

**External Monitoring**  
**of the**  
**CIP-ICT-PSP 1<sup>st</sup> Call**

**Independent Monitoring Panel's**  
**REPORT**

*November 2007*

# The Monitoring Panel

We, the undersigned, are pleased to present to the European Commission our report on the evaluation of proposals responding to the 1st Call in the ICT Policy Support Programme within the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.

**Bob Malcolm**  
**Rapporteur of the Panel**

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "R Malcolm". The letters are cursive and fluid.

**Narciso Garcia**

A handwritten signature in blue ink. It is highly stylized and abstract, with a large loop at the bottom and a vertical stroke on the right side.

## CONTENTS

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	4
2. INTRODUCTION .....	6
2.1. The process followed by the Monitoring Panel.....	6
3. OBSERVATIONS OF THE MONITORING PANEL .....	7
3.1. External service provision .....	7
3.2. Evaluators .....	9
3.3. Working conditions .....	11
3.4. Evaluation Award Criteria.....	13
3.5. Reaching consensus.....	15
3.6. Reporting .....	17
3.7. Ranking of proposals.....	18
3.8. Evaluators' views of the evaluation process .....	19
4. ARRANGEMENTS FOR INDEPENDENT OBSERVATION AND MONITORING .....	21
5. ANNEXES .....	22

## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

87 proposals were received, requesting €153.9M, in response to the first call for proposals in the ICT Policy Support Programme within the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme.

Observers note that almost all proposals (97%) had at least some degree of SME participation, and SMEs were seeking almost 40% of the total funding.

While the evaluation processes for this programme are similar to the evaluation processes used elsewhere by the Commission, they were tailored specifically to the particular types of objectives for this programme, and for the particular - and new - instruments to be used.

The main findings of the Monitoring Panel are summarised here. The body of the report contains more detail of the observations that formed the basis for this summary.

### **Conduct of the evaluation**

The Monitoring Panel finds that the evaluation was conducted fairly and equitably:

- evaluators and officials acted with integrity;
- the evaluation process led to valid outcomes;
- while difficulties were occasionally experienced at the ‘normal’ level of operation, they were always resolved by the ‘problem resolution’ processes without jeopardising the validity of the outcomes.

### **Impact of the new programme**

The CIP Framework Programme, and the associated instruments for the ICT PSP, have objectives and requirements that are significantly different from those of the RTD Framework Programmes.

The Monitoring Panel finds that the evaluation processes used during this evaluation, that had been tailored for the new programme and the new instruments, were adequate and appropriate for the task. Nevertheless, potential for further tailoring - especially of criteria and scoring guidelines - was observed.

### **Impact of limited competition**

The Monitoring Panel is satisfied that quality standards were maintained, despite the expected and planned low level of competition for certain Objectives in the Call.

## **Sharing of good practice**

Notwithstanding the potential for further beneficial tailoring, the essential nature of the evaluation process and the way in which it is managed share much in common with the evaluation processes for other programmes, suggesting that good practice might usefully be shared both within the ICT-PSP, and with other programmes.

## 2. INTRODUCTION

This is the report of the Monitoring Panel for evaluation of proposals responding to the 1<sup>st</sup> Call of the ICT Policy Support Programme within the Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme, held in Brussels during November 2007.

### 2.1. The process followed by the Monitoring Panel

Members of the panel observed a range of:

- general briefings
- specific briefings for particular objectives
- re-briefings that some units held as the evaluation proceeded so as to give evaluators an opportunity to ask for further clarification or to express any concerns
- consensus meetings
- panel meetings

Monitoring Panel members reviewed:

- a sample of ESRs
- all panel reports
- early results of the survey of evaluators

The Monitoring Panel interviewed a selection of both experienced and inexperienced:

- heads of unit and evaluation co-ordinators;
- project officers;
- evaluators, and
- rapporteurs.

A time-slot was reserved for daily meetings with evaluation co-ordinators and other representatives of the Commission to identify and resolve any concerns. A final ‘checkpoint’ meeting was held at the end of the evaluation to give initial feedback on the findings of the Monitoring Panel to the various units involved in the evaluation; specifically to report that the Monitoring Panel had nothing improper to report; and to seek any clarification from the Commission before preparing this written report.

In the next section, the observations made by the panel are presented. These are structured more or less along the lines of the Terms of Reference for the monitoring exercise.

The key findings are abstracted and summarised in the Executive Summary, above.

### 3. OBSERVATIONS OF THE MONITORING PANEL

The main activities of the Monitoring Panel were to observe samples of the various events in evaluation - briefings, Consensus Meetings, Panel Meetings, etc.

The principal finding is that, to the extent to which observers had visibility, the evaluation was conducted fairly and equitably:

- evaluators and officials acted with integrity;
- the evaluation process led to valid outcomes;
- while difficulties were occasionally experienced at the ‘normal’ level of operation, they were always resolved by the ‘problem resolution’ processes.

The structure of the remainder of this section of the report follows as closely as possible the structure of the Terms of Reference for the monitoring exercise (Annex I to Annex 5 of this report).

#### 3.1. External service provision

##### 3.1.1. *Electronic submission mechanism*

Observers note that the electronic submission mechanism (EPSS) worked well and proved effective for both proposers and the Commission. Out of the total of 87 proposals submitted electronically, only 1 proposal missed the deadline. Investigation by the eligibility committee of the timing of interaction by the proposers of that proposal with the EPSS revealed that it was clearly submitted late.

Observers note that the Commission’s explanation of what must be done to submit proposals is extremely clear, and the advice to submit early versions as soon as possible is also both good and clear.

##### 3.1.2. *IT services*

The IT support system and ‘Pinocchio’ in particular presented problems throughout the whole period of the evaluation. There was confusion over user IDs and passwords, and inappropriate error messages from Pinocchio<sup>1</sup> misled users over the real cause of their difficulties. It took considerable time of busy officials even to enable the observers to gain access.

Observers noted mixed but generally critical opinions from rapporteurs and officials over the value of Pinocchio during the evaluation process (in the cases where access could be achieved). In particular, rapporteurs experienced some difficulty in moving and modifying information in the IERs to the draft CRs. Different ‘workarounds’ were adopted by different

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. “User does not have access rights” regardless of whether the user has been able to enter the system or not.

rapporteurs, using various combinations of MS Word and NotePad (or similar) and in some cases manuscript - with more serious implications for workload and scheduling. To some extent, the variation in workarounds represented different access capabilities, to some extent different styles of CM management, and to some extent different familiarity with the equipment and software. None of this caused any serious problems, but it was a source of some frustration among experts.

While some teams may have overcome the problems of Pinocchio, the fact that it was predominantly not used during the earlier phases of evaluation prevented analysis of the evolution of the evaluation during its course - whether by the Commission or Observers.

The prevalence of AZERTY keyboards compared with QWERTY keyboards caused delays in preparation of reports. Rapporteurs and POs reported to observers that some computers with QWERTY keyboards repeatedly switched back to AZERTY settings for no apparent reason, causing considerable frustration.

There was a general difficulty in transferring files between computers, so that users frequently swapped and shared USB memory sticks to transfer files. This is neither convenient nor secure.

While a data projector (or 'beamer') was usually available in consensus (and panel) meetings, in many of the rooms there was no proper screen, so the projection was on to the wall. There is usually difficulty in reading the large amount of detailed information necessary during such meetings: this only exacerbated that problem.

The more substantive aspects of the use of Pinocchio 'online' is addressed further, below, under the topic of 'achieving consensus'. It should be mentioned here, though, that the artificial limit of 4000 characters per field was a frustrating limitation that emerged only when rapporteurs discovered it when trying to use it 'for real'.

In summary, Pinocchio seems to have both design and implementation flaws that appear to stem from a failure to follow quite basic and long-understood good IT design practice.

### *3.1.3. 'Domestic' service provision*

While the later briefing emphasised the difference of this programme from the FP7 RTD Programme, the information package that experts received on registration included information on FP7 and not on CIP or the ICT-PSP. Even the badges for experts show 'FP7'.

