

# *The ICT Theme in FP7*

## Proposal evaluation

The Evaluation criteria: Keys to  
success and reasons for failure  
- The Golden Rules

# Funding schemes

## 3 funding schemes – 5 “instruments”

- Collaborative Projects (CP)
  - Large scale integrating Projects (“IP”)
  - Small or medium scale focused research actions (“STREP”)
- Networks of Excellence (NoE)
- Coordination and Support Actions (CSA)
  - Coordinating or networking actions (“CA”)
  - Support Actions (“SSA”)

# Evaluation

- Proposals are evaluated by independent experts
- Three evaluation criteria are used:
  - Scientific and technical quality*
  - Implementation*
  - Impact*with fuller descriptive 'bullet points'
- All proposal coordinators receive an Evaluation Summary Report
- Funding follows successful evaluation, selection and detailed contract negotiations

# CP - Integrating Projects

## Experience of IPs in FP6

- Purpose: Ambitious objective driven research with a 'programme approach'
- Target audience: Industry (incl. SMEs), research institutions. Universities – and in some cases potential end-users
- Typical duration: 36-60 months
- Optimum consortium: 10-20 participants
- Total EU contribution: €4-25m (average around €10m)
- Flexibility in implementation:
  - Update of workplan
  - Possibility for competitive calls for enlargement of consortium

# CP – Focused projects

## Experience of STREPs in FP6

- Purpose: Objective driven research more limited in scope than an IP
- Target audience: Industry including SMEs, research institutes, universities
- Typical duration: 18-36 months
- Optimum consortium: 6-15 participants
- Total EU contribution: €1-4 m (average around €2m)
- Fixed workplan and fixed partnership for duration

# CP – Evaluation criteria

## 1. Scientific and technical quality

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Progress beyond the state-of-the-art
- Quality and effectiveness of the S & T methodology and associated workplan

# CP – Evaluation criteria

## 2. Implementation

- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants
- Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance)
- Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)

# CP – Evaluation criteria

## 3. Impact

- Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the workprogramme under the relevant activity
- Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property



# Networks of excellence

## Experience of NoEs in FP6

- Purpose: Durable integration of participants' research activities
- Target audience: research institutions, universities, mainly indirectly: industry – through governing boards etc
- Typical duration: 48-60 months  
(but indefinite integration!)
- Optimum consortium: 6-12 participants
- Total EU contribution: €4-10m (average around €5m)
- Flexibility in implementation:  
Update of workplan  
Possibility to add participants through competitive calls

# NoEs – Evaluation criteria

## Scientific and technical quality

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Contribution to long term integration of high quality S/T research
- Quality and effectiveness of the joint programme of activities and associated workplan

# NoEs – Evaluation criteria

## Implementation

- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants
- Quality of the consortium as a whole (including ability to tackle fragmentation of the research field and commitment towards a deep and durable institutional integration)
- Adequacy of resources for successfully carrying out the joint programme of activities

# NoEs – Evaluation criteria

## Impact

- Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the workprogramme under the relevant activity
- Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large

# CSAs - Coordination actions

## Experience of CAs in FP6

- Purpose: Co-ordination of research activities
- Target Audience: Research institutions, universities, industry incl. SMEs
- Typical duration: 18-36 months
- Optimum consortium: 13-26 participants
- Total EU contribution: €0.5-2m (average around €1m)
- Fixed overall workplan and partnership for the duration

# CSAs - Support actions

## Experience of SSAs in FP6

- Purpose: Support to programme implementation, preparation of future actions, dissemination of results
- Target audience: Research organisations, universities, industry including SMEs
- Typical duration: 9-30 months
- Optimum consortium: 1-15 participants
- Total EU contribution: €0.03-3m (average around €0.5m)
- Fixed overall workplan and partnership for the duration

# CSAs – Evaluation criteria

## Scientific and technical quality

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Contribution to the coordination of high quality research \*
- Quality and effectiveness of the coordination/support action mechanisms and associated workplan

\*Coordination actions only

# CSAs – Evaluation criteria

## Implementation

- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants
- Quality of the consortium as a whole\* (including complementarity, balance)
- Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)

\*for Support actions, only if relevant



# CSAs – Evaluation criteria

## Impact

- Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the workprogramme under the relevant activity
- Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large

# Evaluation criteria scoring

- Scale of 1-5 (and 0)
- No weighting
  - except FET Open
- Criterion threshold 3/5
- Overall threshold 10/15

# The Golden Rules

Use the Instructions\* and Forms for the evaluators

1. Give the instructions and your draft proposal to experienced colleagues
2. Then re-write your proposal following their recommendations

\*appendix in the Guide for Applicants

# The Golden Rules

Submit on time !

