had we performed additional procedures or had we performed an audit or review of the Financial Statements of the Beneficiary in accordance with International Standards on Auditing, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Sources of Information

The Report sets out information provided to us by the management of the Beneficiary in response to specific questions or as obtained and extracted from the Beneficiary’s information and accounting systems.

Factual Findings

The above mentioned Financial Statements per Activity were examined and all procedures specified in the appended table for our engagement were carried out. On the basis of the results of these procedures, we found:

- All documentation and accounting information to enable us to carry out these procedures has been provided to us by the Beneficiary. Except as indicated below, no exceptions were noted.

Exceptions

In some cases, the Auditor was not able to successfully complete the procedures specified.
These exceptions are as follows:

- In connection with our review, we observed that time registration is made in respect of employees only in the periods (weeks) in which they are working on a project under the seventh framework programme, and therefore the standard time cannot be fully documented;
- The hourly rates of all employees have been adjusted by more than 1,590 hours on an annual basis;
- The time-records for one employee stated 138 hours under "management" and 38 hours under "other activities". The salary for the hours has been included in research, which is correct according to our information as timesheets had been incorrectly filled in. The hours correspond to EUR 8,506.61;
- We have noted that in two instances the name of the project was not indicated on the time sheets. We have subsequently received a confirmation from the project manager stating that the hours were related to the project in question;
- We have observed that for one employee salary for 17 hours of research had erroneously been included which relates to management. The salary of EUR 1,167.48 has been adjusted in Form C;
- We have observed minor differences in the hourly rate used for a total of five employees, which entails that on an overall basis an excess amount of EUR 675.42 has been entered on the project;
- We have noted that with respect to three vouchers, VAT has not been deducted. Additional EUR 441.56 should have been deducted;
- Tips of EUR 4.32 were included. No documentation of this exists;
- Expenses included were understated by EUR 6.93 in respect of one voucher;
- We have noted that one voucher of EUR 62.29 had been certified only by the traveller;
- In respect of one voucher VAT had been deducted although no VAT is stated on the voucher. An excess amount of EUR 36.18 has been deducted;
- We have noted a difference relating to conversion during period 2 of a total of EUR 49.40. The matter has been adjusted in the final Form C;
- Interest on pre-financing was understated by EUR 845.88. The matter has been adjusted in Form C.

**Emphasis of Matter**

Without qualifying our Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs claimed under a Grant Agreement financed under the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7), we point out that for 3 employees Aalborg Universitet has not recorded 1,477 hours on an annual basis in the time registration but instead up to 1,590 hours. The registration of up to 1,590 hours instead of 1,477 hours in the time registration implies increased personnel costs of EUR 1,643.19.
Use of this Report

This Report is solely for the purpose set forth in the above objective. This Report is prepared solely for the confidential use of the Beneficiary and the European Commission and solely for the purpose of submission to the European Commission in connection with the requirements as set out in Article II.4.4 of the Grant Agreement. This Report may not be relied upon by the Beneficiary or by the European Commission for any other purpose, nor may it be distributed to any other parties. The European Commission may only disclose this Report to others who have regulatory rights of access to it, in particular the European Anti Fraud Office and the European Court of Auditors.

This Report relates only to the Financial Statements specified above and does not extend to any other financial statements of the Beneficiary.

No conflict of interest exists between the Auditor and the Beneficiary in establishing this Report. The fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report was EUR 8,300 of which VAT is equal to EUR 1,660.

We look forward to discussing our Report with you and would be pleased to provide any further information or assistance which may be required.

Aalborg, 12 July 2010

PricewaterhouseCoopers
Statsautoriseret Revisionsaktieselskab

Michael Stender
State Authorised Public Accountant

Appendix I: Procedures performed by the Auditor
Appendix II: Terms of reference
The hours have been included in research which is correct according to management and 48 hours under "other activities". The salary for 18 hours under the project manager was the less important part of the project. The evidence selected was authorized by the project manager. The evidence was collected in a monthly basis using a paper-based system.

For the same section examine and describe the time recording of employees (paper or computer daily/weekly/monthly). Signed.

1. $900 hours on an annual basis.

The hourly rates of all employees have been adjusted by more than fully documented.

The framework program, and therefore the standard time cannot be changed, unless the project under the second research is included in respect of employees only in the periods (weeks) in which in connection with our review, we accepted that time registration is within 1.16.

The average number of productive hours for the employee selected was 1.16.

The hourly rate is represented by the percentage of hours worked available by the employee in a year after the deduction of holidays, sick leave and other entitlements. This calculation was provided by the benefits.

Benefits:

When calculating a representative sample, the calculation should use a random sample.

Recorded hourly benefits and overtime hours for personal

Procedures performed by the author

Appendix 1 - Helping Autism Diagnosed Young People Navigate and Develop Socially, HANDS, 22416
**Subcontracting**

| Procedure | Standard Procedure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procurement process and employment conditions of personal staff</th>
<th>Employment performance and employment conditions of personal staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The auditors should obtain the employment contracts of the employees selected and compare with the standard employment terms and conditions.</td>
<td>The auditors should note whether the employment contracts are in accordance with the national legislation currently in force and the terms and conditions are consistent with the national legislation currently in force.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The employees reported the following differences in the employment contracts:

- **Unfair Dismissal**: The employee was dismissed without notice, whereas the employment contract stipulated a minimum notice period. The auditors should verify the legal validity of the dismissal and the correctness of the notice period.