The snack bar opened just in time to be available for those involved in this evaluation. It had a limited range and slow service (due primarily to poor service process design that introduced 'bottlenecks'). However, the quality was adequate, and there were several alternatives outside the evaluation building within easy walking distance.

Coffee, tea and water were generally available in a timely manner and in sufficient quantities.

Cleaning was only lightly carried out, mainly on garbage bins and on table tops. Paper scraps and food scraps on the floor and used cups on window shelves remained for days until the end of the evaluation. There were dirty chairs (e.g. pieces of sandwich bread) and even small remains from the construction of the building.

## **3.2. Evaluators**

### *3.2.1. Competence of evaluators*

Observers saw no evidence of evaluators who were not competent to assess the proposal that they considered. Interviews with evaluators and rapporteurs revealed that in the opinion of their peers, evaluators were indeed competent for their assigned tasks.

The diversity of evaluators, which was beneficial to achieve coverage of all aspects of proposals, had the effect that consensus could take longer as evaluators worked toward a shared understanding.

### *3.2.2. Assignment of evaluators to proposals*

Given the newness of the programme and the instruments, care had been taken to establish a pool of potential evaluators ‘bottom up’ to suit each of the objectives of the various themes, rather than assigning evaluators from a common pool drawn from the general list of experts. So their ‘assignment’ was ensured to be appropriate.

### *3.2.3. Availability of suitable evaluators*

There were sufficient evaluators, not only for the scheduled tasks but also to respond to unexpected reassignments to accommodate conflicts of interest and withdrawal of evaluators due to their domestic circumstances. Indeed, the number could have been reduced if the schedule had been made more intense. Again, given the newness of the programme and the instruments, observers consider that an appropriate balance had been struck.

There were 75 evaluators in total, 22 women and 53 men. 7 of the 75 were from ‘new’ Member States (the EU 25 - 15). It is not possible to comment on the appropriateness of gender balance and country representation and in any case, as discussed in 3.2.2 above, considerable importance had been attached to acquiring evaluators with appropriate competence rather than achieving any ‘quotas’ for representation.

One unanticipated conflict of interest was identified early in the process and another emerged during cross-reading. Both were handled correctly and appropriate alternative evaluators assigned.

### *3.2.4. Evaluator briefings*

The evaluator briefings were very thorough. Differences from the RTD FP and from the former eTen Programme were firmly emphasised and carefully explained. The different nature of the objectives, the instruments and the criteria were all explained in the general briefings and in the specific briefings (e.g. for the ‘Pilot Type A’ instruments).

In response to evaluators' questions during briefings, there was good clarification of several possible borderline cases: for example, although research was not expected, a little amount of development was welcomed. The use of the word 'innovation' was confusing to some evaluators (for Pilot Type B proposals in particular), but it was explained that the innovation should lie in the new services, or new mechanisms for service delivery offered by existing technology, rather than in advancing the technology itself. It was said "*We don't want our resources invested in research*".

Some units also held daily re-briefings early in the morning (c. 08.30). These were typically short (around 30 minutes). They were perceived by Observers, and both POs and evaluators that were interviewed by observers, to refresh the understanding of evaluators and also to encourage every person to arrive early - helping the schedule to be maintained. They presented an opportunity to remind experts that this is a new program and that, therefore, new people are submitting proposals, so their way of presenting ideas could be different from those who are more accustomed to other FPs.

The objectives, the instruments and the criteria were all re-explained during the evaluation in those areas where re-briefings took place and also where necessary - typically during Consensus Meetings. Evaluators explicitly commented that they appreciated these briefings.

Evaluators were informed that internet access was not available, even for additional information.

Although the briefings were very thorough, the considerable quantity of information and briefings gave problems for some evaluators and from comments they made later during the evaluation that observers noted<sup>2</sup>, some of them clearly missed some of the briefing. Because of the resilient nature of the evaluation process, consequent misunderstandings were never problematic for correct assessment, but they nevertheless slowed the process down while evaluators came to a common understanding during Consensus Meetings.

Another misunderstanding arose over the request for evaluators to evaluate proposals based on "*what is written*". This was revealed later in at least one observed case during a consensus meeting. It is intended to mean that evaluators should not assume anything about the proposers (their capabilities, for instance) or the proposers' intentions (the activities they will undertake and the way that they will undertake them, for instance). In the instance that was observed, an evaluator had noticed that a proposal did not fully meet the expectations of the work-programme and had therefore marked the proposal below threshold as if the work-programme expectation had been an 'eligibility criterion'. But it was not. This was discussed and clarified in the meeting, and since the rest of the proposal was quite good, the weakness that had been identified was commented on and an appropriate remark added for consideration during possible negotiation. The evaluator

---

<sup>2</sup> E.g. "*5 to me means perfect.*"

had not understood that ‘as written’ still allows for improvement: the intention of the phrase is that evaluators should not *assume* that the proposers would do something that is not in the proposal.

While the briefings properly emphasised the *policy* orientation of the Call, Observers noted that during Consensus Meetings and Panel Meetings, there were differences in knowledge among the experts of *all* the pertinent policies - Riga, Manchester, i2010, etc. In the event, these were always explained adequately - often by evaluators filling each other in on the main points of the various policy declarations. The briefing did touch upon the main aspects of these policies, but the ‘information overload’ during briefing has already been mentioned.

The difficulties indicated above exposed a general problem that was not covered in the briefing: what sources of information are pertinent to the evaluation, and where are they? There are (at least):

- the work-programme description of the objectives
- the work-programme description of the instruments
- the guidance for proposers
- guidance for evaluators (especially on criteria and scoring)
- various policy documents

Embedded in the description of the instruments are the ‘eligibility criteria’.

The work-programme talks of ‘requirements’: where these are not eligibility criteria it is not clear whether they are ‘hard’ requirements - or can be either addressed during negotiation or relaxed.

In summary, there is tension between the need to convey a great deal of information and the capacity of evaluators to absorb it during the time available. How this tension might be resolved is not clear, but Observers caution against spending more time on already long and intense briefing sessions that can become very tiring.

#### 3.2.5. *Rapporteur briefings*

Members of the Monitoring Panel did not attend any briefings for rapporteurs, so they are unable to discern whether the occasional difficulties reported in section 3.5.1 below arose from the nature of their briefing or not.

### **3.3. Working conditions**

#### 3.3.1. *Environment*

Observers consider that the working conditions were generally adequate. Sufficient space had been allocated, but only *just*. Some of the consensus rooms were extremely small for 3 evaluators, 1 rapporteur and 1 moderator,

let alone when an additional P.O. and an Observer wished to attend. It was difficult to find rooms for impromptu 'side meetings' to discuss problems, concerns, etc.

The evaluation building is new, so the poor noise insulation is surprising. The noise from building works as the building is being finished is unfortunate but understandable: the disturbance from the noise of slow trains passing some distance away, in rooms with all windows shut, is less forgivable.

The combination of a crowded room, a high level of noise, over-heating, and the apparent failure of the ventilation system posed problems, especially during the critical period of evaluator briefings in the larger rooms where there were poor sightlines, poor ventilation, and a malfunctioning public address system. Observers noted that evaluators had considerable difficulty maintaining concentration.

Some evaluators commented on the fact that smokers in the atrium were concentrated around the entrance and exit from the non-smoking area, causing some distress.

### 3.3.2. *Security*

Observers consider that physical security was generally adequate. However, there were other evaluations proceeding in parallel with the ICT-PSP evaluation in the same building on adjacent floors. While the ICT-PSP personnel and evaluators for the various Objectives appeared generally to be able to recognise their own team and question the presence of others, the absence of distinguishing characteristics (such as differently coloured badges) made this more difficult than it could have been.

The need to walk through floors on which other evaluation teams were working in order to reach the snack bar, was both disruptive to those teams (witness the notices posted around those floors asking for 'outsiders' to be quiet) and posed a security risk.

