

## Trial evaluations and feedback on proposal drafts

### General Remarks

The evaluation/feedback process should be guided by the following two documents:

- The Work Programme relevant to the proposal in question
- The Guide for Applicants, especially Annex 4, relevant for the Call addressed by the proposal in question

These two documents constitute the Commission's requirements for the content of the proposal. In the remainder of this document, we present questions for each section of a proposal that are known to be important in the evaluation process, but not necessarily mentioned in an explicit manner in the documents above.

### Abstract/introductory sections

*What is this proposal about?*

This question should be easily answered from the abstract and introductory section, and it should be answered concordantly by all reviewers. If not, the proposal has its first major flaw. Also, the abstract should be able to answer all of Sean McCarthy's five questions (see below) briefly.

More specifically, the Abstract should address the following issues:

- Deliverables – What are the expected results?
- Background - Why are you doing this project? Educate the evaluator, fact and figures from policy documents. Why bother? Who cares? Why now?
- Relevance of the Proposal Objectives to the Objectives of the IST Programme
- Relevance of the Proposal Objectives to the Strategic Objectives of the IST Work Programme 2005-2006
- How will the objectives be achieved - Phases of work
- Partners and roles - Who will be involved, and why are they involved?
- Estimated Budget and Duration

Does the abstract catch the reader's interest/enthusiasm? A bad abstract will minimize the proposal's chances.

### The S&T part:

Sean McCarthy's five questions (appendix 1) should be answered in detail!

Other questions:

- Is the proposal written in an understandable manner (for experts as well as generalists)?
- Is the main idea communicated clearly enough?
- What are the objectives (e.g. what kind of socio-economic problem is going to be solved)?
- What are the deliverables (what will be delivered in order to solve these problems)?
- Is the distinction between objectives and deliverables clear enough?

### **State of the Art:**

- Is the SoA described adequately? Is it understandable for both experts and generalists?
- Are the advancements of the SoA clearly described?

### **Work plan and methodology:**

- Does the proposal account for the research in the project necessary to achieve the objectives and deliverables?
- Are methods and work plan sound?

### **S&T in General:**

- Is the proposal enjoyable to read?
- Are there diagrams/tables inserted into the text passages that make it easier to get the main points?
- Is the language good enough to communicate all important points (also to non-native speakers of English)?

### **Implementation:**

- Is the work package structure logical?
- Makes the distribution of resources sense?
- Are there any nonsense partners (e.g. a few PM in almost every WP)?
- Are the management structures sound as described in the proposal?
- Are descriptions of partners streamlined and consistent?
- Is partner excellence and importance sufficiently described, both on organisational and personal level?
- Is the complementarity of the consortium described well enough? I.e. Does every partner has clearly defined tasks in the consortium?

### **Impact:**

- Does the impact match the Work Programme?
- Is there a lead user to take on the exploitation?
- Are IPR-related issues addressed sufficiently
- Are enough of the deliverables PU (public)?
- Is there a clear dissemination strategy?
- Are exploitation and dissemination addressed at both consortium and individual level?

### **Appendix 1: Sean McCarthy's five questions (to be kept in mind throughout the proposal):**

- Question 1: Why bother? (What problem are you trying to solve?)
- Question 2: Why is this important at EU level?
- Question 3: Is there already a product or service available?
- Question 4: Why now? (What would happen if this project was not funded?)
- Question 5: Why you? (Are you the best consortium to undertake this research?)