- **Wage Deductions**: The employee reported that wages were deducted for non-remediable events, which is not stipulated in the employment contract. The auditors should verify the legality of these deductions and ensure they comply with labor laws.

- **Working Hours**: The employee reported working more than the standard working hours indicated in the employment contract. The auditors should verify the accuracy of the working hours stated and ensure they are within the legal limits.

- **Medical Insurance**: The employee reported that the medical insurance coverage provided by the employer was inadequate compared to the standard coverage stipulated in the employment contract. The auditors should verify the adequacy of the insurance coverage and its compliance with labor laws.

- **Pension Contributions**: The employee reported that the employer did not contribute to the pension fund, whereas the employment contract stipulates that the employer must contribute. The auditors should verify the employer's contributions and ensure they comply with labor laws.

**Procurement Process**

- **Subcontracting**: No exceptions were noted.

- **Employment Performance**: The employees were directly hired by the subcontractor in accordance with the national legislation currently in force. The auditors should verify the legal validity of the employment contracts and ensure they are consistent with the national legislation currently in force.
| Procedures | 5. Obtain a written description from the Beneficiary referring to the
|            | party resources used and company with Annex I to the Client.
| 6. Inspect documents and obtain communications that substantiate
|            | the author obtained incomplete documents for each subcontractor.
| 7. Allocation of equipment subject to depreciation is correctly
|            | identified and allocated to the project.
| Other Direct Costs | 
| Minimum 20% or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater.
| Full coverage if less than 20% items, otherwise a sample of
| the asset value was assigned to the invoice and no VAT.
| Purchase documentation and where relevant the project
| has documented the link with the project on the invoice and
| accompanied records and underlying invoices. The boundary
| of the author exceeded the equipment charged to the project.
| No exceptions were noted.
| Commercial contracts that are prior to the beginning of the project
| have been awarded as part of an existing framework.
| The contracts had been awarded as part of an existing framework,
| in support of the final choice of subcontractor. On the
| basis of the formation of the contract for money has been prepared by the
| owner, and where necessary, the value and the invoice process was followed and
| the author obtained incomplete documents for each subcontractor.
| No exceptions were noted.
| Standard factual findings and basis for exception reporting
| No exceptions were noted.
| Same
| to the Beneficiary's normal accounting policy and found to be the
| usual cost to charge the equipment to the project was comprised
| on other identifiable indirect costs were charged. The depreciation
| on the equipment that was charged to the invoice and no VAT.
| Allocation of equipment subject to depreciation is correctly
| identified and allocated to the project.
| Minimum 20% or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater.
| Full coverage if less than 20% items, otherwise a sample of
| the asset value was assigned to the invoice and no VAT.
| Purchase documentation and where relevant the project
| has documented the link with the project on the invoice and
| accompanied records and underlying invoices. The boundary
| of the author exceeded the equipment charged to the project.
| No exceptions were noted.
| Commercial contracts that are prior to the beginning of the project
| have been awarded as part of an existing framework.
| The contracts had been awarded as part of an existing framework,
| in support of the final choice of subcontractor. On the
| basis of the formation of the contract for money has been prepared by the
| owner, and where necessary, the value and the invoice process was followed and
| the author obtained incomplete documents for each subcontractor.
| No exceptions were noted.
| Standard factual findings and basis for exception reporting
| No exceptions were noted.
| Same
| to the Beneficiary's normal accounting policy and found to be the
| usual cost to charge the equipment to the project was comprised
| on other identifiable indirect costs were charged. The depreciation
| on the equipment that was charged to the invoice and no VAT.
been deducted.

In respect of one voucher EUR 36.18 has been deducted although no
the same. No VAT or other Liable Indirect taxes were charged.

The costs charged were compared to the invoices and found to be
allocation in the project accounts.

The auditor inspected the sample and found that the Beneficiary had
consumables correctly identified and allocated to the project.

were included. No documentation of this exists.

We have noted that one voucher of EUR 62.79 had been certified.

We have noted that with respect to these vouchers VAT has not

Beneficiary.

Travel expenses were in line with the written policy provided by the
the same. No VAT or other Liable Indirect taxes were charged.

The costs charged were compared to the invoices and found to be
allocation in the project accounts.