The rooms for the secretariat were sufficiently large, but they were shared with the Project Officers. Observers note that since evaluators - and especially rapporteurs - had to have frequent contact with the secretariat and with Project Officers, the Project Officers had difficulty to arrange and sustain confidential discussions when needed.

IT security appeared to be sufficiently 'tight' to observers - especially since the predominant problem appeared to be that of gaining access to either the network or Pinocchio. However, the observers' own computer was removed and replaced on the morning of the final day of the evaluation, after which observers could no longer access the system or Pinocchio. This is of some concern, since that particular PC was set up with the observers' access rights. While the network and Pinocchio password protection should be sufficient that other casual users of the PC should not be able to gain the privileges of observers, the loss of physical protection caused by relocation of the PC does diminish security.

The information that the use of mobile phones and their own laptops is not allowed during the evaluation was communicated well and respected by the experts. However, experts expressed their view that they would appreciate ‘safe’ WiFi access, such as that available in Av. Beaulieu, in order to check their emails at the end of their day’s work. (There is less extensive publicly accessible WiFi in Brussels than one would expect for a major city.)

### *3.3.3. Planning and workload*

Observers consider that there was sufficient allowance and contingency to accommodate inevitable disturbances to the evaluation schedule with relatively few requirements for late working. Most evaluators were generally able to leave the building between 7 and 8 p.m.

However, there were exceptions. Some evaluators, and especially some rapporteurs, had a very demanding workload. In particular, where the arrangement chosen was for rapporteurs to complete their Consensus Reports after the Consensus Meetings, they had in principle more time to concentrate on capturing the results of the discussion but their schedule could become *very* problematic. This was particularly the case where the rapporteur did not use a ‘beamer’ and after the meeting had to type up their manuscript notes *and* reconcile them with those of the evaluators - *and* get the agreement of the evaluators. This was difficult enough when evaluators were in broad agreement: had there been significant disagreements during the CM, it would have been much worse.

Other aspects of working conditions are addressed in sections 3.1.2 and 3.1.3 above.

## **3.4. Evaluation Award Criteria**

### *3.4.1. Consistency of interpretation*

Evaluators were able to achieve a common interpretation in Consensus Meetings and in Panel Meetings, so that proposal evaluations were calibrated to the extent necessary to achieve appropriate threshold decisions and, where necessary, ranking.

Criteria that can be consistently interpreted - and ‘scored’ - provide a near-objective basis for resolution of different perspectives of evaluators and for consistent scoring of proposals, and hence consistent decision-making on which proposals are supportable, and on the relative ranking of such proposals.

The specification of criteria and their explanation, during briefings, of the appropriate application of the criteria were specifically designed to suit the nature of the objectives and the nature of the new instruments for this new programme.

However, observers noted that evaluators had, at times, some difficulty in reaching a common understanding of the interpretation of the criteria for the different instruments. Indeed, during the ‘feedback’ session at the end of

panel meetings, evaluators suggested that in the future for this programme, the criteria and scoring guidelines should be tailored for the various instruments.

The ‘Impact’ criterion occasionally gave evaluators difficulty. Evaluators did understand that it is the potential impact that is of interest, but still sometimes hesitated to score a proposal highly on impact when the implementation was not considered credible. This observation is borne out by the responses to the survey of evaluators, in which almost 40% of those responding rated ‘Impact’ as the most difficult criterion.

#### *3.4.2. Guidance on criteria*

Observers noted the quite detailed guidance given to evaluators in the IERs and - typically - used in Consensus Meetings to focus the discussion of evaluators. For each criterion there were several ‘bullets’ of interpretive guidance, a number of these having several ‘sub-bullets’ (i.e. bulleted sub-criteria).

While the detailed guidance certainly seemed to the observers to facilitate agreement on consensus by focussing on specific points in turn (and simplified the rapporteur’s job), some evaluators and some officials expressed concern that the detailed technical nature of the guidance could take attention away from the extent to which the proposal addressed the objectives of the programme and of the call for proposals.

Observers noted that Consensus Meetings in which moderators and rapporteurs focussed on these detailed bulleted sub-criteria took significantly longer than those meetings where the detailed guidance on criteria were not used to focus discussion.

#### *3.4.3. Scoring*

The setting of the threshold at 9 enabled a good ‘dynamic range’ for above-threshold proposals, which eased their ranking. While this was not such a problem during this evaluation, given the generally small number of above-threshold proposals in each panel, it could be important for future evaluations with more above-threshold proposals.

However, observers noted that the basic ‘labelling’ of scores - in particular “2 = *poor*, 3 = *good*” - caused difficulty in some borderline cases where evaluators were unwilling to describe a ‘not quite good enough’ proposal as ‘Poor’, nor a ‘just good enough’ proposal as ‘Good’.

In practice, most experienced (or trained) meeting moderators resolved this difficulty by drawing the attention of evaluators to the more detailed phrasing of the criteria, the essence of which is to consider whether weaknesses in a proposal are:

- irretrievable (leading to a score below threshold);
- serious but addressable during negotiation and if satisfactorily addressed then the proposal should be supportable;

- minor - with the potential for minor improvements during negotiation.

Such a policy requires appropriate interpretation to suit the expectations of the different instruments.

### **3.5. Reaching consensus**

Consensus was successfully achieved in almost all cases. In one case additional evaluators with specific expertise were brought into the Consensus Meeting, at the request of the original evaluators, and a consensus emerged. In another exceptional case a split decision was recorded and brought to the attention of the panel in the subsequent panel meeting, where a final panel consensus was agreed.

#### *3.5.1. Good moderation practice*

In Consensus Meetings, there was noticeable variation in the style and effectiveness of moderation. To Observers, this seemed not to be linked to seniority or experience of the moderators but to the extent to which they had participated in ‘good practice’ discussion (and possibly training) in other programmes<sup>3</sup>.

Some moderators, for instance, instead of polling the opinions of evaluators left them to speak for themselves. If there was a clash among evaluators, or if some (even all) were shy or reactive, then not all voices were heard equally.

Observers also noticed in more than one case that some experienced rapporteurs working with less confident moderators could tend to dominate discussion in their attempts to clarify the views of evaluators - especially when there was initial disagreement - and find agreed wording for the CR comments: this could put rapporteurs at risk of influencing comments, rather than being entirely neutral, as intended. This was brought to the attention of the Commission staff who responded appropriately and to the observers’ satisfaction by reinforcing and clarifying the role of the rapporteur.

Nevertheless, the Monitoring Panel does support the view that the use of a dedicated rapporteur, as opposed to one of the evaluators acting as rapporteur, appears to contribute to smooth running of meetings and increases the likelihood of a fair outcome.

#### *3.5.2. Value of detailed guidance on criteria*

It is not clear to Observers whether, when the meeting went point-by-point through the detailed guidance on criteria described above, the achievement of consensus was helped or hindered. On the one hand it meant that all

---

<sup>3</sup> In one observed CM, there was a long period of 37 minutes without any phrase agreed, mainly due to the inability of the moderator to break the stalemate.

evaluators addressed all the issues equally. On the other hand, the detailed discussion that it generated took time<sup>4</sup> and distracted evaluators from discussion of their general assessment of the goodness of proposals on balance<sup>5</sup>. However, this did not prevent valid consensus being achieved: it just took a long time, some times.

### 3.5.3. *Use of ICT*

There was a considerable variation in practice over the use of IT during the Consensus Meetings. To some extent this was due to the difficulties of access to the system, as discussed above, and to some extent to the difficulties in using Pinocchio, also discussed above. But there were some fundamental differences that affected the process.

When Pinocchio *was* used online, during the CM, apart from the technical difficulties associated with copying text into the forms and the loss of formatting, it did not allow the initial scores to be hidden. Where scores are similar, this can perhaps accelerate agreement. But where they are different it can solidify stances, making the achievement of consensus more difficult.

Even when Pinocchio was not used, there was wide variation in practice between moderators and rapporteurs in the extent to which they revealed the initial views (and sometimes scores) of evaluators, again potentially solidifying positions.

