

Preparing a proposal in FP7 - ICT

*Information day – ICT Call 5
Objective 1.2 "Internet of Services,
Software and Virtualisation"*

9th June 2009



Funding schemes

Four instruments in this objective:

Large scale integrating projects (CP-IP or "IP")
Small or medium scale focused research actions
(CP-FP or "STREP")

for Outcomes a) and b)

Coordinating or networking actions (CA)
Support Actions (SA)
("CSA")

for Outcome c)

What is an Integrated project ?

IPs are designed to generate the knowledge required to respond to the challenges of ICT in FP7 by integrating the critical mass of activities and resources needed to achieve ambitious, clearly defined scientific and technological objectives of a European dimension

Each IP should

- integrate the types of activities needed to obtain the goals
- integrate the critical mass of resources needed to obtain the goals
- integrate elements of the development chain to attain high-impact goals
- support industry-academia collaboration including SMEs

What is a STREP ?

Small or medium scale focused projects are designed to generate the knowledge required to improve European competitiveness and to meet the needs of society or Community policies:

- by improving existing or developing new products, processes or services and/or
- by proving the viability of new technologies offering potential economic advantage

What does a STREP do ?

STREPs combine any of the following types of activities:

- targeted, well defined and precisely focused research and technological development
- demonstration component(s) as appropriate
- project management

(Dissemination and IPR protection activities are classified under project management, STREPs do not do training, coordination or commercial exploitation)

IP or STREP – Evaluation criteria

1. Scientific and technical quality

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Progress beyond the state-of-the-art
- Quality and effectiveness of the S & T methodology and associated workplan

IP or STREP – Evaluation criteria

2. Implementation

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

IP or STREP – Evaluation criteria

3. Impact

- Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the workprogramme under the relevant activity
- Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

What is a Coordination action ?

Coordination actions are designed to promote and support the networking and co-ordination of research and innovation activities (projects) at national, regional or European level over a fixed period

What is a Support action?

Support actions are designed to complement the other FP7 funding schemes. They:

- underpin the implementation of the programme
- help in preparations for future Community research and technological development policy activities and
- stimulate, encourage and facilitate the participation of SMEs, civil society organisations, small research teams, newly developed and remote research centres, as well as setting up research clusters across Europe
- Cover one off events or single purpose activities

(Support actions do not conduct S&T research !)

CSAs– Evaluation criteria

Scientific and technical quality

- Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives
- Contribution to the coordination of high quality research (CA only)
- Quality and effectiveness of the coordination/support action mechanisms and associated workplan

CSAs– Evaluation criteria

Implementation

- Appropriateness of the management structures 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 (budget, staff, equipment)

* if appropriate

CSAs– Evaluation criteria

Impact

- Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the workprogramme under the relevant activity
- Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large

Minimum consortium

- Three independent legal entities from three different Member States or Associated countries (presently Albania, Bosnia, Croatia, FYROM, Iceland, Israel, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Switzerland, Turkey)
- EEIGs composed of members that meet the criteria above
- Participation of international (intergovernmental) organisations
- Participants from third countries if in addition to minima (*ICPC countries are funded!*)

(Support actions – no minimum requirements)

Basic principles

- Proposals are evaluated by independent experts
- All proposal coordinators receive an Evaluation Summary Report
- Funding follows successful evaluation, selection and detailed grant agreement negotiations

Evaluation criteria scoring

Scale of 1-5

No weighting: All three criteria of equal importance

Criterion threshold 3/5

Overall threshold 10/15

Selection for funding is based on the highest overall scores (within each budget segment)

The Golden Rules

Use the pre-proposal check service* to make sure your proposal is eligible and in scope for this call.....

