

*Oportunidades de financiamento en proxectos colaborativos nas
convocatorias 2018 de H2020*

Avaliación de propostas

Dr. Octavio Pernas Sueiras
26 de xuño 2017



Table of contents

- My role as an EC expert
- Lessons learnt
- Hints and tips



Table of contents

- **My role as an EC expert**
- Lessons learnt
- Hints and tips



Excellent Science

European Research Council (ERC)

Future & Emerging Technologies (FET)

Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions

Research Infrastructures

Industrial Leadership

Leadership in Enabling and Industrial Technologies

Access to Risk Finance

Innovation in SMEs

Societal challenges

Health, demographic change and wellbeing

Food security, sustainable agriculture, forestry, marine, maritime, inland water and bio-economy

Secure, clean and efficient energy

Smart, green and integrated transport

Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials

Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies

Secure societies – protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens

Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation

Science with and for Society

EIT

JRC



Evaluation criteria

1. **EXCELLENCE: up to 5 points**

- Clarity and pertinence of the **objectives**.
- Soundness of the **concept**, and credibility of the proposed **methodology**.
- Extent that the proposed work is **beyond the state of the art**, and demonstrates **innovation potential** (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models).
- Appropriate consideration of **interdisciplinary** approaches and, where relevant, use of **stakeholder knowledge**.

General Threshold: 3



Evaluation criteria

2. **IMPACT: up to 5 points**

- The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected **impacts mentioned in the work programme** under the relevant topic.
- Any substantial **impacts not mentioned in the work programme**, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society;
- Quality of the proposed measures to:
 - **Exploit and disseminate** the project results (including management of **IPR**), and to **manage research data** where relevant.
 - **Communicate** the project activities to **different target audiences**.

General Threshold: 3



Evaluation criteria

3. IMPLEMENTATION: up to 5 points

- Quality and effectiveness of the **work plan**, including extent to which the **resources** assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables.
- Appropriateness of the **management structures and procedures**, including **risk and innovation management**.
- **Complementarity** of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise.
- **Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks**, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.

General Threshold: 3

- ***Overall threshold: 10 (max. 15)***
- ***Always check your call for thresholds***
- might be higher than general ones



The scoring scale

0

The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1

Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2

Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant **weaknesses**.

3

Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of **shortcomings** are present.

4

Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a **small number of shortcomings** are present.

5

Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. **Any shortcomings are minor.**



Evaluation: phase 1 (on-line)

1. EC on-line training for evaluators

- General briefing: evaluation criteria, rules for participation, etc.
- Topic-specific: topic text, project dimension, what is in scope, etc.

2. Role of evaluators

- At least 3 evaluators: **Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs)** for each proposal.
- Each report includes comments and marks.

3. Role of Rapporteur / Recorder

- Integrates IERs into a **draft Consensus Report (CR)**: just comments, no marks.
- Recorder **DOES NOT** include his/her own comments in the report.



Evaluation: phase 2 (Brussels)

1. Usual schedule developed over a full week
2. Briefing for evaluators (Monday)
 - General briefing.
 - Topic-specific.
3. Consensus meetings (Monday to Thursday am)
 - Evaluators + recorder + EC officer work on **draft CR**
 - Recorder and EC officer - only facilitate discussion.
 - Output: **Final CR**, with a consensus mark, reached within 2 hours. **Quality-check** by EC to ensure that the new text agreed matches the final scores)

Evaluation: phase 2 (Brussels)

4. Proposal ranking /cross-reading exercise (Thursday pm)

- Proposals are initially ranked by EC according to their mark.
- **Cross-reading** of proposals ABOVE threshold
 - *Calibration exercise*
 - 2-3 additional experts
 - Limited time per proposal

5. Panel review (Friday)

- Cross-readers may suggest changes to marks (consistency).
- Resolves any cases where a minority view is recorded in the CR.
- Recommends a **final list of proposals** in priority order.
 - How proposals with identical scores are ranked?