On the other hand, when the emerging consensus view (i.e. the draft CR) was displayed for all to see - and agree, it did facilitate instant agreement on the CR at the end of the meeting, avoiding the kind of problems described in section 3.3.3 above.

Rapporteurs varied in their ability to use the ICT available to them, even in basic capabilities such as typing, use of MS Word, and 'keyboard shortcuts'.

### 3.5.4. *Socialisation*

In interviews, evaluators said that when they had differences of opinion with other evaluators, they found it easier to negotiate consensus when they had been able to achieve some kind of rapport with them.

When teams failed to achieve a rapport - typically through early disagreement that descended into hostility - then relationships were sometimes soured throughout the evaluation week. This is of less importance with large pools of evaluators addressing many projects, but with smaller teams (that *could* have the benefit of mutual understanding - see section 3.7) it can lead to repeated, time-consuming confrontation.

Evaluators told Observers that they appreciated the efforts by officials to improve the establishment of rapport - for instance by getting the evaluators

---

<sup>4</sup> In some cases, one paragraph per bullet was drafted, even when it did not add any information.

<sup>5</sup> As one expert put it: "*If you point at this, this, this, this and this .. what you see is the finger.*"

to understand ‘where they were all coming from’. Some (but not all) moderators led a short *tour de table* before the CM, for instance. The officials responsible for Theme 1 handed out, at the start of the week, a ‘*Who’s who*’ collection of short biographies, with pictures. This was considered by all parties to be very beneficial: experts (and officials) (and observers) could often be seen referring to it during discussions.

Socialisation was also helped by the reception on Tuesday evening - a good example of good practice for which Observers are as grateful as the other experts.

### *3.5.5. Impact of small numbers of proposals in certain objectives*

Experts all understood the need to maintain standards for assessment of quality, even when there was little competition in some Objectives, and in a few cases, no competition at all. Observers noted that this concern for quality was sustained during Consensus Meetings (and the inevitable simpler) Panel Meetings for such Objectives.

However, Observers also noted that when a proposal to such an Objective was scored above threshold, experts sometimes took less care to be precise about the scoring since ‘*it doesn’t matter*’. It is true that precision of scoring would not affect the outcome for that particular proposal, but the Monitoring Panel believes that a lack of consistency across the community of evaluators - on the interpretation of criteria, and on the scoring for criteria - can lead to difficulties in evaluation of other proposals, and in future evaluations.

## **3.6. Reporting**

### *3.6.1. Evaluation Summary Reports*

ESR reports were generally very thorough and clear, with care taken to comment on the proposal as written and to separate into the ‘Remarks’ section any recommendations to the Commission for negotiation should a proposal reach that stage.

The comments on the ESRs were justified and the style was appropriate and certainly adequate in quantity for feedback to proposers.

However, when the way of operating in the Consensus Meeting had been to follow the detailed guidance on criteria ‘sub-bullet by sub-bullet’, the lengthier process had also led to lengthier consensus reports and hence ESRs. It is not clear to Observers that this is always desirable.

The recommendations for negotiation were sufficiently clear to guide the Commission to achieve improvements and to address any weaknesses.

### *3.6.2. Panel Reports*

Panel reports were clear and concise. The formally required information was provided. In addition, some panels made useful observations on the nature of the proposals received and on the evaluation process itself, taking

into consideration the new programme and its new objectives, and the new instruments. Where panels had agreed further recommendations for negotiation, they were recorded correctly.

While showing some variation in the detail of discussion, Observers consider the panel reports to be sufficiently consistent in the light of the range of instruments and numbers of proposals for consideration.

### **3.7. Ranking of proposals**

Panel consensus was reached without difficulty, although discussion was often protracted.

The panels observed were well-briefed and well-managed by the chair persons, and care was taken to explain the role of panel members and particularly their ability (indeed, their responsibility) to adjust scores where appropriate to achieve more consistent marking, and their role in generating a ranked list. Supporting documentation - especially to enable cross-reading - was made available in sufficient time.

While panel members therefore understood the principles of re-scoring and ranking, discussions - in panel meetings - of the possibility of re-scoring and of re-ordering specific proposals appeared to the observers to be inhibited by a lack of confidence among panel members, given the limited depth of their cross-reading of proposals. Only those panel members who had evaluated both of two closely ranked proposals were able to speak with confidence about their relative merits. For the objectives with 'a few' proposals (e.g. the Thematic Networks of Objective 1.4) that drew on a limited pool of evaluators, at least some cross-reading was an intrinsic part of the process, facilitating discussion considerably. Observers note that in responses to the survey of evaluators, they were less satisfied with the time available for cross-reading than with other facets of the process.

Panel consensus was generally facilitated by the relatively small number of proposals addressed in panels, and the even smaller number of above-threshold proposals. Clearly this was the case for the objectives for which 'Pilot Type A' proposals were sought, with only one proposal received. However, even with a more significant number of proposals (e.g. the 19 'Pilot Type B' proposals for Objective 1.3) the limited number of above-threshold proposals, and the relatively wide dynamic scoring range for them (i.e. 7 half-marks range available) meant that there were only a few ties to resolve<sup>6</sup>. (Observers also note that the Evaluation Handbook, which is based on the published, legally adopted Workprogramme for 2007, is very prescriptive in defining an algorithm that *must* be used to resolve ties unless all scores for all three criteria are equal.)

---

<sup>6</sup> In interviews, evaluators suggested increasing this range even further - to 7 'full' marks, say - so as to accommodate natural tendencies to avoid 'extreme' scores.

Again, during panel meetings, Pinocchio posed problems. The initial display of the proposals for the panel is usually done with a ranking based on overall score. However, Pinocchio does not split proposals between those over-threshold and those below. So a proposal below threshold (e.g.  $10 = 4 + 2 + 4$ ) can be located above others that should be ranked higher (e.g.  $9 = 3 + 3 + 3$ ).

### **3.8. Evaluators' views of the evaluation process**

At the time of preparation of this report, early results of the official survey of evaluators were available.<sup>7</sup> Observers believe the questionnaire to be appropriate and adequate. The small changes to the questionnaire made before final release were appropriate (for instance, removing the hints on types of participant, thereby making the questions more appropriate to the new instruments and their participants). Unfortunately, the way in which the results of the survey are presented makes it difficult to use the information gathered effectively (see section 4, below).

In panel meetings and also in interviews by Observers, experts agreed that the process was fair and they found their colleagues to be competent and to behave with integrity. From the limited response to the survey, and the observers' limited ability to analyse the results (see preceding paragraph) evaluators were generally well-satisfied about the early stages of the process, with average 'scores' above 4 out of 5. The satisfaction level drops to below 4 for the panel processes, with most concern about the time available for cross-reading.

The report from one of the 'Pilot Type A' panels expressed the unanimous view of the evaluators involved that the task of distinguishing 'technical' evaluation from the more strategic and political assessment of the (single) proposal for that Objective was challenging. They noted that separation of these two quite distinct activities may prove to be beneficial in future. They saw the priority to be assessment of the likely benefit to the programme concerning political and strategic preparation for common specifications and common practice. They nevertheless insisted that the approach to implementation must also be realistic and realisable.

Specific views expressed by evaluators in interviews, not already accommodated in the preceding text, include:

- concern over the expectations for 'risk assessment':
  - how deep an analysis is expected?;

---

<sup>7</sup> 24 out of 53 male evaluators had responded, but only 2 out of 22 female evaluators. The results are questionable in a few cases, e.g. 6 responded that this was NOT their first time as an evaluator for CIP-FP; and only 1 evaluator was aware of any conflicts of interest, but 11 evaluators were satisfied with their resolution.

