3. CRITERI E ITER DI VALUTAZIONE
ADAPTING TO HORIZON 2020

• New types of call → new types of proposal
  • multi-disciplinary and multi-sectorial;
  • more emphasis on innovation and close-to-market;
• **EU Commission will check your proposal for eligibility** (against general eligibility criteria set out in General Annexes A and C to the work programme and specific eligibility conditions set out in the work programme for your call).

Example:
Research & innovation actions require, for instance, a minimum of three independent legal entities established in different Member States or associated countries.

• **Specific cases:**
In the case of two-stage submission schemes, an eligibility check is carried out at first stage. At second stage, we will check that the eligibility conditions are still complied with.
EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

- **EC** chooses its experts
- **Experts** evaluates your proposal
- **EC** establishes its ranked list
EC CHOSES ITS EXPERTS

• How are the evaluators selected?

• Looking at **keywords specified in your proposal**.
• High level of **skills, experience and knowledge in the relevant areas** (*e.g. field, project management, innovation, exploitation, dissemination and communication*);
• Provided the above condition can be satisfied, a **balance in terms of**:
  • skills, experience and knowledge;
  • geographical diversity;
  • gender;
  • where appropriate, the private and public sectors
EC CHOOSES ITS EXPERTS

• At least **three independent experts** per proposal (but can be more depending on WP).
  
  **Exception:** For the first stage in two-stage submission schemes and for low-value grants, it may be that only two experts are used.

• Additional experts appointed for **ethics review**.

• The evaluation process might be followed by one or more **independent observers**.
CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Is considered a conflict of interest exists, if an expert:
• was involved in the preparation of a proposal;
• benefits directly or indirectly if a proposal is accepted;
• has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant;
• is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant;
• is employed or contracted by one of the applicants or any named subcontractors;
• is a member of an advisory group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU or Euratom Horizon 2020 work programmes or work programmes in an area related to the call;
• is a National Contact Point or is directly working for the EEN
• is a member of a programme committee;
• for Marie Skłodowska-Curie actions: is acting as a referee of the applicant.
PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE
CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE

- PROCEDURA DI PRESENTAZIONE A DUE STEP: SOLO ECCELLENZA E IMPATTO (4 SOGLIA MINIMA PER ENTRAMBI I CRITERI)
1. Excellence
   - Clarity of the objectives;
   - Soundness of the concept, including transdisciplinary considerations;
   - Credibility of the proposed approach;
   - Progress beyond the state of the art.

2. Impact: [...] contribution to:
   - The expected impacts listed in the work programme
   - Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge;
   - Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets;
   - ...measures to, disseminate and exploit the project results,... communication.

3. Quality and efficiency of implementation
   - Coherence and effectiveness of work plan, ... allocation of tasks, resources;
   - Competences, experience and complementarity of the individual participants, as well as of the consortium as a whole;
   - Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures....risk management.
AWARD CRITERIA

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACTIONS; INNOVATION ACTIONS; SME INSTRUMENT

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;

Credibility of the proposed approach;

Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant;

Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches).
AWARD CRITERIA
RESEARCH AND INNOVATION ACTIONS;
INNOVATION ACTIONS; SME INSTRUMENT

**IMPACT**

The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic;

Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge;

Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets, and where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets;

Any other environmental and socially important impacts;

Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant.
QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources;

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant);

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management.
Ciascun criterio è valutato da 0 a 5, con soglia minima per criterio di 3/5 e soglia complessiva di 10/15

A differenza di FP7, per Innovation Action e SME instrument, il criterio dell’IMPATTO
- Ha un peso ponderato di 1.5
- È considerato per primo nel caso di pari punteggio
CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE
PUNTEGGI

PUNTEGGIO DA 1 A 5 (POSSIBILITA’ DI ½ PUNTO)

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.
PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE
SELF EVALUATION

DISPONIBILI PER TIPOLOGIA DI AZIONE
(RIA, IA, SME instrument, CSA)
EVALUATION PROCESS

Proposal

Individual Evaluation Report

Eligible proposal

Minimum 3 experts

Individual evaluation

Consensus

Consensus group

Consensus Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Expert

Expert

Expert

Expert

Minimum 3 experts

Individual evaluation

Consensus
PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

FASE I — INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION

Ciascun esparto valuta individualmente la proposta e prepara un’‘INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)’ con commenti e punteggio per criterio.