The auditor inspected the sample and found that the Beneficiary had

Standard financial finding and basis for exception reporting

Appendix I - Helping Autism Diagnosed Young People Navigate and Develop Socially, HANDS, 22426
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, inspection and control exchange rates into Euros.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Rural Aid Fund and basis for exception reporting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting Period</td>
<td>Of a total of EUR 49.0. The manner has been addressed in this manual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We have noted a difference relating to conversion during period 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The rural applicability of the first day of the month following the end of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The author compared the exchange rates used for conversion with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The applicable official exchange rates established by the European</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The author examined the relevant project accounts and obtained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount included in the claim regarding receivables is the same as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount recorded in the project accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The author examined the relevant project accounts with the interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The beneficiary is obliged to deduct from his claim any receivables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The matter has been addressed in Form C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interests on pre-financing were understood by EUR 84.88. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shown in the bulk transactions and found items to be the same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The author compared the relevant project accounts with the interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obliged to declare interests yielded on pre-financing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identification of interest yielded on pre-financing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount recorded in the project accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount included in the claim regarding receivables is the same as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>represent a complete record of the sources of income connected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with the provision of the beneficiary that the amounts listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the name of the beneficiary, with its co-ordination of the project is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aalborg University
Fredrik Bajers Vej 5
DK-9220 Aalborg Ø

1 May 2009

Terms of Reference for Independent Reports of Factual Findings on costs claimed under Grant Agreements financed under the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7)

The following are the terms of reference (‘ToR’) on which Aalborg University ‘the Beneficiary’ agrees to engage PricewaterhouseCoopers ‘the Auditor’ to provide independent reports of factual findings on Financial Statements prepared by the Beneficiary and to reports in connection with European Community financed grant agreements concerning the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7). Where in these ToR the ‘European Commission’ is mentioned this refers to its quality as signatory of the Grant Agreements with the Beneficiary. The European Community is not a party to this engagement.

Responsibilities of the Parties to the Engagement

‘The Beneficiary’ refers to the legal entity that is receiving the grants and that has signed the Grant Agreements with the European Commission.

- The Beneficiary is responsible for preparing Financial Statements for the Actions financed by the Grant Agreements in compliance with such agreements and providing it to the Auditor, and for ensuring that these Financial Statements can be properly reconciled to the Beneficiary’s accounting and bookkeeping system and to the underlying accounts and records. Notwithstanding the procedures to be carried out, the Beneficiary remains at all times responsible and reliable for the accuracy of the Financial Statements.

- The Beneficiary is responsible for the factual statements which will enable the Auditor to carry out the procedures specified, and will provide the Auditor with a
written representation letter supporting these statements, clearly dated and stating the period covered by the statements.

- The Beneficiary accepts that the ability of the Auditor to perform the procedures required by this engagement effectively depends upon the Beneficiary providing full and free access to the Beneficiary’s staff and its accounting and other relevant records.

'The Auditor' refers to the Auditor who is responsible for performing the agreed-upon procedures as specified in these ToR, and for submitting independent reports of factual findings to the Beneficiary.

- The Auditor must be independent from the Beneficiary.


- The procedures to be performed are specified by the European Commission and the Auditor is not responsible for the suitability and appropriateness of these procedures.

Subject of the Engagement

The subject of this engagement is the interim and final Financial Statements in connection with the Grant Agreements received by Aalborg University.

Reason for the Engagement

The Beneficiary is required to submit to the European Commission a certificate on Financial Statements in the form of independent reports of factual findings produced by an external auditor in support of the payment requested by the Beneficiary under Article II.4 of the Grant Agreements. The Authorising Officer of the Commission requires these Reports as he makes the payment of costs requested by the Beneficiary conditional on the factual findings of these Reports.

Engagement Type and Objective

This constitutes an engagement to perform specific agreed-upon procedures regarding independent reports of factual findings on costs claimed under the Grant Agreements.

As this engagement is not an assurance engagement the Auditor does not provide an audit opinion and expresses no assurance. The European Commission derives its assurance by
drawing its own conclusions from the factual findings reported by the Auditor on the Financial Statements and the payment requests of the Beneficiary relating thereto.

The Auditor shall include in its Reports that no conflict of interest exists between it and the Beneficiary in establishing these Reports, as well as the fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Reports.

Scope of Work

The Auditor shall undertake this engagement in accordance with these ToR and:

- in accordance with the International Standard on Related Services (‘ISRS’) 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as promulgated by the IFAC;

- in compliance with the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IFAC. Although ISRS 4400 provides that independence is not a requirement for agreed-upon procedures engagements, the European Commission requires that the Auditor also complies with the independence requirements of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants.

The Auditor should plan the work so that the procedures can be effectively performed. For this purpose he performs the procedures specified in appendix I of these Terms of Reference and uses the evidence obtained from these procedures as the basis for the Reports of factual findings.

Reporting

The Reports of factual findings, an example of which is attached to this ToR, should describe the purpose and the agreed-upon procedures of the engagement in sufficient detail in order to enable the Beneficiary and the European Commission to understand the nature and extent of the procedures performed by the Auditor. Use of the reporting format attached as Annex VII of the Grant Agreement is compulsary. The Reports should be written in the language indicated in Article 4 of the Grant Agreements. In accordance with Article II.22 of the Grant Agreements, the European Commission and the Court of Auditors have the right to audit any work carried out under the project for which costs are claimed from the Community, including the work related to this engagement.