- is risk mitigation sufficient or should contingency management be addressed?;
  - how do evaluators reconcile ‘risk = adventure’ (good) vis-à-vis ‘risk = potential failure = waste of taxpayers’ money’ (bad)?
- no obvious place in the process to consider the quality of the consortium as a whole vis-à-vis its constituent partners - maybe under potential impact? maybe under implementation?
  - suggestion that while the order of the evaluation form (relevance, impact, implementation) is correct for presenting a result, for reasoning during consensus meetings the order in which they are addressed might be different (perhaps relevance, implementation, then impact)

Some evaluators also expressed concern that while *they* had been briefed very thoroughly on the difference from RTD programmes, many of the proposers seemed to have paid little attention to the specific ambitions of this new programme and its new instruments<sup>8</sup>, possibly (incorrectly) assuming similarity with earlier programmes and instruments with which they were familiar.

---

<sup>8</sup> E.g. a frequent weakness in proposals for Thematic Networks to address, appropriately, ‘long-term impact’.

#### 4. ARRANGEMENTS FOR INDEPENDENT OBSERVATION AND MONITORING

All Commission staff, both those responsible for the evaluation and those responsible for the various Strategic Objectives that were the subject of the Call, were very responsive and co-operative, despite their own heavy work-loads. The panel thanks them for their co-operation.

In the opinion of the Observers, the daily meetings with the Commission were valuable for achieving a common understanding of the monitoring process, and although no serious problems had to be raised at these meetings, Observers hope that the regular feedback contributed to evolution of a common appreciation of the evaluation process itself. While such meetings might have been less necessary toward the closing stages of the evaluation, it might have been beneficial for the various Theme co-ordinators to have attended these meetings, had their responsibilities and heavy workloads allowed - again in the interest of achieving a common understanding.

At first, it was difficult for members of the Monitoring Panel to plan their schedule of observations, but after liaising with Theme co-coordinators, their various schedules were obtained to enable planning. The Monitoring Panel notes that each Theme co-coordinator had their own tool for planning the evaluation, and that none of them had chosen to use the planning tool provided to them. The different styles were confusing for Observers at first, but given the small scale of the evaluation overall, the small number of Observers (two), and the presence of both Observers on site throughout the evaluation that facilitated communication between them, no significant scheduling difficulties were experienced. A 'busier' evaluation would have been more problematic.

The provision of a room as a 'HQ' for the panel was invaluable. Occasionally this room had to be shared, and the difficulty of finding alternative rooms for private discussion has already been mentioned in section 3.3.1. The computer, printer, and physical storage were appreciated - after resolution of access difficulties reported earlier - and before its removal (!).

The way in which statistics from the evaluator survey are presented (Annex 2) is very poor. It does not follow even basic school-level standards for presentation of information. The responses to each question are presented in order of the preponderance of responses in each category, rather than in the fixed and logical order of the categories themselves. This ordering also naturally changes from question to question. Furthermore, the percentages in each category are not normalised (as they should be) to take out the 'Not Applicable' and 'Don't Know' responses. Analysis is very difficult and if comparisons were required over programmes and time it would be near-impossible. The survey *could*, in principle, make a valuable contribution to the evidence base for monitoring exercises. It *could* provide very useful statistical information to support (or refute) the feelings gained through observation of small samples of the process. But instead the performance of the survey is a burden on experts and Commission officers, with limited benefit compared with the benefit that could be derived if it were done more professionally.

## 5. ANNEXES

**Summary : SME participation per activity**

At Theme 1: eGovernment 97% proposals had SME participants

At Theme 2: eInclusion 98% proposals had SME participants

At Theme 3: eHealth 100% proposals had SME participants

At Theme 4: Others 100% proposals had SME participants

**Overall 98% proposals had SME participants**

At Theme 1: eGovernment 32% of the participants were SME

At Theme 2: eInclusion 38% of the participants were SME

At Theme 3: eHealth 23% of the participants were SME

At Theme 4: Others 40% of the participants were SME

**Overall 33% of the participants were SME**

At Theme 1: eGovernment 17% of the requested funding was for SMEs

At Theme 2: eInclusion 32% of the requested funding was for SMEs

At Theme 3: eHealth 11% of the requested funding was for SMEs

At Theme 4: Others 40% of the requested funding was for SMEs

**Overall 25% of the requested funding was for SMEs**

**Summary : SME participation per activity per instrument**

**At Theme 1: eGovernment**

ICT-PSP-PA 100% proposals had SME participants

ICT-PSP-PB 95% proposals had SME participants

ICT-PSP-TN 100% proposals had SME participants

**At Theme 2: eInclusion**

ICT-PSP-PB 97% proposals had SME participants

ICT-PSP-TN 100% proposals had SME participants

**At Theme 3: eHealth**

ICT-PSP-PA 100% proposals had SME participants

ICT-PSP-TN 100% proposals had SME participants

**At Theme 4: Others**

ICT-PSP-TN 100% proposals had SME participants

**At Theme 1: eGovernment**

ICT-PSP-PA 7% of the participants were SME

ICT-PSP-PB 46% of the participants were SME

ICT-PSP-TN 30% of the participants were SME

**At Theme 2: eInclusion**

ICT-PSP-PB 31% of the participants were SME

ICT-PSP-TN 61% of the participants were SME

**At Theme 3: eHealth**

ICT-PSP-PA 9% of the participants were SME

ICT-PSP-TN 27% of the participants were SME

**At Theme 4: Others**

ICT-PSP-TN 40% of the participants were SME

**At Theme 1: eGovernment**

ICT-PSP-PA 8% of the requested funding was for SMEs

ICT-PSP-PB 39% of the requested funding was for SMEs

ICT-PSP-TN 31% of the requested funding was for SMEs

**At Theme 2: eInclusion**

ICT-PSP-PB 31% of the requested funding was for SMEs

ICT-PSP-TN 55% of the requested funding was for SMEs

**At Theme 3: eHealth**

ICT-PSP-PA 9% of the requested funding was for SMEs

ICT-PSP-TN 27% of the requested funding was for SMEs

**At Theme 4: Others**

ICT-PSP-TN 40% of the requested funding was for SMEs

Details for ICT-PSP-PA										
	Total evaluated	Partic.	Cost (kī½)	Grant (kī½)	% of proposals had sme participants	No of proposals had sme participants	% of the participants were SMEs	No of the participants were SMEs	% Request funding was for SMEs	Request funding was for SMEs
Theme 1: eGovernment	2	43	49.446	24.723	50	1	24	10	15	3.632
Theme 2: eInclusion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theme 3: eHealth	1	23	23.500	11.000	100	1	22	5	21	2.278
Theme 4: Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>72.946</b>	<b>35.723</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>5.910</b>
Details for ICT-PSP-PB										
	Total evaluated	Partic.	Cost (kī½)	Grant (kī½)	% of proposals had sme participants	No of proposals had sme participants	% of the participants were SMEs	No of the participants were SMEs	% Request funding was for SMEs	Request funding was for SMEs
Theme 1: eGovernment	18	212	63.127	31.563	95	17	49	102	42	13.140
Theme 2: eInclusion	28	313	137.676	67.679	97	27	37	114	37	24.579
Theme 3: eHealth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Theme 4: Others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>200.802</b>	<b>99.242</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>37.720</b>

Details for ICT-PSP-TN										
	Total evaluated	Partic.	Cost (ki $\frac{1}{2}$ )	Grant (ki $\frac{1}{2}$ )	% of proposals had sme participants	No of proposals had sme participants	% of the participants were SMEs	No of the participants were SMEs	% Request funding was for SMEs	Request funding was for SMEs
Theme 1: eGovernment	7	130	3.271	3.271	100	7	37	48	38	1.241
Theme 2: eInclusion	6	89	1.907	1.907	100	6	67	59	68	1.290
Theme 3: eHealth	4	71	1.449	1.449	100	4	33	23	47	668
Theme 4: Others	17	289	6.920	6.920	100	17	50	142	52	3.585
<b>Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>579</b>	<b>13.546</b>	<b>13.546</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>6.784</b>
Details for all Instrument										
	Total evaluated	Partic.	Cost (ki $\frac{1}{2}$ )	Grant (ki $\frac{1}{2}$ )	% of proposals had sme participants	No of proposals had sme participants	% of the participants were SMEs	No of the participants were SMEs	% Request funding was for SMEs	Request funding was for SMEs
Theme 1: eGovernment	27	385	115.844	59.557	93	25	42	160	31	18.013
Theme 2: eInclusion	34	402	139.583	69.586	98	33	44	173	38	25.870
Theme 3: eHealth	5	94	24.949	12.449	100	5	30	28	24	2.946
Theme 4: Others	17	289	6.920	6.920	100	17	50	142	52	3.585
<b>Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>1170</b>	<b>287.295</b>	<b>148.511</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>503</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>50.414</b>