FASE II — CONSENSUS GROUP

Tutti gli esperti formano un ‘consensus group’ per raggiungere un’opinione condivisa sulla valutazione (‘CONSENSUS REPORT’).

FASE III — PANEL REVIEW

Per concludere, un panel – generalmente guidato da un rappresentante CE - rivede tutte le proposte del bando (o di parte di un bando) per:

– accertare che le valutazioni dei consensus group siano consistenti
– se necessario, proporre valutazioni/commenti diversi
– risolvere i casi in cui ci siano delle posizioni di minoranza nel consensus report
– convocare (tramite i cd. Hearing) i coordinator delle proposte per ulteriori spiegazioni

Il ‘PANEL REPORT’ include l’ ‘EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT (ESR)’ di ciascuna proposta (sulla base del consensus report, inclusi i commenti e le eventuali revisioni del panel report), con punteggio e spiegazioni per criterio, insieme al punteggio complessivo finale (‘panel ranked list’) e, se necessario, le raccomandazioni di priorità del panel.
PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE
PROPOSTE CON STESSO PUNTEGGIO

NELL’ORDINE SI ATTRIBUISCE PRIORITA’ A:

1. le proposte che riguardano topic altrimenti non coperti all’interno del WP
2. tra queste, si guarda prima al punteggio del criterio 'excellence', e poi ad 'impact'  
   ▪ (al contrario per Innovation actions & SME instrument)
3. se c’è ancora parità, al budget destinato alle PMI
4. se c’è ancora parità, al bilanciamento di genere del personale coinvolto
5. se c’è ancora parità, altri fattori (sinergie tra progetti, obiettivi H2020, etc...)

@APRE 2013
PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

COMUNICAZIONE RISULTATI

• **PROPOSTE VALUTATE POSITIVAMENTE** = *INVITATION LETTER + EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT* al coordinatore per informarlo dei risultati della valutazione e per invitarlo alla fase di preparazione del Grant

  ECCEZIONE PER LA PRESENTAZIONE A DUE STEP:
  - ‘GO’, il coordinatore viene semplicemente invitato a presentare la proposta completa per il II step, ma non riceve ESR
  - ‘NO GO’, il coordinator riceve ESR

• **PROPOSTE BOCCIATE** = *PROPOSAL REJECTION LETTER* al coordinatore con relative giustificazioni e possibilità di REDRESS

• **RESERVE LIST** = nel caso in cui la proposta non sia finanziabile per mancanza di fondi e finanziamenti extra diventino disponibili in futuro.
Subject: Result of Evaluation / Invitation to grant preparation
H2020 - H2020-GARRI-NCP-2014-1
635656 - SIS.net2

Dear Adalheidur JONSDOTTIR,

We are pleased to inform you that the above mentioned proposal has been favourably evaluated by the Commission. Consequently, we wish to proceed to the preparation of the Grant Agreement based on your proposal.

Please find enclosed the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) for your proposal. The ESR reflects the comments of the evaluators and their advice to the Commission on the proposal.

**Invitation to grant preparation**

With reference to the submitted proposal and its evaluation, the grant preparation shall be based on the following:

1. **Proposal No:** 635656 - SIS.net2 - CSA
2. **Strategic objective:** H2020 - H2020-GARRI-NCP-2014-1
3. **Project Officer:**
   - Mr. Jean-Francois DECHAMP
   - Jean-Francois.DECHAMP@ec.europa.eu
   - +32 22961462
   - Science for and in society
4. **Maximum Grant Amount:**
   - EU contribution requested in Proposal: 1,999,598.00 EUR
   - Maximum EU financial contribution attributed to Action following evaluation: 1,999,598.00 EUR
5. **Duration of the Action:** 36 Months

6. **Technical content:** The ‘Description of the Action’ (Annex 1 of the future Grant Agreement) and the ‘Estimated budget for the action’ (Annex 2 of the future Grant Agreement) shall be based on the proposal submitted.

In the event that the ethics assessment and/or the security scrutiny identify substantive issues, these recommendations must be taken into account during grant preparation and reflected in the Description of the Action.

Please note that, in principle, no changes in the consortium composition (including linked third parties) are possible during the grant preparation phase. Please inform your Project Officer (3) as soon as possible if an organisation from the proposal is no longer in a position to participate in the grant agreement for duly-justified reasons (e.g. due to bankruptcy).

