H2020 – Evaluation des propositions

B. Cuenot – Chercheur@ CERFACS (http://www.cerfacs.fr)
cuenot@cerfacs.fr

Domaines d'expertise:
-Mécanique des Fluides
-Chimie
-Energie
-(Plasma)

Domaines d'application:
-Aéronautique
-Environnement
-Pétrochimie

Premières évaluations : 2003!

La procédure d'évaluation

- Evaluation individuelle
  Cette étape se fait en télétravail
  Les évaluations sont vérifiées une première fois sur la forme par le *vice-chair*

- Consensus
  A Bruxelles
  3 évaluateurs dont 1 rapporteur qui rédige l'évaluation et la fait valider par les 2 autres évaluateurs
  L'évaluation est à nouveau vérifiée sur la forme par le *vice-chair*

- Assemblée générale
  Le classement des propositions est présenté et validé en Assemblée générale

Avant chaque session d'évaluation, les évaluateurs sont informés en détail des aspects spécifiques au call et à la session

Les resoumissions sont traitées de la façon suivante:

- l'évaluation individuelle est faite normalement
- au cours ou à la fin du consensus, l'évaluation précédente est consultée pour vérifier qu'il n'y a pas d'incohérence dans les commentaires (mais il peut y avoir des contradictions, à condition qu'elles soient clairement justifiées)

Echelle de notation

0 -	*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.*** *Proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.*
3 -	***Good.*** *Proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.*
4 -	***Very Good.*** *Proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.*
5 -	***Excellent.*** *Proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*

H2020 - ITN

1. EXCELLENCE	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research programme (including inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects) ☐ Quality and innovative aspects of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects) ☐ Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for EID and EJD projects) ☐ Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • • Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score 1 (out of 5):	

50%

H2020 - ITN

30%

2. IMPACT	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Enhancing the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development ☐ Contribution to structuring doctoral / early-stage research training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity, including the potential for: a) meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the doctoral/research training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field b) developing sustainable joint doctoral degree structures (for EJD projects only) ☐ Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results ☐ Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score 2 (out of 5):	

H2020 - ITN

20%

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources, (including awarding of the doctoral degrees for EID and EJD projects) ☐ Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management (with a mandatory joint governing structure for EID and EJD projects) ☐ Appropriateness of the infrastructure of the participating organisations ☐ Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the programme	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • • Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score 3 (out of 5):	

H2020 - RISE

1. EXCELLENCE (50%)	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects ☐ Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives ☐ Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • • Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score:	

50%

H2020 - RISE

2. IMPACT (30%)	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Enhancing the potential and future career perspectives of the staff members ☐ Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels ☐ Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results ☐ Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • • Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score:	

30%

H2020 - RISE

20%

3. QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION (20%)	
The following aspects will be considered when assigning an overall score for this criterion: ☐ Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources ☐ Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management ☐ Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure) ☐ Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the project	
Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • • Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): • • •	
Score:	