## Annex 2 Evaluator survey response

<i>Response statistics for Evaluators survey</i>			
SECTION 1: QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF			
What is your current or most recent organization type?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Commercial sector - Consultancy firm	7	(26.9%)	(26.9%)
Higher education establishment	7	(26.9%)	(26.9%)
Public sector	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
Commercial sector - SME	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
Commercial sector - Large Company	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Private/commercial innovation centre - Industrial sector	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Private non-profit innovation centre	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Public innovation centre - International	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Other organisation type (please specify)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Private/commercial innovation centre - Company	0	(0%)	(0%)
Private non-profit	0	(0%)	(0%)
International organisation	0	(0%)	(0%)
Other public innovation centre	0	(0%)	(0%)
What is your gender?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Male	24	(92.3%)	(92.3%)
Female	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
Place of residence			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
EU Member States	25	(96.2%)	(96.2%)

Associated Countries	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Candidate Countries	0	(0%)	(0%)
Others	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>Member States</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Italy	4	(16%)	(15.4%)
Belgium	2	(8%)	(7.7%)
Finland	2	(8%)	(7.7%)
Germany	2	(8%)	(7.7%)
United Kingdom	2	(8%)	(7.7%)
Denmark	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Hungary	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Ireland	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Netherlands	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Spain	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Sweden	1	(4%)	(3.8%)
Austria	0	(0%)	(0%)
Bulgaria	0	(0%)	(0%)
Cyprus	0	(0%)	(0%)
Czech Republic	0	(0%)	(0%)
Estonia	0	(0%)	(0%)
France	0	(0%)	(0%)
Greece	0	(0%)	(0%)
Latvia	0	(0%)	(0%)
Lithuania	0	(0%)	(0%)
Luxembourg	0	(0%)	(0%)
Malta	0	(0%)	(0%)
Poland	0	(0%)	(0%)
Portugal	0	(0%)	(0%)
Romania	0	(0%)	(0%)
Slovakia	0	(0%)	(0%)

Slovenia	0	(0%)	(0%)
Candidate countries			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Croatia	0	(0%)	(0%)
Turkey	0	(0%)	(0%)
Associated countries			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Iceland	0	(0%)	(0%)
Israel	0	(0%)	(0%)
Liechtenstein	0	(0%)	(0%)
Norway	0	(0%)	(0%)
Switzerland	0	(0%)	(0%)
Was it your first time as an evaluator in the Competitiveness Innovation Framework Programme (CIP)?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
YES	20	(76.9%)	(76.9%)
NO	6	(23.1%)	(23.1%)
What is your age group?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
50-59	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
36-49	7	(26.9%)	(26.9%)
over 60	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
25-35	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
In which kind of call have you participated?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number

			records
CIP ICT-PSP	26	(100%)	(100%)
CIP Entrepreneurship and Innovation Programme	0	(0%)	(0%)
CIP Intelligent Energy-Europe Programme	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>SECTION 2 : QUESTIONS ABOUT THE EVALUATION PROCESS</b>			
<b>A. INFORMATION</b>			
<b>Was the invitation clear and timely?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= Very clear and timely)	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
4 (= Clear and/or timely)	7	(26.9%)	(26.9%)
3 (= average)	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
2 (= Not very clear and/or timely)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= Not clear or timely at all)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>How useful did you find the documentation BEFORE the evaluation?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Useful	26	(100%)	(100%)
Not useful	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did not use it	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>How useful did you find the documentation DURING the evaluation?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Useful	26	(100%)	(100%)

Not useful	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did not use it	0	(0%)	(0%)
Were the general briefing sessions clear and complete?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= clear)	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
5 (= very clear)	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
3 (= average)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= totally unclear)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= unclear)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Were the specific briefing sessions clear and complete? (If applicable)			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= very clear)	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
4 (= clear)	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
3 (= average)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= totally unclear)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= unclear)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>B. INDIVIDUAL READING AND CONSENSUS</b>			
Did you have sufficient time for the reading of the proposals?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= sufficient time)	21	(80.8%)	(80.8%)
3 (= average)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)

5 (= more than enough time)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= totally insufficient time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= too little time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did you have sufficient time for reaching consensus?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= sufficient time)	17	(65.4%)	(65.4%)
3 (= average)	6	(23.1%)	(23.1%)
5 (= more than enough time)	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
1 (= totally insufficient time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= too little time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How do you rate the process of reaching consensus?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
5 (= excellent)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
3 (= satisfactory)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How do you rate the role of the moderator in the consensus meetings?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
5 (= excellent)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)

3 (= satisfactory)	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

How do you rate the participation of the evaluators in the consensus discussion?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= excellent)	13	(50%)	(50%)
4 (= good)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
2 (= poor)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
3 (= satisfactory)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

C. PANEL

Did you participate in panel meetings?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
YES	24	(92.3%)	(92.3%)
NO	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)

Did you have sufficient time for the panel meeting?

	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= sufficient time)	14	(58.3%)	(53.8%)
3 (= average)	2	(8.3%)	(7.7%)
5 (= more than enough time)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)
1 (= totally insufficient time)	0	(0%)	(0%)

2 (= too little time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did you have sufficient time for the Cross readings?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= sufficient time)	12	(46.2%)	(46.2%)
2 (= too little time)	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
3 (= average)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
5 (= more than enough time)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= totally insufficient time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How do you rate the overall organisation of the panel meeting?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	8	(33.3%)	(30.8%)
5 (= excellent)	6	(25%)	(23.1%)
3 (= satisfactory)	3	(12.5%)	(11.5%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How effective was the introduction of the proposals to the panel?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	9	(37.5%)	(34.6%)
3 (= satisfactory)	3	(12.5%)	(11.5%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	3	(12.5%)	(11.5%)
2 (= poor)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)

5 (= excellent)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How effective was the panel chairperson?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= excellent)	9	(37.5%)	(34.6%)
4 (= good)	7	(29.2%)	(26.9%)
3 (= satisfactory)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How fair and equitable was the process of ranking proposals?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= very fair)	9	(37.5%)	(34.6%)
4 (= fair)	6	(25%)	(23.1%)
3 (= average)	2	(8.3%)	(7.7%)
1 (= very unfair)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= unfair)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Do panel meetings add value to the decision process?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= high value added)	8	(33.3%)	(30.8%)
3 (= average)	5	(20.8%)	(19.2%)
5 (= very high value added)	2	(8.3%)	(7.7%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)

Don't know (if you have no opinion)	1	(4.2%)	(3.8%)
1 (= no value added)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= low value added)	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>D. EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT</b>			
<b>Did you participate in the preparation of the Evaluation Summary reports (ESRs)?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
yes	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
no	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
<b>Did you have sufficient time to prepare the Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs)?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= sufficient time)	8	(53.3%)	(30.8%)
3 (= average)	2	(13.3%)	(7.7%)
1 (= totally insufficient time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= too little time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
5 (= more than enough time)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>How do you rate the quality of the Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs)?</b>			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	6	(40%)	(23.1%)
3 (= satisfactory)	2	(13.3%)	(7.7%)
5 (= excellent)	2	(13.3%)	(7.7%)
1 (= Very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)

Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
<b>SECTION 3: EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>			
Please tick the types of instruments you evaluated in the current call			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Thematic Network	12	(46.2%)	(46.2%)
Pilot Type B	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
Pilot Type A	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
Which criteria did you find most difficult to apply?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
No difficulty	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
Impact	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
Relevance	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
Implementation	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Do you think the evaluation criteria were clearly understood?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= yes, mostly)	13	(50%)	(50%)
5 (= yes, entirely)	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
2 (= no, only part of them)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
3 (= average)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
1 (= no, not at all)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Do you think the evaluation criteria were consistently applied?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number

			records
4 (= yes, mostly)	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
5 (= yes, entirely)	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
3 (= average)	6	(23.1%)	(23.1%)
2 (= no, only part of them)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= no, not at all)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Were the marking thresholds appropriate (if applied)?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= yes, mostly)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
5 (= yes, entirely)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
3 (= average)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
2 (= no, only part of them)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= no, not at all)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
SECTION 4: OPINION ON THE EVALUATION TASK AND EVALUATORS			
Did all the proposals you evaluated fall within your area of expertise?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Yes, all	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
More than 80%	8	(30.8%)	(30.8%)
More than half	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
Less than half	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did you think that there was a difference between the levels of marking applied to the first proposal and the last proposal you evaluated?			