Timing

The Reports should be submitted within 14 days from go-ahead from Aalborg University.
Other Terms

We assumed that documentation will be available in accordance with the documentation list. We moreover refer to our enclosed current terms of business.

Final Remarks

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions to this engagement letter. If the above is in accordance with your expectations, and you can accept the terms and conditions of the agreement, please sign and return the enclosed copy of this letter to the undersigned.

Yours faithfully

Michael Stenskrog
State Authorised Public Accountant

Appendix I: Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs claimed under a Grant Agreement financed under the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7) and Procedures performed by the Auditor

I hereby accept the above.

Aalborg, 7/5 2009
Aalborg University

Erik Grave Kristensen
Terms of Business for Assurance Services

1. Introduction
1.1 These Terms of Business shall apply to the assurance services that Pricewaterhouse-Coopers A/S (CVR No 16 99 42 94) provides to its client (the "Client"). The engagement letter prepared for the Client together with any appendices (the "Engagement Letter") and these Terms of Business constitute the agreement between PwC and the Client (the "Agreement"). In case of any discrepancy between the Engagement Letter and these Terms of Business, the terms of the Engagement Letter shall take precedence.

1.2 PwC is a member of the Pricewaterhouse-Coopers global network ("PwC Network") of independent legal entities which share name, values, knowledge and expertise.

2. PwC’s Services
2.1 PwC’s services (the "Services") are described in the Engagement Letter and include any ancillary services agreed by PwC and the Client to be provided.

3. Staffing, Subcontractors, etc
3.1 If the Engagement Letter states the names of the PwC partners and employees who are to provide the Services, PwC may replace such partners and employees with other partners and employees, however without any extra cost to the Client.

3.2 PwC may employ foreign Pricewaterhouse-Coopers firms as subcontractors ("PwC Subcontractors") in connection with performance of the Services.

3.3 PwC shall be liable to the Client for the Services provided by PwC's Subcontractors. The PwC Subcontractors engaged by PwC will act solely on behalf of PwC and at PwC's instructions. Where a PwC Subcontractor communicates with the Client, this shall be regarded as communication on behalf of PwC. The Client cannot bring any claim against PwC's partners, employees, PwC Subcontractors and Subcontractors' partners and employees in relation to the Services and the Agreement unless the party in question has a direct, absolute liability to the Client. PwC's partners, employees, PwC Subcontractors and Subcontractors' partners and employees shall be entitled to enforce this provision against the Client.

3.4 If, during the term of the Agreement and for a period of six months after the termination or expiration of the Agreement, PwC or the Client directly or indirectly employs the other Party's employees who have been directly involved in providing or receiving the Services, that Party shall pay the other Party DKK 250,000 per employee. This shall not, however, apply when employing the other Party's employees who unsolicitedly apply for (1) a generally advertised job position or (2) a job position which is part of a general recruiting campaign. Each Party shall agree to inform its own employees of the terms of this clause 3.4.

4. Client Assistance and Responsibilities
4.1 The Client shall provide PwC with all the information, assistance, etc necessary for PwC to provide the Services.

4.2 The Client shall be responsible for managing and instructing the Client's other advisers and suppliers and shall be liable to PwC for the services provided by such advisers and suppliers.

4.3 If, in connection with the performance of the Agreement, PwC's (or any PwC Subcontractor's) partners and employees work at the Client's address or another location requested by the Client, the Client shall guarantee that all office conditions, PwC's access to and use of systems (including software and data), etc do not breach legislation, agreements and third party rights.

5. Fee and Invoicing
5.1 Fee for the Services shall be determined as described in the Engagement Letter. VAT shall not be included in the fee unless stated in the Engagement Letter. If the Engagement Letter does not indicate the amount of PwC's fee or how the fee is determined, the fee shall be based on time spent, including for transportation/travel. Hourly rates are determined based on, inter alia, the partners' and employees' experience and expertise. PwC will adjust hourly rates on 1 July of every year without notice or announcement.

5.2 In addition to the fee mentioned in clause 5.1 above and any VAT, PwC shall invoice any costs and out-of-pocket expenses incurred in relation to the Agreement, including those incurred for PwC's Subcontractors, transportation, accommodation, meals, materials, courier services, etc.
5.3 PwC is entitled to invoice continuously in connection with its performance of the Agreement. PwC reserves the right to invoice on account. Invoices shall be payable 2 weeks after the invoice date. In the event of any late payment, PwC may charge interest in accordance with the Danish Act on Interest.

6. Termination of the Agreement

6.1 The Client as well as PwC may terminate the Agreement with effect from the time when the other Party receives written notice of termination. PwC cannot, however, terminate the Agreement where such termination is in breach of current legislation or generally accepted auditing practice.

6.2 If the Agreement is terminated prior to its agreed expiry, PwC shall be entitled to payment of all fees and reimbursement of costs for the period up to termination of the Agreement as well as to reimbursement of its costs as a result of the Agreement’s early termination, including costs relating to PwC’s Subcontractors, cf clause 5 hereof.

