I criteri di valutazione
Proposal evaluation

• **Criteria & scoring** – in the WP General Annex
• **Process** – in Commission Guidelines
Adapting to Horizon 2020

• New types of call; new types of proposal
  • multi-disciplinary and multi-sectoral; more emphasis on innovation and close-to-market;
• Simplification, for applicants, experts, and for streamlined operations;
• Coherence across the programme
Evaluation of proposals

- **Award criteria**
  - Excellence
    - Sole criterion for ERC frontier research actions
  - Impact
    - Higher weighting for innovation actions
  - Quality and efficiency in the implementation
  - Details, Weightings and thresholds to be laid down in WP

- Evaluation to be carried out by independent experts

- Possibility of a 2 stage submission procedure
1. **Excellence**

- 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

2. 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.
Award criteria: Research and Innovation Actions; Innovation Actions; SME instrument

3. **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.
Scoring/weights/thresholds

- As in FP7 each criterion scored out of 5; individual threshold of 3; overall threshold of 10
- Unlike FP7, for Innovation Actions and SME instrument...
  - impact criterion weighted by factor of 1.5
  - Impact considered first when scores equal
Priority of proposals with equal score

• For each group of tied proposals
  • First consider those that "fill gaps" in the WP
  • Of those, look at score for 'excellence', then at score for 'impact' (*reverse for Innovation actions & SME instrument*)
  • If still equal, look at SME budget
  • If still equal look at gender balance in key personnel
  • If still equal, consider other factors (overall portfolio, wider H2020, EU objectives etc)
  • Then repeat for those that don't "fill gaps"
Evaluation Process

Chain of individual, consensus and panel review maintained. But changes w.r.t. FP7:

- Dealing with multi-disciplinary/sectoral proposals
- New expert profiles, new blood; Call for experts planned for November
- Robust rules on expert turnover;
- More experts per proposal;
- Clear procedures for cases where experts disagree

Dealing with 8 month TTG

- Proposals strictly evaluated on their own merit No recommendations for substantial changes
- More multi-step (stopping evaluation when threshold failed)
- Fast and simplified procedure for SME instrument (i.a.)
Submission

- Full use if pre-registered data (PIC etc)
- Self check for SME status, financial viability
- Proposal “part B” structure closely matching criteria
- Aligned with Grant Agreement “Description of Work”
- Simpler but tougher page limits
  - “warn and watermark” in first round of calls
- More 2-stage procedure; with simplified approaches for short proposals
Proposal structure

Based around evaluation criteria:

• Excellence
• Eg. Objectives, concept, progress beyond state-of-art..

Impact

• Eg. Potential impact (*incl. with reference to WP*); measures to maximise impact (*dissemination, communication, exploitation*)

Implementation

• Including *work packages descriptions*