

# Key aspects in a successful application

**The evaluator's perspective**

# THE EVALUATION PROCESS

- The evaluators are researchers
- They know how demanding the application process is
- The evaluators are experts (but eventually not in every single aspect of the grant)
- You must show you dominate the field but you must also be clear enough for the “not so expert” to understand the message

# THE EVALUATION PROCESS

- Within structured and detailed criteria, the evaluation still has a ***SUBJECTIVE*** component.
- The details may make the difference
- Make the evaluator wish to support your grant
- Catch the attention in the first page

## The text of the call

***Read very carefully the text of the call. Your science may be excellent but the proposal rated as poor if outside the scope of the call or expected impacts***

## Read the evaluation forms

***The evaluators have to stick to it and justify their scores in accordance.***

**Pay attention to details**

***Gender, young investigators, countries,  
stakeholders, anonymity***

**Be very critical with yourself**

***Ask peers to read and comment***

# The process is very competitive

Be excellent in the science you propose.

Make yourself clear.

Be creative and innovative: go beyond.

# So...

## Do

- Be clear
- Be simple
- Define the aims
- Clearly identify how to achieve the aims
- Specify milestones and deliverables
- Be honest with potential pitfalls
- Highlight complementarity

## DO NOT

- Repeat yourself in the various sections
- Overstate
- Pretend that your project will be miraculous
- Be sloppy
- Propose more than the budget can accommodate
- ...

# Good luck

(And do not forget to apply)



# Examples

<https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/opportunities/h2020/calls/h2020-phc-2014-2015.html>



2016-2017

Self-evaluation form

Form 1: Research and innovation actions

Innovation actions

Form 2: Coordination & support actions

Version 2.0  
22 October 2015

### Scoring

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned.

### Interpretation of the scores

- 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.

### Thresholds

The threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

### Two-stage submission schemes

The scheme below is applicable to a full proposal. For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' will be evaluated. Within these criteria, only the aspects in bold will be considered. The threshold for both individual criteria will be 4.

# Research and innovation actions

## 1. Excellence

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:*

- **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**

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

# Coordination and support actions

## 1. Excellence

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:*

- **Clarity and pertinence of the objectives**
- **Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology**
- **Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures**

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

# Research and innovation actions

## 2. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- **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

Comments:

**Score 2:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

# Coordination and support actions

## 2. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- **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;**
- 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

Comments:

**Score 2:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

# Research and innovation actions, and coordination and support actions

## 3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation\*

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- 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.

Comments:

**Score 3:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
*Threshold 10/15*

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.



# Coordination and support actions

## 3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation \*

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- 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.

Comments:

**Score 3:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
Threshold 10/15

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.