Electronic submission via EPSS

Online preparation only

- Improved validation checks before submission is accepted
- FP6 Failure rate =  $\pm 1\%$
- Main reason for failure - waiting till the last minute
- Submit early, submit often!

# The Golden Rules

## Divide your effort over the evaluation criteria

- Many proposers concentrate on the scientific element, but lose marks on project planning or impact description

## Think of the finishing touches which signal quality work:

- clear language
- well-organised contents, following the Part B structure
- useful and understandable diagrams
- no typos, no inconsistencies, no obvious paste-ins, no numbers which don't add up, no missing pages ...

# The Golden Rules

Make it *easy* for the evaluators to give you high marks. Don't make it hard for them!

- Don't write too little; cover what is requested
- Don't write too much
- Don't leave them to figure out why it's good, tell them why it's good
- Leave nothing to the imagination

# The Golden Rules

Learn from our experience of FP6 !

# S & T Quality

- Can't quite see what they are aiming at...  
**Score 1**
- Unoriginal work, carried out many times before  
**Score 2 or 3**
- Clear explanation of quality work *advancing the state-of-the-art* **Score 4**
- Clear explanation of quality work advancing the state-of-the-art, with real original thought  
**Score 5**



# Implementation:

## Quality of the consortium

- Re-assuring phrases about how good we are  
**Score 1**
- Appends the CVs; work it out for yourself  
**Score 2 or 3**
- Clear description of who we are and what we do, reflecting the objectives addressed  
**Score 4**
- Description of who we are and what we do, focused on the objectives addressed, *and* among the best in the business **Score 5**

# Implementation:

## Quality of the management

- Re-assuring phrases about how well-managed it's going to be and how experienced we are  
**Score 1**
- Here's the standard management plan I learned at business school **Score 2 or 3**
- Adequately detailed organisation and management plan specific to this project, clear responsibilities, problem-solving mechanisms **Score 4**
- Detailed, clear and flexible plan embracing contingency planning and reaching beyond the end of the project **Score 5**

# Implementation:

## Mobilisation of resources

- More re-assuring phrases **Score 1**
- Copies and pastes the text from the corporate brochures; work it out for yourself  
**Score 2**
- Resource plan specific to the project, but sketched out **Score 3**
- Detailed resource planning, but possibly over/under-estimated **Score 4**
- Just the right amount of resources, convincingly integrated **Score 5**

# Impact

- Issue avoided (there is no impact / impact not actually related to goals of the programme)  
**Score 0**
- Re-assuring phrases about how valuable this work is going to be **Score 1 or 2**
- Specific impact is clearly identified in detailed terms **Score 3**
- Clearly identifies impact in detailed terms, showing deep knowledge of the area *and* original thinking **Score 4 or 5**

# The Golden Rules

Make sure your Project Workplan reflects the promises you made in the rest of your proposal

For example:

- S&T quality implies an adequate and well-organised research effort
- Good project management implies clear Workpackage leadership
- Strong Impact implies an important dissemination effort

## Typical Project workplan (man-months)

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



# The Workpackage that nobody wanted

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



## The Workpackage that does too much

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104





The partner who doesn't know what to do

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



# The token SME

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



## ..and New Member State

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



## The well-lead workpackages which will get results

	<b>WP1</b>	<b>WP2</b>	<b>WP3</b>	<b>WP4</b>	<b>WP5</b>	<b>WP6</b>	
<b>P1</b>	10	4			4		18
<b>P2</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
<b>P3</b>					3		3
<b>P4</b>		12	2	2	12		28
<b>P5</b>			14	2	3		19
<b>P6</b>			5	2	11		18
<b>P7</b>						6	6
<b>Total</b>	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



# The Golden Rules

## Use all the help you can get

- Commission contact person for each objective open in call
- A help desk for proposers' questions
- A help desk for electronic submission problems
- A network of National Contact Points

<http://cordis.europa.eu/ist/ncps.htm>

(and don't wait till it's too late)!