



# How to Prepare a Winning Proposal

## *Manufacturing in FP7*

**Nick Bodycombe**

**European Office Manager**

**Research and Commercial Division**

**Cardiff University**



Credit and thanks to:

**David Lauder, *University of York*, UK**

**Henk van Ekelenburg, *ProSupport*, The  
Netherlands**

***EU Advisor*, Finland**



# Outline

- **Introduction**
- **Science & Technological Quality**
- **Implementation**
- **Impact**
- **Conclusion**



# Introduction: Eligibility

## Checked by the Commission:

- **Receipt strictly before deadline (not even 1 nanosecond later!!!)**
- **Minimum number of partners and participating States (as specified in each FP7 Call)**
- **Completeness of proposal (presence of all required forms)**
- **Scope (a proposal will be deemed out-of-scope by Commission checkers only in clear cases)**
- **Other criteria (e.g. budget limits – min/max EC contributions)**



# Introduction:

# Evaluation Criteria

**Criteria are adapted to each funding scheme and thematic area**

**Evaluation criteria for FP7 Co-operation and FP7 Capacities:**

- 4. Scientific & Technological Quality**
- 5. Implementation**
- 6. Impact**

**Relevance to the Call is considered under “Impact” but also affects the scoring of “Quality”**



# Introduction:

## Instructions to Evaluators

**The “S&T quality” of a proposal (criterion 1) is evaluated to the extent that the content is relevant to the topics of the call.**

**For example, if a proposal is only marginally relevant, or if only one work package is relevant, you must downgrade your score – no matter how excellent the science!**

**Relevance to the objectives of the call is considered under “Impact” (criterion 3) - in relation to the sub-criterion “Contribution to expected impacts listed in the Work Programme”**



# Scientific & Technological Quality: Objectives

- **Include three or four objectives:**
  - **Specific and clearly stated**
  - **Measurable and quantifiable**
  - **Ambitious (going beyond the state-of-the-art) yet realistic and achievable**
  - **Relevant to the particular Work Programme**
  - **Timely**

**Be *SMART!***



# Scientific & Technological Quality: Innovation

- **Describe RELEVANT State-of-the-Art. Highlight any related EU-funded work (previous and current)**
- **Clearly indicate GAPS in State-of-the-Art**
- **Clearly indicate HOW GAPS will be filled, and link this to your methodology**
- **Carry out risk analysis**
- **Detail the fall back plans to manage and mitigate risks**



## Scientific & Technological Quality: Checklist (1)

- **Have you clearly stated the State-of-the-Art?**
- **Are the objectives:**
  - **SMART?**
  - **linked to the Work Plan (implementation)?**
  - **ambitious but feasible?**
  - **linked to the State-of-the-Art (i.e. fill ‘gaps’)?**
- **Are the Methodology and the Work Plan:**
  - **linked?**
  - **clearly stated?**
  - **effective (feasible)?**



## Scientific & Technological Quality: Checklist (2)

- **Are the Work Packages well integrated?**
- **Have you identified the critical path?**
- **Have you provided clear milestones at critical points?**  
e.g. “patent search completed”; “scientific model validated”;  
“prototype manufactured”; “field testing with 1000 test runs completed”.
- **Have you provided a list of deliverables for the key tasks?**
- **Have you evaluated risks fully?**
- **Have you proposed fall back plans/ alternative courses of action?**



# Implementation: Consortium

- **Small and Medium Scale Projects: typically 5-7 organisations (universities, research institutes, SMEs, large companies, Civil Society Organisations, etc... from 4 or 5 EU Member States and/or Associated Countries, and/or Third Countries)**
- **Large Scale Integrated Projects: typically 10-20 organisations**
- **Coordination Actions Projects: typically 10-15 organisations**
- **Support Actions Projects: typically 5-10 organisations**



# Implementation: Consortium Balance

- **Expertise (Complementarity)**
- **Work – NO!!! to: one partner per WP; having all partners in all WPs; or one partner doing all the work**
- **Budget – NO!!! to partners with disproportionate budgets**
- **Geography – European Dimension – not regional need**

**Avoid token partners: *ie* SMEs, large companies, renowned research groups, partners from new Member States, etc. which are introduced for *cosmetic* reasons only**



# Implementation Checklist (1)

## • Project Management

- **Is the management structure clear/efficient/well described?**
- **Does the co-ordinator have demonstrable capacity and experience?**
- **Is there a clear communications strategy?**
- **Is there a clear decision making strategy?**
- **Have IPR issues been well managed and a Consortium Agreement (between partners) been discussed?**
- **Have you clearly distinguished project and scientific management?**



## Implementation Checklist (2)

### • Consortium Development

- Are the roles of the partners clearly described and complementary?
- Does the experience of the partners match the tasks assigned to them?
- Have you presented evidence that you can work together?
- Do all partners have a well defined role?
- Are all (or nearly all) partners leaders in their fields?
- Is there a good balance between industrial (including SMEs) and non-industrial partners?



## Implementation Checklist (3)

- **Budgetary and Financial**
  - **Are the resources well justified and sufficient to fulfil the project's objectives?**
  - **Are any large budgetary items well justified?**
  - **Is the project within the overall budget limit?**
  - **Does the budget reflect a fair distribution of work effort?**
  - **Do you have a *fall-back* plan in case of budget cuts?**



# Impact

## **Demonstrate:**

- **Filling gaps at European level**
- **Maintaining European lead (competitive advantage)**

## **Provide supporting evidence:**

- **Figures**
- **Qualitative indicators**
- **European level versus National level**

## **Demonstrate European policy relevance:**

- **Directives, Regulations, Green Papers, White Papers, Commission Docs, EC Staff Working Papers etc..**
- **Put proposal into context – see bigger picture!!!**



## Impact: Keywords

- **Contribution at EU and/or International Level to the expected impacts list in the Work Programme under relevant topic/activity**
- **Expected impacts listed in Work Programme per topic, e.g.**  
**“New markets such as: extending the industrial robotics market to flexible small scale manufacturing, opening up services (professional and domestic) markets to robots;**  
**Novel functionalities for embedded systems and assistive systems for interpersonal communications, such as support of dynamic translation, and effective medical diagnostics and therapeutics.”**



# Impact - Checklist (1)

- **Have you provided a clear link between your objectives and the expected impact listed in the Work Programme?**
- **Have you demonstrated how your proposal will deliver the stated impact?**
- **Have you described the likelihood of achieving stated impacts?**
- **Have you detailed dissemination activities? Are they feasible and integrated with the project aims?**



## Impact - Checklist (2)

- **Have you formulated a clear exploitation plan?**
- **Have you described how previous work at European and National level would be exploited where possible?**
- **Have you clearly explained the relevance of your project to any European policy aims?**



# Conclusion: The Golden Rule

**“You get funded in FP7 not only because you are a good researcher, but because you can convince the evaluators that YOUR proposal is the best in responding to those EU needs and priorities.”**

**EU-Advisor e-training module**

**Good luck!**