	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
NO	23	(88.5%)	(88.5%)
YES	3	(11.5%)	(11.5%)
Do you think that the efforts to calibrate (e.g. re-briefing, cross reading, etc.) are sufficient?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
YES	1	(33.3%)	(3.8%)
NO	1	(33.3%)	(3.8%)
How would you rate the level of complexity of the evaluation task?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
3 (= average)	12	(46.2%)	(46.2%)
2 (= complex)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
4 (= easy)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= very complex)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
5 (= very easy)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How would you rate the level of efficiency and speed of the evaluation?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	17	(65.4%)	(65.4%)
5 (= excellent)	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
3 (= satisfactory)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

How would you rate the level of transparency of the evaluation procedures?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	13	(50%)	(50%)
5 (= excellent)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
3 (= satisfactory)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How would you rate the level of impartiality/confidentiality/fairness of the evaluation?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
5 (= excellent)	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
3 (= satisfactory)	4	(15.4%)	(15.4%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
If you have evaluated innovation proposals before for national or international innovation funding schemes, how do you rate the overall quality of the EU process in comparison?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= better)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	7	(26.9%)	(26.9%)
3 (= similar in quality)	5	(19.2%)	(19.2%)
5 (= very much better)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
2 (= worse)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= very much worse)	0	(0%)	(0%)

How would you rate the relevance of the expertise of the other evaluators?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	17	(65.4%)	(65.4%)
5 (= excellent)	8	(30.8%)	(30.8%)
3 (= satisfactory)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How would you rate the quality of the expertise of the other evaluators?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	17	(65.4%)	(65.4%)
5 (= excellent)	8	(30.8%)	(30.8%)
2 (= poor)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
3 (= satisfactory)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Do you think that the balance of expertise in the evaluation group(s) was appropriate?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= agree)	19	(73.1%)	(73.1%)
5 (= strongly agree)	6	(23.1%)	(23.1%)
1 (= strongly disagree)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
2 (= disagree)	0	(0%)	(0%)
3 (= average)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

Were you aware of any instances of potential conflict of interest?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
NO	23	(88.5%)	(88.5%)
YES	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
If yes, were these:			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
Indirect - evaluator's institution involved in the proposal	1	(100%)	(3.8%)
Direct conflicts - evaluator involved in the proposal	0	(0%)	(0%)
Indirect - evaluator linked to a direct competitor	0	(0%)	(0%)
Other (Please specify)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Did you think these were handled correctly?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
YES	11	(42.3%)	(42.3%)
NO	0	(0%)	(0%)
How would you rate the quality of the evaluation overall?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	13	(50%)	(50%)
5 (= excellent)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
3 (= satisfactory)	2	(7.7%)	(7.7%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

**SECTION 5: LOGISTICS**

Was the registration efficient and welcoming?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
5 (= excellent)	15	(57.7%)	(57.7%)
4 (= good/ high)	10	(38.5%)	(38.5%)
3 (= satisfactory)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)
How do you rate the overall organisation of the evaluation?			
	Number of requested records	% Requested records	% of total number records
4 (= good)	16	(61.5%)	(61.5%)
5 (= excellent)	9	(34.6%)	(34.6%)
3 (= satisfactory)	1	(3.8%)	(3.8%)
1 (= very poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
2 (= poor)	0	(0%)	(0%)
N/A (if a question is not applicable)	0	(0%)	(0%)
Don't know (if you have no opinion)	0	(0%)	(0%)

### Annex 3 Statistics of programme participation

COUNTRY	FEMALE	MALE	TOTAL
Austria	0	1	1
Belgium	0	8	8
Cyprus	1	0	1
Czech Republic	1	0	1
Denmark	0	2	2
Finland	3	2	5
France	1	5	6
Germany	2	5	7
Greece	1	4	5
Hungary	0	1	1
Ireland	0	1	1
Italy	3	6	9
Luxembourg	0	1	1
Netherlands	0	2	2
Norway	1	0	1
Poland	0	1	1
Portugal	0	1	1
Romania	0	2	2
Slovenia	0	1	1
Spain	2	2	4
Sweden	0	1	1
Switzerland	0	1	1
United Kingdom	7	5	12
United States	0	1	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>75</b>

# Monitoring of the CIP-PSP Call 1 Evaluation

## Annex 5

### Terms of reference of the monitoring panel

#### 1. BACKGROUND TO THE MONITORING

The role of the observers is to monitor the process of evaluation and report to the Commission, as represented by the Director General of DG-INFSO, on the conduct of the evaluation of CIP-PSP proposals, ways in which the procedures could be improved, the application of the evaluation criteria used in the sessions, and the way in which the evaluators apply these criteria. The observers also verify that the procedures set out or referred to in the CIP-PSP<sup>9</sup> Work Programme and other relevant documents and procedures are adhered to and report immediately to the Director responsible for evaluation and monitoring (Directorate C) on any potential problem and any deviation from agreed procedures.

#### 2. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The observers will report:

- on the conduct of, the fairness and equity of the evaluation;
- on “best practice” and on ways in which cases close to the boundary of acceptability are dealt with;
- on respect for procedures and ways in which procedures could be improved;
- on the preparations for the evaluation including selection of evaluators and allocation of proposals to them;
- on the evaluation criteria used and the way in which evaluators apply these criteria; and
- on the process of reaching a consensus on evaluation marks and proposal ranking (whether in meetings or through electronic means).

#### 3. SCOPE AND TIMETABLE

The task of the independent observers is to look at the process of evaluation and not the outcome, unless the outcome of the evaluations is a direct result of the operational problems. For this reason, it is not necessary that the observers have expertise in the area of the proposals being evaluated. Indeed, the observers are not expected to have too intimate a knowledge of the particular area in order to avoid conflicts between their opinion on the outcome of the evaluations and the functioning of the sessions. In any case, they will not express views on the proposals under examination or on the evaluators’ opinions on the proposals.

---

<sup>9</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/information\\_society/activities/ict\\_psp/calls/call\\_proposals\\_07/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/information_society/activities/ict_psp/calls/call_proposals_07/index_en.htm)

The observers will begin their work prior to the beginning of the evaluation process (on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2007) and will report to the Director General at the end of the evaluation process by 12<sup>th</sup> December 2007.

Monitoring will be effected through direct observation of the evaluation including evaluators briefings, consensus meetings and panel meetings, as well as interviews with relevant stakeholders and EC staff and review of the documentation.

The observers will regularly report on their preliminary findings to the Management of Directorate C of DG Information Society and Media. They will be responsible for their final written report.

In addition to their reporting duties, the observers will also be encouraged to enter into informal discussions with the Commission officials involved in the management of the evaluation; to inform immediately the Director responsible for Evaluation and Monitoring (Directorate C) on any potential problem and any deviation from agreed procedures; and suggest any possible improvements that could be put into practice immediately.

The Commission will inform the programme committee of the observers' written report findings and may make available publicly a summary of their report.

