

Programme FET

(du point de vue évaluateur)

Benedicte.Le-Grand@univ-paris1.fr



Comment devenir évaluateur ?


- **Inscription**

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/experts>

- **Déclaration des conflits d'intérêt**

- **Engagement sur la confidentialité**

Submission and evaluation in FP7



	Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
FETOPEN 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of targeted breakthrough and its specific science and technology contributions towards a long-term vision. • Novelty, level of ambition and foundational character. • Range and added value from interdisciplinarity. • Appropriateness of the research methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of the new technological outcome with regards to its transformational impact on technology and/or society. • Quality of measures for achieving impact on science, technology and/or society. • Impact from empowerment of new and high potential actors towards future technological leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the workplan and clarity of intermediate targets. • Relevant expertise in the consortium. • Appropriate allocation and justification of resources (person-months, equipment, budget).
	<p>Threshold: 4/5 Weight: 60%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3.5/5 Weight: 20%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 20%</p>

Barème de notation

-
- 0 - *The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*
 - 1 - *Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*
 - 2 - *Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.*
 - 3 - *Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.*
 - 4 - *Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.*
 - 5 - *Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*
-

	Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
FETOPEN 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of targeted breakthrough and its specific science and technology contributions towards a long-term vision. • Novelty, level of ambition and foundational character. • Range and added value from interdisciplinarity. • Appropriateness of the research methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of the new technological outcome with regards to its transformational impact on technology and/or society. • Quality of measures for achieving impact on science, technology and/or society. • Impact from empowerment of new and high potential actors towards future technological leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the workplan and clarity of intermediate targets. • Relevant expertise in the consortium. • Appropriate allocation and justification of resources (person-months, equipment, budget).
	<p>Threshold: 4/5 Weight: 60%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3.5/5 Weight: 20%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 20%</p>

<p>FETOPEN 2 FETOPEN 3</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of objectives. • Contribution to the coordination and/or support of high-risk and high-impact research, for new or emerging areas or horizontally. • Appropriateness of the coordination and/or support activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transformational impact on the communities and/or practices for high-risk and high-impact research. • Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, use of results, and dissemination of knowledge, including engagement with stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of workplan and management. • Relevant expertise in the consortium. • Appropriate allocation and justification of resources (person-months equipment, budget).
	<p>Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 40%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 40%</p>	<p>Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 20%</p>

	Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
FETPROACT 1 FETPROACT 2 FETPROACT 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of targeted breakthrough and its specific science and technology contributions towards a long-term vision. • Novelty, level of ambition and foundational character. • Range and added value from interdisciplinarity. • Appropriateness of the research methods. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Importance of the new technological outcome with regards to its transformational impact on technology and/or society. • Quality of measures for achieving impact on science, technology and/or society. • Impact from empowerment of new and high potential actors towards future technological leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the workplan and clarity of intermediate targets. • Relevant expertise in the consortium. • Appropriate allocation and justification of resources (person-months, equipment, budget).
	Threshold: 4/5 Weight: 60%	Threshold: 3.5/5 Weight: 20%	Threshold: 3/5 Weight: 20%

FET Flagship (FETFLAG1)

<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>Excellence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Scientific and technological quality of the individual participants and of the consortium as a whole in view of the objectives and the roadmap of the Flagship• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants and the consortium as a whole with regards to non-scientific aspects (e.g., ethics, dissemination, societal engagement and gender issues)
<p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Contribution to the expected impacts listed in the work programme• Extent to which the consortium enables access to resources required to achieve the complete flagship roadmap• Extent to which the consortium enables fostering complementarities, exploiting synergies, and enhancing the overall outcome of regional, national, European and international research programmes
<p>Criterion 3</p> <p>Quality and efficiency of the implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Quality of the proposed governance and management structure• Openness and flexibility of the consortium

FET Flagship (FETFLAG2 & FETFLAG3)

<p>Criterion 1</p> <p>Excellence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of adherence to the programme of activities as envisioned in the framework partnership agreement • Soundness of scientific concept, quality of objectives and progress beyond the state-of-the-art • Quality and effectiveness of the workplan (including milestones, flexibility and metrics to monitor progress) • Quality of measures for the coordination of activities across the Flagship Initiative, in particular to ensure overall continuity and coherence of the initiative.
<p>Criterion 2</p> <p>Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution to the expected impacts listed in the work programme • Extent to which the proposal makes use of complementarities, exploits synergies, and enhances the overall outcome of related regional, national, European and international research programmes • Effectiveness of measures for use of results, management of intellectual property and dissemination of knowledge • Effectiveness of measures relating to human capital, education and training at European level • Approach to address societal benefit and potential ethical and legal implications, including engagement with authorities and end-users
<p>Criterion 3</p> <p>Quality and efficiency of the implementation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of the governance, including management procedures and risk management • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants, and their contribution to the common goal • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance, involvement of key actors) • Openness and flexibility of the consortium • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (e.g. in-kind contributions, infrastructures, person-months, equipment and budget)