7. Confidentiality etc

7.1 PwC and the Client shall be under a duty of confidentiality with respect to all confidential information relating to the affairs of the other Party, as long as such information is of a confidential nature. The internal procedures of PwC ensure the protection of the confidential information of the Client acquired by PwC in connection with the Agreement. The partners, employees and Subcontractors of PwC shall be under a duty of confidentiality. The duty of confidentiality shall be subject eg to rules imposing a duty of reporting to public authorities or others. Confidential information may be exchanged to the extent required under applicable legislation or in connection with providing the Services, for example with PwC’s Subcontractors.

7.2 To the extent that the Client has group relations with foreign enterprises, the Client shall consent to PwC:

- exchanging information with foreign auditing firms for the purpose of the foreign auditing firms’ provision of services to an enterprise with group relations to the Client;
- passing on information on client conditions, services provided, fees received, staffing, etc to the PwC Network for the purpose of statistics, business development and optimisation within the PwC Network.

7.3 PwC is subject to special requirements for quality management and quality control by the Auditor’s Public Oversight Body, the PwC Network and the Danish Institute of State Authorised Public Accountants. The controlling parties are subject to the same duty of confidentiality as PwC. The Client shall accept that PwC passes on information etc on the Client which may be necessary in connection with this quality management and control.

7.4 PwC do not warrant confidentiality in external communication, including mail, e-mail and facsimile. PwC will be pleased to use encrypted communication or digital signature as further agreed with the Client.

7.5 To the extent that, under the Agreement, PwC processes information subject to the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data, PwC shall be a data processor as defined in the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data and shall act only according to instructions from the Client, which is responsible for the data (the controller). The provisions of section 41 (3)-(5) of the Danish Act on Processing of Personal Data shall also apply to data processing by PwC.

7.6 The Client shall be responsible for the passing on of information to PwC and its Subcontractors at all times complying with the applicable rules for processing of personal data.

7.7 PwC shall not in consequence of the Agreement be prevented from offering and providing services to other clients, even if such clients are competitors or have interests contrary to those of the Client.

7.8 Subject to its duty of confidentiality, cf clause 7.1 hereof, PwC shall be entitled to inform any third party of the nature of its engagement with the Client as a reference.

8. Limitation of Liability, Time-barring, etc

8.1 PwC is responsible to the Client pursuant to the general principles of Danish law with the limitations and exclusions set out in the Agreement to the extent that its provisions are not incompatible with applicable legislation.

8.2 PwC shall not be liable for any losses attributable to the materials, information, systems, services, etc provided by the Client, or the advisers or suppliers of the Client, cf clause 4.2 hereof. PwC shall not be liable for any services provided by any third party engaged by the Client, including the advisers and suppliers of the Client.
8.3 PwC shall not be liable for any failure to fulfil, or delayed fulfilment of, its obligations under the Agreement caused by any hindrance or circumstances outside PwC’s and/or Subcontractors’ control.

8.4 PwC shall not be liable for any advisory services provided verbally but not confirmed in writing. Letters, reports, statements, etc. in draft form do not constitute the final advisory or assurance service of PwC and the Client may rely only on PwC’s final Services.

8.5 The Client shall immediately notify PwC in writing of any errors or inadequacies of the Services or matters which may give rise to claims being raised against PwC. PwC shall be entitled to remedy any identified error or inadequacy related to the Services within a time limit which is appropriate in the circumstances.

9. Rights

9.1 PwC shall retain the title and all intellectual property rights to materials, including concepts, systems, work processes, templates, models, spreadsheets, software, databases, methods, reports, know-how, etc. applied for the purposes of, or prepared as part of, PwC’s performance of the Agreement. PwC shall, furthermore, retain the title and all intellectual property rights to the Services and any type of materials, including internal materials (draft materials, working papers and the like) prepared as part of the performance of the Agreement. PwC shall be entitled to use its intellectual property rights in servicing other clients or for any other purposes.

9.2 The Client shall have only a right of use of the Services.

10. Electronic Communication

10.1 PwC and the Client shall accept the use of electronic communication (including e-mail, cd-rom or any other medium) and the risks related hereto. Each Party shall be responsible for protecting its own systems and interests in connection with electronic communication. PwC and PwC’s Subcontractors shall not be liable for any errors, losses, virus, delays, destruction, etc. in connection with, or caused by, electronic communication and information.

11. Validity

11.1 Where one or several provisions of the Agreement or parts hereof are held invalid or otherwise cannot be upheld as a result of mandatory rules of law, subsequent amendments to legislation or changes in regulatory requirements, such provisions shall not be considered to form part of the Agreement. The validity of the remaining provisions of the Agreement shall not be affected.

12. Governing Law and Jurisdiction

12.1 The Agreement shall be governed by the laws of Denmark without giving effect to the rules relating to conflict of laws.