7. **Timetable for grant preparation:**

7.1 **7 weeks after the date of this letter** is the deadline for the submission of the grant agreement data, including annexes. Following the assessment of the submitted version of the grant agreement data, you will have a two-week deadline to submit the final version taking into consideration all requirements highlighted by the Project Officer,

7.2 **8 weeks after the date of this letter** is the deadline for the electronic signature of the participants’ declarations of honour.

The Commission foresees proceeding with the signature of the grant agreement within **3 months** after the date of this letter.

Failure to respect the deadlines indicated above (7) will be considered as a wish not to enter into, or continue with, the grant preparation and, therefore, to withdraw your proposal. In such a case, the Commission reserves the right to initiate the procedures to reject your proposal, unless alternative arrangements have been accepted by the Commission.

The entire grant preparation process, including communication with the Commission and the subsequent signature of the Grant Agreement, shall be carried out through the Research Participant Portal Grant Management Service (PP GMS). By logging into the ‘My Area’ section in the Participant Portal and selecting the project, each step of the grant preparation process can be followed, and all relevant documents consulted, at any time.

The Grant Agreement preparation data provided through the Participant Portal (pre-filled with the information already available in the Beneficiary Register, and structured data from your proposal) are needed in order to prepare the grant agreement and provide programme-wide statistical information.

Please note that some information related to the legal and financial status of participants is read-only and may only be updated by the Legal Entity Appointed Representative (LEAR) of the concerned entity through the ‘My Organisation(s)’ page of the ‘My Area’ section in the Participant Portal. It is therefore important to ensure that all participants are aware of the need to appoint a LEAR.

Furthermore, please be aware that linked third parties mentioned in your proposal also need to be registered and validated as legal entities. If necessary, please urge them to start the registration/validation process as quickly as possible.
In the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring and explained in the comments.

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

Credibility of the proposed approach

Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures

The proposal very well resonates with the objectives of the call and sets the project objectives accordingly. It aims to provide training for the networks of NCPs and to give feedback to the Commission. The project will solely address cross-cutting issues, as requested by the call.

The proposal follows a grassroots approach, giving the NCPs the floor to learn from each other. The novel concept introduced (NCP Academy) is not elaborated so as to how exactly the proposed objectives will be achieved. There are references in the first part of the proposal focused on its relationship with the work programme that remains under-qualified, such as the one referring to the project's ambition to respond to the heterogeneity of NCP services which are provided at the national level, or its aim to provide quality training to the NCP community.

The proposal's references to the need for integral training are under-elaborated e.g. how exactly a harmonised training approach and a cross-fertilisation will be materialised and become operational.

Another shortcoming is that the proposal does not take into account the results and main conclusions from previous similar projects on the role and activities of NCPs in detail.

Criterion 2: Impact

Score: 3.50 (Threshold: 3.00%, Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project contribute to the

-the relevant topic
-advance the project results (including management of IPR), to be considered.

A good impact on the NCP quality level. The effectiveness of the proposed shortcomings:

-explained e.g. at the description of implementation risks "lack of demand" is voiced widely (p.38), but this activity is not described in the relevant WP4 advertisement or awareness raising activities either.

More NCPs with fewer capacities and outside the consortium and to the nads that the enabling of NCPs will be less effective than expected, presenting many collaborative tools (e.g. collaborative tools), e.g. in general well-structured and well-planned. However, as training materials for the expiry of the project, the proposal looks detail and reference to the relevant intellectual property rights, project life will be sustained on the European level.

Operational Capacity

Status: Operational Capacity: Yes

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: Yes

Remarks

Not provided
My Proposals

This page provides a list of all proposals relating to you as a participant, as follows:

- proposals you have initiated or submitted as a Coordinator/Principal Investigator, or
- proposals you have contributed to as a project participant

You can view, edit or download your draft or submitted proposals, depending on the proposal status and the deadline of the relevant call.

To start preparing a new proposal, go to Funding Opportunities, to the page of the call or topic that you want to apply for, and enter the electronic submission system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>CALL</th>
<th>FUNDING SCHEME</th>
<th>PROPOSAL ID</th>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>REMAINING TIME</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H2020</td>
<td>H2020-SC5-2014-one-stage</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>SEP-210145597</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>VS-FO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Showing 1 to 1 of 1 entries. (filtered from 58 total entries)
Ethics pre-screening and ethics review

- In parallel to the evaluation, EC will check if your proposal **complies with ethical principles and relevant legislation.**
Ethics pre-screening and ethics review

• In parallel to the evaluation, EC will check if your proposal complies with ethical principles and relevant legislation.

