

General comments on my presentation

- ✓ Commission is doing a magnificent work in producing support documents
- ✓ How can I contribute to help making successful proposals? Flashes on my experience.
- ✓ Probably only common sense remark, (but common sense is sometime lost in the rush of the proposal)

A fair evaluation

- ✓ What do proposers expect from evaluators? a fair evaluation
- ✓ Help the evaluators to have the best attitude toward your proposal remembering
 - they have little time to read your proposal
 - They are human

Evaluators have little time to evaluate proposals

- ✓ Do not tire them
 - Clear sentences and short periods.
 - Main points crystal clear, avoid buzzwords and bla, bla, bla
 - Avoid excessive use of acronyms
 - Use consistent wording

Experts the selection criteria

- ✓ Experts are selected to have
 - A high level of expertise
 - An appropriate range of competencies.
- ✓ Providing the above conditions can be satisfied, other criteria are also taken into consideration:
 - An appropriate balance between academic and industrial expertise and users;
 - A reasonable gender balance;
 - A reasonable distribution of geographical origins;

Evaluators are human: do not irritate them

- ✓ Evaluators may not be specialist in your specific field but are highly educated people with a background in setting up and managing research project.
- ✓ They get upset
 - if they cannot understand what you "really" want and have to complete your presentation with their suppositions
 - if the proposal is written in such a way that implies that the reader should share the proposal statements on the base of the assumed authority of the proposers.
 - if they have to struggle with inconsistencies and missing logical links

Evaluation criteria

- ✓ S/T validity
- ✓ Impact
- ✓ Implementation

S/T validity: State of the Art

- Evaluators cannot be specialist in everything. Your state of the art is an important source of information for them.
- Overwhelming lists of articles (for the most part written by some of the proposer do not carry the information he needs.
- Obviously "do not cheat".
- Define the domain to which you refer your state of the art and why this domain is meaningful for your project.

S/T validity: Objectives

- Explain what you want to do: do not try to impress with what you want to do
 - Define the problem that you intend to solve
 - Specify the knowledge that would not be there if the project would not be carried out
 - Explain why this knowledge is critical to solve the proposed problem
- Explain concepts rather than giving numbers
- If you give numbers explain how you measure them
- If you give increments of performances in % be sure you have defined the base lines
- Avoid repetitions of buzzwords
- Give objectives for a project don't just directions of research

S/T validity: Methods

- Avoid the confusion between "solving identified problems" and "developing new methods for non identified generic problems"
- Don't try to sell a "research programme" for a "research project"
- If they exist prefer trivial solutions (that may even not need doctors) to complex ones (that may be good for publication)

Impact

➤ Enumerate both Pros and Cons

- new technologies tend to present few high advantages as confronted with existing technologies but many minor disadvantages that all together delay their adoption.

➤ Potential value vs investment

- Don't claim as indubitable enormous advantages it is difficult for the evaluator to understand why you want to share with others such a gold mine

➤ Explain selfsustainability of impact

- Explain the social political and environmental condition that are likely to help your results have an impact but point also out the risk that these conditions do not come true

➤ Do not confine impact evaluation to giving numbers

- Economic social environmental impact are processes that happen in the course of time do not treat them as mere question of numbers

➤ Distinguish between horizontal and vertical impact

Implementation

➤ Cosortium

- Real motivation, roles and responsibilities of partners are often unclear

➤ Governance

- Programme governannce vs.project govrnance
- Lack of time for validtion of results
- Uncertainty vs cost profile
- Man month spread without motivation
- Lack of delegate powers
- Lack of technical/scientific leadership

➤ Dissemination & Exploitation

- Unbalance of public vs restricted deliverables