The indicative schedule for the Monitoring activity is:

Monday 19- November	Observation of the 1 <sup>st</sup> stage of proposal evaluation, including evaluator briefings, consensus and panel meeting. Selected interviews (e.g. evaluation co-ordinators, evaluators, Commission Staff)
Friday 23 November (afternoon)	Oral report in a meeting with the Management of Directorates C and H
Wednesday 28 – November	First draft of the Monitoring report to the Commission Services (by email)
Thursday 6 – December	Presentation of the final version of the Monitoring report to the Director General – Formal submission
Friday 18 – January 2008	Presentation of the final version of the Monitoring report to the Member States Committee (if requested by the Commission)

The observers are required to respect the confidentiality obligations and code of conduct as evaluators and to sign confidentiality agreements. They will not be permitted to divulge details of the proposals, the evaluators assigned to examining the proposals, nor the discussions in the evaluation panels.

#### **4. BACKGROUND TO THE CIP-PSP CALL 1**

The CIP-PSP Call 1 was published on 25 May 2007 with a deadline of 23 October 2007 with an indicative budget of 54 million Euro.

The call was open for all funding schemes: Pilot A, Pilot B and Thematic Networks. The evaluation of the written proposals will be performed from 19 to 30 November 2007. A total of about 90 proposals has been submitted, and about 80 expert evaluators have been identified and will be engaged to assist in the evaluation of the written proposals.

Following the evaluation of written proposals the Commission Services will prepare the Evaluation Report and a draft Implementation Plan that should be signed by the Director General by 18 December.

# Monitoring of the CIP-PSP Call 1 Evaluation

## Annex I Indicative List of Key Issues in Monitoring the CIP-PSP Call 1 Proposal Evaluation

To help identify the issues which the observers may wish to address in their observation of the CIP-PSP Call 1 proposal evaluation, the key issues that have previously been addressed and which continue to get particular attention within DG-Information Society and Media are listed below:

Proposal submission, reception and registration: notably:

- the effectiveness and management of electronic submission (and IT support generally);
  - the role and effectiveness of the external service provider;
2. Proposal assignment to 'Objectives', evaluation panels and evaluators, notably :
- the clarity of assignment criteria of proposals to 'Objectives';
  - the effectiveness of arrangements in ambiguous cases.
5. Adequacy of evaluator knowledge and expertise, notably:
- adequacy of the procedures for selecting evaluators; balanced range of expertise<sup>10</sup> (statistical patterns); effectiveness of the contractual procedures for evaluators;
  - availability of sufficiently knowledgeable, experienced and independent experts;
  - adequacy of arrangements to avoid conflicts of interest;
  - adequacy of briefings on evaluation procedures (incl. on objectives, instruments, and evaluation criteria, etc. )
6. Adequacy of working conditions, notably:
- the physical working conditions (space, ventilation, etc.);
  - adequacy of security arrangements (to ensure confidentiality and security and to avoid exchange of views between the evaluators);
  - adequacy of logistical planning (organisation of consensus and panel meetings);
  - working hours; number of proposals per evaluator (pages to read).

---

<sup>10</sup> In particular the participation of women evaluators, new evaluators, and evaluators from Industry.

7. The interpretation of the evaluation criteria, notably:
  - relevance of criteria for all instruments; overlap between criteria;
  - the uniformity and consistency of interpretation of the criteria;
  - the clarity of the criteria, and the clarity with which they are covered in proposals: the ease with which proposals can be assessed against them;
  - the adequacy and consistency of background documentation and guidelines;
  - the appropriateness and effect of thresholds;
  - use of the marking system: use of full range of marks, justification of marking. Are first proposals marked differently than later ones?
8. Developing consensus, notably:
  - Adequate training and briefing of the ‘EC moderators’ on how they should perform their tasks;
  - the consistency of individual evaluation;
  - the availability of good practice guidelines;
  - the effectiveness of processes for reaching consensus between evaluators;
  - the effectiveness and consistency of panel discussions (fixed or changing evaluator panels);
  - quality of the consensus process.
9. Reporting, notably:
  - the adequacy, quality and consistency of justifications for marks on the ESR<sup>11</sup> (Do they provide sufficient feedback to applicants and sufficient guidance for negotiations);
  - the consistency of the panel reports – and of the rapporteurs’ interpretation of their task.
8. Ranking of proposals, notably:
  - the clarity and consistency of ranking procedures;
  - organisation of panel meetings; quality and appropriateness of the expertise of the panel members? Quality of the chair person? Role/quality of the rapporteur?
  - the adequacy of supporting reports and documentation.
9. Assessment of the evaluation procedure by the evaluators, notably:

---

<sup>11</sup> Evaluation Summary Report.

- Adequacy of the questionnaire addressed to evaluators;

Unforeseen problems may arise. It may then be necessary to address the adequacy of contingency arrangements and internal quality management procedures, in particular in cases close to the boundary of reasonable practice and acceptability; the effectiveness of conflict resolution; the robustness of the process and its organisation; the effectiveness of the supervision mechanism; and the effectiveness of the Commission's response.

Finally, the observers may wish to comment on the adequacy and effectiveness of the arrangements for independent observation and monitoring.

# Monitoring of the CIP-PSP Call 1 Evaluation

## Annex 6 Panel Composition

### Members

Mr Narciso García  
Mr Bob Malcolm (rapporteur)

### Curricula-vitae

#### **Narciso García**

Narciso received the Ingeniero de Telecomunicación degree (five years engineering program) with high honors in 1976 (Spanish National Graduation Award) and the Doctor Ingeniero de Telecomunicación degree (PhD in Communications) with “Summa Cum Laude” in 1983 (Doctoral Graduation Award), both from the E.T.S. Ingenieros de Telecomunicación of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid.

He is Professor of Signal Theory and Communications at the Department of Signals, Systems, and Communications of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, and has been a member of its faculty since 1977. He leads the Image Processing Group (Grupo de Tratamiento de Imágenes) and has been Vice-Head (1987-1994) and Head (1994-2001) of the Department of Signals, Systems and Communications.

From 1978 till 1988 he was also a Scientific Advisor at the Image Processing Department of the IBM Madrid Scientific Center. He has been Coordinator of the Spanish Evaluation Agency from 1990 till 1992 and evaluator, reviewer, auditor, rapporteur, and observer of European programs since 1990. He has been Director of the Spanish delegation at the Management Committee of the Information Society Technologies Programme of the Fifth Framework Programme of the European Union.

His professional interests cover digital image processing, digital television, computer vision, and telecommunication systems. He has been actively involved in European projects (Eureka, Race, Cost, Esprit, Acts, Telematics, IST) and was a co-writer of the EBU proposal, base of the ITU standard for digital transmission of TV at 34-45 Mb/s (ITU-T J.81). He is a pioneer of digital image processing activities in Spain and has received the Junior Research Award of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid in 1987 and the Senior Research Award of the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid in 1994.

#### **Bob Malcolm (Rapporteur)**

Since 1989 Bob has operated the consultancy, ideo ltd, specialising in research strategy and management, including knowledge transfer. This followed 20 years experience in systems engineering in the aerospace and computing services industries during which he has worked as systems engineer, research manager, quality manager, project manager, and business manager. Bob has advised industry, universities, and local, national and international governmental agencies.

Bob has been associated with the EU R&D Programmes from the mid-1980's as project director, reviewer, evaluator, and consultant to both the European Commission and the UK Department of Trade and Industry. He has managed national UK industrial and academic research programmes.

He has chaired and participated in many industrial, academic, professional, national and international committees and advisory groups. He is a Past-Chairman of the Research and Development Society and was founding chairman of the Informatics Division of the IEE. He is a visiting professor at the University of Surrey, and a Visiting Senior Research Fellow at the University of Hertfordshire. He currently chairs the Strategy Board of the Systems Engineering Innovation Centre and the Management Committee of the multi-institutional Systems Engineering Doctorate Centre, both located at Loughborough University.