12.2 Any dispute arising out of or in connection with the Agreement or the Services shall exclusively and finally be settled by arbitration in accordance with “Rules of Arbitration Procedure of the Danish Institute of Arbitration”. The Danish Institute of Arbitration shall appoint the arbitrators in accordance with the above-mentioned rules. The venue of the arbitration tribunal shall be Copenhagen and the language of the proceedings shall be Danish or English. The Client as well as PwC shall be subject to a duty of confidentiality with respect to the dispute, including but not limited to its existence, the arbitration proceedings and the award.
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To:
Aalborg University
Frederik Bajers Vej 5
9220 Aalborg Ø

For the attention of:
Name of contact person
Address
Postal code and city

Independent Report of Factual Findings on costs claimed under a Grant Agreement financed under the Seventh Research Framework Programme (FP7)

In accordance with our contract dated <dd Month yyyy> with Aalborg University ("the Beneficiary") and the terms of reference attached thereto (appended to this Report), we provide our Independent Report of Factual Findings ("the Report"), as specified below.

Objective

We, PricewaterhouseCoopers, Statsautoriseret Revisionsaktieselskab, established in Skelagervej 1A, 9000 Aalborg, Denmark represented for signature of this Report by [name of signing partner], State Authorised Public Accountant, have performed agreed-upon procedures regarding the total costs of EUR x,xxx.xx declared in the Financial Statement/s/ of Aalborg University hereinafter referred to as the Beneficiary, to which this Report is attached, and which is to be presented to the Commission of the European Communities under grant agreement [EC grant agreement reference: title, acronym, number] for the following period/s/ xx xxxxx 200x to xx xxxxx 200x [and xx xxxxx 200x to xx xxxxx 200x]. This engagement involved performing certain specified procedures, the results of which the European Commission uses to draw conclusions as to the eligibility of the costs claimed.

Scope of Work

Our engagement was carried out in accordance with:
- the terms of reference appended to this Report and:
- International Standard on Related Services ("ISRS") 4400 Engagements to perform Agreed-upon Procedures regarding Financial Information as promulgated by the
International Federation of Accountants (IFAC):

the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants issued by the IFAC. Although ISRS 4400 provides that independence is not a requirement for agreed-upon procedures engagements, the European Commission requires that the Auditor also complies with the independence requirements of the Code of Ethics for Professional Accountants;

As requested, we have only performed the procedures set out in the terms of reference for this engagement and we have reported our factual findings on those procedures in the table appended to this Report.

The scope of these agreed upon procedures has been determined solely by the European Commission and the procedures were performed solely to assist the European Commission in evaluating whether the costs claimed by the Beneficiary in the accompanying Financial Statement has been claimed in accordance with the Grant Agreement. The Auditor is not responsible for the suitability and appropriateness of these procedures.

Because the procedures performed by us did not constitute either an audit or a review made in accordance with International Standards on Auditing or International Standards on Review Engagements, we do not express any assurance on the Financial Statements.

Had we performed additional procedures or had we performed an audit or review of the Financial Statement/s of the Beneficiary in accordance with International Standards on Auditing, other matters might have come to our attention that would have been reported to you.

Sources of Information

The Report sets out information provided to us by the management of the Beneficiary in response to specific questions or as obtained and extracted from the Beneficiary’s information and accounting systems.

Factual Findings

The above mentioned Financial Statement/s per Activity was /were/ examined and all procedures specified in the appended table for our engagement were carried out. On the basis of the results of these procedures, we found:

- All documentation and accounting information to enable us to carry out these procedures has been provided to us by the Beneficiary. Except as indicated below, no exceptions were noted.

Exceptions

In some cases, the Auditor was not able to successfully complete the procedures specified.
These exceptions are as follows:

- *In connection with our review, we observed that time registration is made in respect of employees only in the periods in which they are working on a project under the seventh framework programme, and therefore the standard time cannot be fully documented;*
- *exceptions such as inability to reconcile key information, unavailability of data which prevented the Auditor from carrying out the procedures, etc. should be listed here. The Commission will use this information to decide the amounts which will be reimbursed.*
- *No exceptions were found.*

**Use of this Report**

This Report is solely for the purpose set forth in the above objective. This Report is prepared solely for the confidential use of the Beneficiary and the European Commission and solely for the purpose of submission to the European Commission in connection with the requirements as set out in Article II.4.4 of the Grant Agreement. This Report may not be relied upon by the Beneficiary or by the European Commission for any other purpose, nor may it be distributed to any other parties. The European Commission may only disclose this Report to others who have regulatory rights of access to it, in particular the European Anti Fraud Office and the European Court of Auditors.

This Report relates only to the Financial Statement(s) specified above and does not extend to any other financial statements of the Beneficiary.

No conflict of interest exists between the Auditor and the Beneficiary in establishing this Report. The fee paid to the Auditor for providing the Report was EUR x.xxx.xx.

We look forward to discussing our Report with you and would be pleased to provide any further information or assistance which may be required.