.....And do it before you prepare your proposal, not afterwards

*described in the Guide for applicants

The Golden Rules

Use the Instructions* and Forms** we prepare for our evaluators

1. Give the instructions and your draft proposal to experienced colleagues
2. Then re-write your proposal following their recommendations

* appendix in the Guide for Applicants

** available on the ICT Call page on Cordis

Proposal Part A (online)

A1

- Title, acronym, objective etc.
- free keywords
- 2000 character proposal abstract
- previous/current submission (in FP7)

A2

- Legal address/administrator address/R&D address
- Clear identification as SME/Public body/Research centre/ Educ. establishment
- Proposer identification code PIC

A3

- Cost details

The image shows a screenshot of the 'Proposal Submission Forms' for the 'Seventh Framework Programme' (FP7). The form is titled 'A1' and is divided into several sections. The top section is for 'Proposal Information' and includes fields for 'Proposal Number', 'Proposal Title', 'Proposal Acronym', and 'Proposal Abstract'. Below this is a section for 'Proposer Information' with fields for 'Proposer Name', 'Proposer Address', 'Proposer Contact', 'Proposer Identification Code (PIC)', and 'Proposer Type'. The bottom section is for 'Cost Details' and includes a large text area for 'Cost Details' and a 'PIC' field. The form is presented in a grid layout with various input fields and labels.

Proposal Part B (pdf format only)

Part B format directly linked to evaluation criteria

Summary

- *S&T quality (bullet points = sections)*
- *Implementation (idem)*
- *Impact (idem)*

Ethics

Section lengths described

The Golden Rules

Submit on time !

3rd November 2009: 17h00 (Brussels)

Electronic submission via EPSS

- Failure rate = $\pm 1\%$
- Main reason for failure to submit - waiting till the last minute
- Submit early, submit often!
- And don't make last minute changes

The Golden Rules

Divide your effort over the evaluation criteria

- Many proposers concentrate on the scientific element, but lose marks on project planning or impact description

Think of the finishing touches which signal quality work:

- clear language
- well-organised contents, following the Part B structure
- useful and understandable diagrams
- no typos, no inconsistencies, no obvious paste-ins, no numbers which don't add up, no missing pages ...

The Golden Rules

Make it *easy* for the evaluators to give you high marks. Don't make it hard for them!

- Don't write too little; cover what is requested
- Don't write too much
- Don't leave them to figure out why it's good, tell them why it's good
- Leave nothing to the imagination

The Golden Rules

Make sure your Project Workplan reflects the promises you made in the rest of your proposal

For example:

- S&T quality implies an adequate and well-organised research effort
- Good project management implies clear Workpackage leadership
- Strong Impact implies an important dissemination effort

Typical Project workplan (man-months)

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



The Workpackage that nobody wanted

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



The Workpackage that does too much

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



The partner who doesn't know what to do

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



The token SME

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104

..and New Member State

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104

The well-lead workpackages which will get results

	WP1	WP2	WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	
P1	10	4			4		18
P2	2	2	2	2	2	2	12
P3					3		3
P4		12	2	2	12		28
P5			14	2	3		19
P6			5	2	11		18
P7						6	6
Total	12	18	23	8	35	8	104



Success factors

- Preserve your credibility: select one proposal and make it a winner
- Show both innovation and exploitation potential
- Critical mass of participation rather than a long list of organisations with limited involvement
- Key individuals, expertise and achievements rather than long list of previous projects
- Make the proposal compelling for a busy reader (the first 5-10 pages are key!)

Reasons for failure

RTD content

- narrow scope
- little or no EU dimension
- lack of focus, aims too general
- lack of innovation, current state of art missing

Planning

- links missing between objectives and work plan
- milestones missing or too general
- risk factors not addressed, no contingency plans
- no monitorable indicators, no metrics

Management

- consortium not balanced, gaps in the skills mix
- lack of integration between partners
- vague management structure
- weak or narrow dissemination plans
- ill-defined exploitation prospects

The Golden Rules

Use all the help you can get

- Pre-proposal check service
- Commission contact person for each objective open in call
- A help desk for proposers' questions
- A help desk for electronic submission problems
- A network of National Contact Points

<http://cordis.europa.eu/ist/ncps.htm>

and don't wait till it's too late !