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Introduction: The reviewer perspective

• Who?
• When?
• What?
• How?
Who?

• Part of 2 large FP6 and FP7 funded projects from 2004-2012 led by University of Brighton
• Led EPSRC funded project
• Participated in expert forum for H2020 – SC6 in 2016
• Participated evaluating proposals in 2017
• Participated as a project evaluator in 2019
Who else?

• Consultants
• Industry
• Academics
• All from across Europe with very different perspectives on economic, social and other priorities
When?

• 3 weeks after submission deadline
• 3 phases over 4 weeks:
  • Reviewing: 1 week and remote consensus: 1 week
  • Cross reading: 2 weeks
  • Central panel: 2 days in Brussels
What?

- Two-stage call - Second stage evaluation
- SC6 CULT-COOP-09-2017: European cultural heritage, access and analysis for richer interpretation of the past.
- Second stage: 57 proposals
What?

• Each reviewer gets 4 proposals
  • Part A + Part B
  • 100-150 pages each to assess
  • Evaluation report to be produced
• ~10 hours in total per proposal including producing report
• 40 hours over 7 days (~5 hours extra per day)
How?  Evaluation criteria

Excellence
- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology
- Extent that proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organizational models)
- Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge.

Impact
- The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic
- Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the WP, that would enhance innovation capacity; create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society
- Quality of proposed measures to exploit and disseminate project results (including IPR, manage data research where relevant); communicate the project activities to different target audiences (n/a SME Phase 1)

Implementation
- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which resources assigned in work packages are in line with objectives/deliverables
- Appropriateness of management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management
- Complementarity of the participants which the consortium as a whole brings together expertise
- Appropriateness of allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfill that role
Scoring

0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information (unless the result of an ‘obvious clerical error’).

1 - Poor: the criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 - Fair: the proposal broadly addresses the criterion but there are significant weaknesses.

3 - Good: the proposal addresses the criterion well but with a number of shortcomings.

4 - Very good: the proposal addresses the criterion very well but with a small number of shortcomings.

5 - Excellent: the proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; any shortcomings are minor.
Tips and tricks

• Prepare for reviewers with different background.
• Be clear how you address each of the criteria.
• Be clear what makes this proposal stand above others.
• Be mindful of role of the associated partners.
• Be interdisciplinary.
Questions?