Xby, xx Xxxxxx 200x
**PricewaterhouseCoopers**
Statsautoriseret Revisionsaktieselskab

NN
State Authorised Public Accountant

Appendix I: Procedures performed by the Auditor
Appendix II: Terms of reference
## Procedures performed by the Auditor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Costs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Recalculate hourly personnel and overhead rates for personnel (full coverage if less than 20 employees, otherwise a sample of minimum 20, or 20% of employees, whichever is the greater), indicate the number of productive hours used and hourly rates. Where sampling is used, selection should be random with a view to producing a representative sample. <strong>Productive hours</strong> represent the (average) number of hours made available by the employee in a year after the deduction of holiday, sick leave and other entitlements. This calculation should be provided by the Beneficiary. [if average costs are used, a separate independent report is required on the methodology]</td>
<td>For each employee in the sample of XX, the Auditor obtained the personnel costs (salary and employer's costs) from the payroll system together with the productive hours from the time records of each employee. For each employee selected, the Auditor recomputed the hourly rate by dividing the actual personnel costs by the actual productive hours, which was then compared to the hourly rate charged by the Beneficiary. The average number of productive hours for the employees selected was XXX. No exceptions were noted. [If the productive hours or costs of personnel cannot be identified, they should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. For the same selection examine and describe time recording of employees (paper/computer, daily/weekly/monthly, signed, authorised).</td>
<td>Employees record their time on a [daily/weekly/monthly] monthly basis using a paper [computer]-based system. The time-records selected were authorised by the project manager or other superior. No exceptions were noted. [If no time records are available which fit the above description, this should be listed as an exception in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Costs (continued)</td>
<td>For the employees selected, the Auditor inspected their employment contracts and found that they were:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Employment status and employment conditions of personnel. The Auditor should obtain the employment contracts of the employees selected and compare with the standard employment contract used by the Beneficiary. Differences which are not foreseen by the Grant Agreement should be noted as exceptions.</td>
<td>- directly hired by the Beneficiary in accordance with its national legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- under the sole technical supervision and responsibility of the latter, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- remunerated in accordance with the normal practices of the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>No exceptions were noted.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[Personnel who do not meet all three conditions should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.]</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I - [EC grant agreement reference: title, acronym, number]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Costs (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Use of average personnel costs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Auditor found that the personnel costs charged to the financial statement:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- are calculated using average costs in accordance with the methodology as specified in the Report of findings on the methodology dated xx Xxxx 200x.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- have been calculated using amounts derived from the relevant period which can be reconciled to the accounting records of the relevant period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Auditor obtained confirmation from the Beneficiary that the rates used were not budgeted or estimated amounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No exceptions were noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[If amounts cannot be reconciled, or if estimates or budgeted amounts were used, this should be reported as an exception in the main report.]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontracting</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Obtain a written description from the Beneficiary regarding 3rd party resources used and compare with Annex 1 to the Grant Agreement.</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Auditor compared the description of the 3rd party resources provided by the Beneficiary to the specification in Annex 1 to the Grant Agreement, and found them to be the same.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>No exceptions were noted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[If the descriptions do not clearly match, this should be reported as an exception in the main report.]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subcontracting (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. Inspect documents and obtain confirmations that subcontracts are awarded according to a procedure including an analysis of best value for money (best price-quality ratio), transparency and equal treatment. Full coverage if less than 20 items, otherwise a sample of minimum 20, or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater. | The Auditor obtained tendering documents for each subcontract entered into and found that the tendering process was followed and that a written analysis of value-for-money had been prepared by the Beneficiary in support of the final choice of subcontractor, or that the contract had been awarded as part of an existing framework contract entered into prior to the beginning of the project. 

*No exceptions were noted.* |

*If the Auditor is not provided with evidence of either of the above situations, the amount of the subcontract should be listed as an exception in the main report.* |
| **Other Direct Costs**              |                                                            |
| 7. Allocation of equipment subject to depreciation is correctly identified and allocated to the project. Full coverage if less than 20 items, otherwise a sample of minimum 20, or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater. | The Auditor traced the equipment charged to the project to the accounting records and the underlying invoices. The Beneficiary has documented the link with the project on the invoice and purchase documentation, and, where relevant, the project accounting. The asset value was agreed to the invoice and no VAT or other identifiable indirect taxes were charged. The depreciation method used to charge the equipment to the project was compared to the Beneficiary's normal accounting policy and found to be the same. 