• Although the main focus is on the ethical dimension (e.g. ethics, human rights and protection of human beings, animal protection and welfare, data protection and privacy, environmental protection, malevolent use of research results), EC may also look at ‘research integrity’ issues (e.g. fabrication, falsification or plagiarism, including misrepresenting credentials and authorship improprieties).
Ethics pre-screening and ethics review

The ethics review has two stages:

• Stage 1 — Ethics screening, starting with the pre-screening (on the basis of your ‘ethics self-assessment’) to see if it raises ‘ethical issues’ and whether they are adequately handled.

• Stage 2 — Ethics assessment; for proposals raising serious ethical issues (e.g. severe intervention on humans, lack of appropriate ethics framework in the country where the research will be conducted, etc.) a more detailed analysis is made.
Useful links

– Grant Manual – Section on: proposal submission and evaluation

– Lists of H2020 expert evaluators in SC1 2014 calls

– H2020 Manual - Working as an expert
http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/docs/h2020-funding-guide/experts/experts_en.htm
ESR EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT
(CALL 2014-2015 H2020)
PUNTI DEBOLEZZA E FORZA
- Lack of credibility due to **lack of details concerning the models** to be used.
- **Limited overall ambition** of the proposal / **Innovation beyond the state-of-the-art** is insufficiently developed.
- No clear evidence of **innovation potential**.
- **No quantitative indicators** for the proposed objectives.
- **Specific objectives inconsistent** with the target of the proposal.
- Objectives are not convincingly addressed, especially concerning the actual **analysis of drivers of change and causalities**.
- Lack of details on the **mechanisms to implement** some of the objectives.
- Some of the objectives are **missing measurable targets** to enable benchmarking of the project results against existing technologies.
• The **conceptual framework** insufficiently elaborated.
• **Disadvantages of the proposed approach** are not considered enough in the proposal.
• Targeted **TRL** values are not consistent.
• The **linkage with other on-going activities** is provided. However the description on how to effectively build upon the achieved results and to cooperate with them is minimal.
• A clear sequence of coordination and support measures is outlined, even if these could have been **presented in a more diagrammatic manner**.
• The proposal could have developed the **gender issues** more clearly.
ESR – best practices: ECCELLENZA

- Strutturare chiaramente gli obiettivi (anche con l’aiuto di grafici), che siano rilevanti rispetto alla call e misurabili.
- Costruire su progetti EU in atto o conclusi.
- Descrivere i concetti base e le diverse componenti tecnologiche del progetto in maniera esaustiva ed organica in tutta la proposta.
- Stabilire un equilibrio credibile tra ricerca, dimostrazione e first market replication action (laddove applicabile).
- Interdisciplinarietà: combinare efficacemente diversi domini di expertise.
- Adottare un approccio interdisciplinare che includa per esempio ‘policy development, citizen science, data interoperability and capacity building’. Non trascurare end-users e/o technology transfer providers!
- Adottare una metodologia che si basi su un approccio step by step.
ESR – debolezze: IMPATTO 1/2

- No significant environmental and social impacts beyond the call targets.
- Not quantified impact/clear justification of the forecasts on impacts is missing.
- Provided numbers are not fully convincing, as supporting facts are missing.
- Enhanced citizen awareness and participation mentioned but not sufficiently developed.
- Little discussion about how the new knowledge produced by the project will be integrated to available data sets, and used in broader scale models.
- Insufficient/standard communication measures.
ESR – debolezze: IMPATTO 2/2

- In the **dissemination strategy** a clear targeted strategy to reach different stakeholders’ groups is not well mentioned.
- The **performance indicators for dissemination** are not ambitious.
- The possibility to set up **training workshops towards end users** as a way to decrease the barrier for adoption of the project results is not considered enough.
- Ability to effectively **replicate the concept and technology throughout Europe** is not evident.
- **Exploitation plan** is absent/partial or vague.
- Lack of details on **IPR management**.
ESR – best practices: IMPATTO 1/3

- Descrivere gli impatti attesi in una *tavola sinottica*.
- Definire una *exploitation strategy* che contenga 4 elementi fondamentali:
  - analisi del mercato (e possibile impatto sullo stesso),
  - management della proprietà intellettuale,
  - innovation management
  - business plan
- Non trascurare gli aspetti della *standardizzazione* (e.g. attraverso link con il CEN/CENELEC)
- Creare una *connessione tra le azioni di disseminazione e di exploitation* al fine di operare in vista di una futura commercializzazione del prodotto/servizio oggetto della proposta (a tal fine, eventualmente sviluppare una SWOT analisys).
ESR – best practices: IMPATTO 2/3

