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Our experience with EU projects (ICT)
- 4 FP7 + 1 H2020 projects (of 10+1 proposals) since 2010, 1 as coordinator (Dr E. Rivière)
- Evaluator for 2 ICT calls (2013+2014), expert for 1 FP7 project

But...
- I am not affiliated with the EC
- I am in no way an expert for organizational/legal/political... questions on the EC
- There are things I am not allowed to talk about
How evaluation works

- EC unit creates a pool of experts to evaluate a strategic objective of FP7's ICT Call
  - Experts from industry and academia (*independent*)
  - Evaluation of different kinds of projects (STREP, IP, CA, SA...)
- 10-20 proposals to evaluate per expert
- Work from home and 1-2 weeks in Brussels

- **Stage 1:** Remote reading at home (individual)
- **Stage 2:** Consensus groups (reviewers)
- **Stage 3:** Panel meeting/hearings (all experts)
How evaluation works

● **Stage 1: Remote reading**
  - Each proposal is read independently by three or more experts and evaluated under specific criteria
  - The experts each prepare an *Individual Evaluation Report* (IER) on the proposal
  - Reports are submitted online before the meeting in Brussels
How evaluation works

**Stage 2: Consensus group**
- The experts who read the proposal meet together to come to a consensus view
- Meetings of at most 2 hours
- The group prepares a *Consensus Report* (CR)
- The group is supported by a *Commission Moderator* and a *Proposal Recorder*
Stage 3: Panel meeting and proposal hearings

- Experts within the area meet together as a panel to review the Consensus Reports of the proposals.
- The panel prepares an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) for the proposals.
- The panel is supported by a Commission Panel Coordinator (Chairman) and an expert as Panel Recorder.
- Proposals above thresholds are presented and discussed, ranking is finalized.
Evaluation criteria

- Proposals are evaluated on three criteria only
  - **Scientific and technical quality** *(does it address topics?)*
  - **Implementation** *(have partners operational capacity?)*
  - **Impact** *(if implemented using the scientific and technical approach and by the partners)*

- Each evaluation criterion is given a score out of five, with explanatory comments
  - A threshold of 3/5 must be achieved on each criterion
  - An overall score is calculated for each proposal by simple addition
  - A threshold of 10/15 must be achieved on the overall score
Panel meeting, proposal hearings

- Global ranking of all proposals
  - Funded in rank order depending on budget
- Scores can still change
  - All reviewers can read/discuss proposals
- Rules to break ties
  1. Topic diversity (least represented topic in better ranked proposals)
  2. Impact
  3. S&T excellence
Lessons from bad proposals

- Many proposals are poorly written
- No clear message, no focus, lack of scope
- Promise too much, unrealistic
- Do not address a real problem, call topics
- Good technical (“academic”) content but no application, impact, or exploitation
- No evidence consortium has all skills, or partners are fully committed
- “Luck” does not help bad proposals
A good (successful?) proposal

- Balanced consortium (enough SME/industrial involvement, technology transfer esp. H2020)
- A simple idea, clear application (storytelling)
- Impact and exploitation are key
- Polish presentation (clarity, figures/tables…)
- Do not forget any “detail” (e.g., risk table, management structure/procedures…)
- Answers objectives (explicit/implicit) of the call
- Read call documents, talk with people
QUESTIONS?