

EXPERIENCIAS PERSONALES DE INVESTIGADORES : DIFERENTES ETAPAS DEL PROCESO DE EVALUACIÓN DE UNA PROPUESTA Y RECOMENDACIONES

José Miguel Martín Martínez

*Catedrático del Departamento de Química Inorgánica.
Responsable del Laboratorio de Adhesión y Adhesivos.
Universidad de Alicante.*

Juan Carlos Trujillo Mondéjar

*Catedrático del Departamento de Lenguajes y Sistemas
Informáticos. Responsable del Lucentia Research Group.
Universidad de Alicante.*



Universitat d'Alacant
Universidad de Alicante

Alicante, 8 de mayo de 2015

INDICE

1. Modelo de “Call”.
2. Instructions for evaluators.
3. Evaluation process.
4. Individual evaluation form.

CALL



European
Commission

RESEARCH & INNOVATION

Participant Portal

European Commission > Research & Innovation > Participant Portal > Opportunities

HOME

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

HOW TO PARTICIPATE

EXPERTS

SUPPORT ▾

Search PP



LOGIN



REGISTER

EU Programmes 2014–2020

Search Topics

Call Updates



Calls



H2020

Research Fund for Coal & Steel

COSME

3rd Health Programme

Consumer Programme

FP7 & CIP Programmes 2007–2013

Calls

ICT 2015 - Information and Communications Technologies

H2020-ICT-2015

Opening Date	15-10-2014	Deadline Date	14-04-2015 17:00:00 (Brussels local time)
Publication date	23-07-2014	Total Call Budget	€561,000,000
Programme	Horizon 2020	Main Pillar	Industrial Leadership
Status	Closed		

Topic: Big data - research

ICT-16-2015

Topic Description

[Topic Conditions & Documents](#)

[Submission Service](#)

Specific Challenge: The activities supported within LEIT under this topic contribute to the Big Data challenge by addressing the fundamental research problems related to the scalability and responsiveness of analytics capabilities (such as privacy-aware machine learning, language understanding, data mining and visualization). Special focus is on industry-validated, user-defined challenges like predictions, and rigorous processes for monitoring and measurement.

CALL

Scope:

a. Research & Innovation Actions: proposals are expected to cover one or both of the themes identified below.

Collaborative projects to develop novel data structures, algorithms, methodology, software architectures, optimisation methodologies and ... Of specific interest is ... The availability of

Collaborative projects to define relevant benchmarks ...

b. Support actions to define challenges and prize schemes for verifiable performance in tasks requiring extremely large scale prediction and deep analysis. Compact consortia ...

CALL

Expected impact: One or more of the following:

- (i) European independence from imported carbon fibres and precursors;
- (ii) Improved competitiveness for European industries via the use of improved, novel, better performing and/or more favourable cost/benefit solutions;
- (iii) Deployment in Europe of materials structures with overall performance comparable to existing technologies but at lower material cost;
- (iv) Securing adequate in-service performance of components in applications such as vehicles, construction, energy, sports, electronic applications etc. at lower material cost and with due concern for recyclability issues; and
- (v) New skills in the European workforce resulting also in indirect socio-economic benefits.

CALL

Expected impact: One or more of the following:

(vi) Ability to track publicly and quantitatively progress in the performance and optimization of very large scale data analytics technologies ...; the ability to track this progress is crucial for industrial planning and strategy development.

(vii) Advanced real-time and predictive data analytics technologies thoroughly validated by means of rigorous experiments testing their scalability, ...

Types of action:

- a. Research & Innovation Actions – A mix of proposals requesting *Small* and *Large contributions* are expected
- b. Coordination and Support Actions

INDICE

1. Modelo de “Call”.

2. Instructions for evaluators.

3. Evaluation process.

4. Individual evaluation form.

Instructions for evaluators

- The first stage evaluation is essentially a “GO / NO GO” decision.
- No ranking is needed at Consensus Level
- No pre-defined **success rate but only the very best should pass**
- The proposals (part B) must be only 10 (+2) pages. Don't expect to find a detailed work plan. Don't take into account material submitted beyond pages 10+2 (Cover page & table of content do not count)
- Focus your assessment on :
 - Soundness of the **concept & quality** of the objectives (including relevance to the call topic) including the progress **beyond the current state-of-the-art**
 - Contribution to the **expected impacts** mentioned in the Work Programme for this topic at European and international level
- Write **at least two/three detailed comments** justifying and explaining the marks (strong points, weak points..). They will be used for feed-back to proposers.

INDICE

1. Modelo de “Call”.
2. Instructions for evaluators.
- 3. Evaluation process.**
4. Individual evaluation form.

Evaluation process

- ~ 6-8 proposals to be assessed (**Individual Evaluation Reports - IER**) by each expert. The number depends on how the received proposals best can be distributed among the experts assigned to the panel and their speed and additional workload
- **If you discover any potential conflict of interest or source of vested interest** please report it right away (there is a box that can be ticked in the Rivet system)– the proposal will be allocated to another expert
- Take your time reading through the proposals and in particular writing down your comments, **justifying the mark you have given**
- Your **first DRAFT Individual Evaluation Reports** will be discussed between evaluators and moderator in order to achieve **uniformity in style and calibrate marks** across the panel
- One evaluator will act as a ‘rapporteur’, i.e. writing a synthesis (**Consensus Report – CR**) of the 3/5 individual evaluation reports

Evaluation process

- If partly presented → 1 week in Brussels
- Two meetings
 - 1. Evaluators' consensus
 - The final report is agreed between all the reviewers
 - 2 from academia
 - 2 from industry
 - 2. All proposals' consensus
 - The last day, all reviewers can see all the proposals and their corresponding scores to prepare the final meeting.

INDICE

1. Modelo de “Call”.
2. Instructions for evaluators.
3. Evaluation process.
- 4. Individual evaluation form.**

Individual evaluation form-1

Individual Assessment Report

IER - Individual evaluation report

Collaborative project

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Half marks may be given.

Interpretation of the score:

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.

Individual evaluation form-2

IMPORTANT

I believe this proposal is relevant ("in scope") because it addresses, fully or partially, a topic that is open in the call. It conforms to any special conditions set out for this topic in the relevant work programme, and it corresponds to an eligible funding scheme:

IF YES. Please complete the IER, entering your scores and comments for all criteria

IF NO. Please enter your reasons below and notify the Commission.

Yes No

Type comments below:

Individual evaluation form-3

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)

Note: when a proposal only partially addresses the topics, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion.

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Progress beyond the state-of-the-art

Type comments below:

Overall score (Threshold: 4/5, Weight: 1)

Individual evaluation form-4

2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management

- Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants
- Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance)
- Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment...)

Type comments below:

Overall score (Threshold: 3/5, Weight: 1)

Individual evaluation form-5

3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

- Contribution, at the European and/or international level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under relevant topic/activity

Note: Refer to the applicable list of impacts specified in the work programme.

Type comments below:

Overall score (Threshold: 3/5, Weight: 1)

Individual evaluation form-6

TOTAL

TOTAL score (Threshold: 8/10)

Any other remarks

e.g. recommendations for Stage 2 submission, only if the proposal is above thresholds (in 2 stages submissions)

Type comments below:

Gracias por su atención!



Universitat d'Alacant
Universidad de Alicante