• Laddove rilevante (principalmente IA NMBP), prevedere un **business case preliminare** che mostri i vantaggi in termini di costi del prodotto/servizio oggetto della proposta.
• Trattare esaustivamente gli aspetti dell’**IPR e dei diritti di accesso per lo sfruttamento commerciale**.
• Sviluppare misure di **disseminazione e comunicazione modellate sulle esigenze dei vari target groups**.
• Laddove possibile, promuovere il **coinvolgimento della società civile** (e.g. attraverso la citizen science).
• Prevedere il coinvolgimento degli attori impegnati nel **policy e decision making**.
ESR – best practices: IMPATTO 3/3

- Coinvolgere direttamente PMI e centri di ricerca privati così che possano direttamente beneficiare dei risultati del progetto, generando nuova innovazione. Le potenzialità di sfruttamento in questo senso sono indice della futura capacità del progetto di generare opportunità di lavoro e benessere economico.

- Stabilire meccanismi di valutazione dell’efficacia delle misure di comunicazione lungo che operino durante tutto l’arco del progetto al fine di garantirne l’efficacia.

- Strutturare le attività di comunicazione e disseminazione in modo da permettere la validazione dei risultati del progetto da parte degli utilizzatori finali, massimizzato così il loro potenziale. Stabilire meccanismi che consentano agli end-user di dare il proprio feedback sul progetto.

- Fare un uso proattivo e mirato dei social media.
ESR – debolezze: IMPLEMENTAZIONE 1/3

- **Workpackages** do not build into a coherent approach.
- The **logical flow of the work plan** is not appropriate to the core objective of the proposal.
- The **work plan is overloaded** as well as tasks and deliverables lists./WPs’ and tasks’ overlap.
- The content of the **work plan** is unequal in the level of details provided.
- **Discrepancies** between work packages, tasks and person months.
- The share of technical/research activities versus networking and dissemination ones and viceversa is sometimes imbalanced comparing with the type of action considered.
- The **allocation of person months** for the project is overestimated.
ESR – debolezze: IMPLEMENTAZIONE 2/3

• More **public deliverables** needed.
• Deliverables defined are limited to reports (e.g. demonstrator deliverables, both for technical demonstrations and for first market exploitation, are missing)
• Limited array of potential end-users included in the **advisory board**.
• **Social scientists are insufficiently represented** which raises questions as to the ability of the consortium partners in delivering the full range of expected impacts.
• **Weak innovation management**. It does not describe enough the potential impact of the project on the innovation capacity of every partner separately, nor is addressed the way new rising ideas will be handled during the project.
ESR – debolezze:
IMPLEMENTAZIONE 3/3

• Poor risk management.
• The consortium does not provide a **exhaustive geographical coverage**.
• Only a minority of the **staff** in the project teams consists of women.
ESR – best practices:
IMPLEMENTAZIONE 1/3

• Descrivere logicamente e distribuire le attività dei Work Packages coerentemente lungo la durata del progetto assicurando la loro corretta implementazione, coordinamento ed integrazione
• Dividere budget e person-months equamente tra partners.
• Costruire un consorzio multidisciplinare ed integrato che copra tutte le task del progetto in termini di expertise e di posizionamento sulla catena del valore.
• L’interdisciplinarietà del consorzio deve servire a prendere in considerazione non solo gli aspetti tecnici, ma anche gli aspetti legati alla società, normativa e mercato.
• Il coordinatore deve preferibilmente avere esperienza pregressa nel coordinamento.
ESR – best practices: IMPLEMENTAZIONE 1/3

• Valorizzare il ruolo delle PMI nel consorzio.
• Laddove possibile, coinvolgere le autorità locali.
• Definire chiare struttura e procedura di management (e.g. che coinvolgano ‘steering committees’, ‘End-users committee’, un ‘communication manager’).
• Descrivere esaustivamente rischi e azioni di mitigazione.
• Allocare le risorse economiche in maniera appropriata e ragionevole.
• Non trascurare gli aspetti di genere.
RESEARCH PARTICIPANT PORTAL

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home
GRAZIE PER L'ATTENZIONE!

APRE
Agenzia per la Promozione della Ricerca Europea
via Cavour, 71
00184 - Roma
www.apre.it
Tel. (+39) 06-48939993
Fax. (+39) 06-48902550

Serena Borgna
borgna@apre.it