Real Examples

1. EXCELLENCE

POSITIVE COMMENTS

*“The objectives are very **clearly described and pertinent** to the specific call requirements”*

*“The scientific and technological concept behind the proposal is **sound and ambitious**”*

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

*“The approach is generally credible (...). However, the proposal **does not clearly state** how the technologies will (...)”*

*“The planned progress beyond the state of the art is **not clearly justified**”*

*“The potential for innovation is **not fully convincing**”*

Real Examples

2. IMPACT

POSITIVE COMMENTS

*“Dissemination and communication strategies are **well developed**”*

*“The proposal **clearly explains** how new knowledge and outputs will be exploited and how this extends beyond the existing capabilities in the sector”*

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

*“The proposal deals with the impacts listed in the work programme, but provides only **generic information** on what will be achieved”*

*“The exploitation plan is acceptable, but the potential marketability of the outcomes remains **unclear** because (...)”*

*“The proposal provides **insufficient details** about how it will enhance competitiveness”*



Real Examples

3. IMPLEMENTATION

POSITIVE COMMENTS

*“The proposal includes partners with **multidisciplinary** and complementary expertise, which have **relevant experience** in the tasks to be undertaken”*

*“The workplan is good, with a clear description of milestones and deliverables (...) **Management** team is adequately described with relevant experience to perform the planned activities”*

NEGATIVE COMMENTS

*“The described management procedures are of **standard** nature, with **no clear link** to the **specific needs of this proposal** and its complexity”*

*“The allocation of tasks among the participants is **not balanced** (...). Furthermore, the **outsourcing** of critical elements of the proposal is **not clearly justified.**”*



Real Examples

| Reviewer | Excellence | Impact | Implementation | TOTAL |
|----------|------------|--------|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | 3 | 3,5 | 3 | 9,5 |
| 2 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 13,5 |
| 3 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 4,5 | 13 |
| CR Mark | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 |



| Reviewer | Excellence | Impact | Implementation | TOTAL |
|----------|------------|--------|----------------|------------|
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 2,5 | 8,5 |
| 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| CR Mark | 2,5 | 3 | 3 | 8,5 |



Table of contents

- My role as an EC expert
- **Lessons learnt**
- Hints and tips



Lessons learnt (I)

1. The overall process does work – “bad” proposals will not make it (but not all “good” proposals will make it).
2. Evaluators are experienced and have multidisciplinary expertise – if there is a weakness, they will spot it.
3. Generally, consensus is reached during the meetings and marks are not changed during the panel review.



Lessons learnt (II)

4. **Proposals with identical total scores** are ranked according to:
- First, their **score for Excellence**, and second, their **score for Impact** (for Innovation action, first Impact and then Excellence).
 - If there are ties, the panel evaluates:
 - the size of the **budget allocated to SMEs.**
 - the gender balance of personnel carrying out the research and/or innovation activities (50 / 50)
 - If there are still ties, the panel agrees further factors to consider (contribution to policies, etc.)
5. The devil is in the details:

Millions can be **gone** for **not ticking ONE box** during the proposal preparation

Table of contents

- My role as an EC expert
- Lessons learnt
- **Hints and tips**



Hints and tips

- Topic and project matching is essential.
- Remember the European aspect – links to policies, EU added value, etc.
- Pay close attention to non-scientific parts of the proposal (IPR management, dissemination/exploitation, etc.).
- “Help” the evaluators:
 - Write short and clear sentences.
 - Use figures, tables, bold characters, etc.
 - Do not assume expert`s knowledge.
 - Whenever possible, quantification.
- Calls are highly competitive – be ready to be dissapointed.



GRAZAS!

Dr. Octavio Pernas Sueiras

OTRI

Edificio Servizos Centrais de Investigación

Campus de Elviña

15071 A Coruña

Teléfono: 881 01 5783

Correo electrónico: octavio.pernas@udc.es

<http://otri.udc.es/>