*No exceptions were noted.* |

*If assets have been charged which do not comply with the above, they should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Direct Costs (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travel costs correctly identified and allocated to the project (and in line with Beneficiary’s normal policy for non-EC work regarding first-class travel, etc.)</td>
<td>The Auditor inspected the sample and found that the Beneficiary had allocated travel costs to the project by marking of invoices and purchase orders with the project reference, resulting in traceable allocation in the project accounts. The costs charged were compared to the invoices and found to be the same. No VAT or other identifiable indirect taxes were charged. Travel expenses were in line with the written policy provided by the Beneficiary. <em>No exceptions were noted.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full coverage if less than 20 items, otherwise a sample of minimum 20, or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater. The Beneficiary should provide written evidence of its normal policy for travel costs (e.g. use of first class tickets) to enable the Auditor to compare the travel charged with this policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Consumables correctly identified and allocated to the project.</td>
<td>The Auditor inspected the sample and found that the Beneficiary had allocated consumable costs to the project by marking of invoices and purchase orders with the project reference, resulting in traceable allocation in the project accounts. The costs charged were compared to the invoices and found to be the same. No VAT or other identifiable indirect taxes were charged. <em>No exceptions were noted.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full coverage if less than 20 items, otherwise a sample of minimum 20, or 20% of the items, whichever is the greater. allocation in the project accounts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Costs which are not allocated to project accounts and do not have a clear attribution (normally by writing the project number on the original invoice) should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>The Auditor obtained the total overhead amount which was allocated and reconciled this to the accounting records for the period in question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Obtain and review a detailed breakdown of Indirect costs (reconciled to the financial accounts) and confirm that the following costs are not present:</td>
<td>The Auditor recalculated the ratio of indirect costs [choose one: as a percentage of personnel costs/ as an hourly rate] and agreed it to the rate used in the Financial Statement(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a) identifiable indirect taxes including value added tax,</td>
<td>The Auditor obtained a detailed breakdown from the accounting system of the indirect costs which have been charged to the contract, and reconciled the individual amounts to the general ledger of the Beneficiary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- b) duties,</td>
<td>The Auditor found that costs for the non-research activities of the Beneficiary, such as manufacturing, education, marketing of products or services, etc., had not been included in the calculation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- c) interest owed,</td>
<td>For each element of the breakdown, the Auditor obtained the Beneficiary's confirmation that it contained none of the ineligible costs specified (typical examples are leasing costs, loan charges, provisions for doubtful debt (but not normal accruals), local business and property taxes, customs duties, exchange losses from billing in a foreign currency).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- d) provisions for possible future losses or charges,</td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- e) exchange losses, cost related to return on capital,</td>
<td>[Only the types of excessive and reckless expenditure listed in the Commission's guidance should be considered, the Auditor is not required to exercise professional judgement or provide assurance in this matter. Amounts which do not meet the above criteria or where the Auditor is not provided with sufficient information in order to inspect and compare the types of cost should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- f) costs declared or incurred, or reimbursed in respect of another Community project,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- g) debt and debt service charges, excessive or reckless expenditure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs (Continued)</td>
<td>The Beneficiary's accounting system does not permit indirect costs to be separately identified for the individual departments. [and/or] The Beneficiary's accounting system is cash-based and year-end adjustments are made using accounting estimates in order to charge certain accrued costs. The Auditor obtained the breakdown of overhead costs and the adjusting entries together with the source of the relevant accounting entries. The Beneficiary provided the Auditor with underlying calculations showing the basis for additional accounting entries. The Auditor agreed these calculations to the relevant sources of management information. No exceptions were noted. [Any elements of a simplified calculation which represent percentage estimates and which cannot be compared to underlying data should be listed (together with the amounts) as exceptions in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Assess use of a simplified method of calculation of overheads at the level of the legal entity.

   The Beneficiary may use a simplified method of calculation (either due to the lack of analytical accounting or legal requirement to use a form of cash-based accounting). This does not permit the use of a generalised estimate, or the use of a 'standard' rate that is not derived from the financial accounts of the period in question. Thus the rate (but not the methodology) should be updated for each accounting period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Inspect and compare exchange rates into Euros.</td>
<td>The Auditor compared the exchange rates used for conversion with the applicable official exchange rates established by the European Communities and the Beneficiary used:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[the conversion rate of the date where the actual costs were incurred]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the rate applicable on the first day of the month following the end of reporting period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Where rates cannot be agreed, an exception should be noted. (together with the amount) in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Identification of receipts.</td>
<td>The Beneficiary is obliged to deduct from its claim any receipts related to the project (income from events, rebates from suppliers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Auditor examined the relevant project accounts and obtained representations from the Beneficiary that the amounts listed represent a complete record of the sources of income connected with the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The amount included in the claim regarding receipts is the same as the amount recorded in the project accounting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Any discrepancies in the receipts noted in the accounts and those reported by the Beneficiary should be noted (together with the amount) as exceptions in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>Standard factual finding and basis for exception reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect costs (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Identification of interest yielded on pre-financing.</td>
<td>The Auditor compared the relevant project accounts with the interest shown in the bank statements and found them to be the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No exceptions were noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Any discrepancies in the interest noted in the accounts and those reported by the Beneficiary should be noted (together with the amount) as exceptions in the main report.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June, 23 2010

Financial statement under Seventh Framework Programme from Aalborg University

The European Commission has carried out a financial audit on Aalborg University and the conclusions has been communicated to us on June, 4 2010. The recommendations to be implemented in all future financial statements has not been implemented in this financial statement as it has not been possible for us to manage in time.

We refer to letter from External Audit of June, 4 2010 and our answer in letter of June, 23 2010. Your Contact person: Mr Costas Voyiatzis, Auditor in charge (costas.voyiatzis@ec.europa.eu). Our Contact person: Mrs Lisbeth Hejndorf (lhe@adm.aau.dk) or Mr Morten Bang Henriksen (mbh@adm.aau.dk).

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard Gajhed
Chief Accountant