

Generalised feedback for successful applicants after the first stage of call:

H2020-MG-2016-Two-Stages_First Stage

Introduction

The evaluation of first stage proposals is now complete. The "[Flash info](#)" published on the Participant Portal shows the key statistics related to this call, including number of proposals submitted, the number evaluated, and the number passing the thresholds and thus invited to the second stage.

For successful first stage applicants, it is important to uphold the principle of equal treatment, and to ensure that all have a chance to benefit from the comments of experts. Therefore, instead of an ESR, this generalised feedback is provided now to all applicants invited to submit a full proposal at the second stage. You are kindly requested to take this feedback into account when preparing your full proposal.

Overall, the quality of proposals was generally high, with a sufficient number of proposals passing to the second stage. You have now the chance to address or clarify issues that should convince the second stage experts. Some or all of these experts may not be the same as those who reviewed your outline proposal.

Summary of main shortcomings

The bullet points below are not always applicable to your particular proposal, they give an overview of typical shortcomings in proposals evaluated and summarise observations of experts involved in evaluation:

- In several instances the proposals were not fully clear in explaining why the proposal would make a big impact.
- Certain proposals did not sufficiently address all the expected impacts of the topic. In several cases the impacts were not well quantified and/or the baseline was missing.
- Some proposals did not fully demonstrate their level of ambition. For other proposals, the progress beyond the state of the art was not well presented.
- In several proposals the possible contribution from stakeholders outside the consortium was not sufficiently elaborated.
- A number of proposals did not present a clear and coherent process for evaluating the pilot or demonstration activities.

Shortcomings per activity

Aviation: in a number of the proposals the link with the objectives and the expected impacts of the topic could have been presented in greater detail. In some proposals the description of the state of the art received insufficient attention.

Waterborne transport: a number of proposals did not fully elaborate the interdisciplinary elements in the proposed work. In addition, some proposals did not sufficiently take the requirements of end-users into consideration.

Safety: the proposals did not always address the topic objectives with sufficient detail. In addition, the proposals did not always elaborate sufficiently on the state of the art. End users requirements were not always taken into consideration.

Urban mobility: for some proposals, the solutions to be developed and their integration into the transport system could have been explained better. The strategy for scale-up, transferability and mainstreaming of the results/apps/solutions could have been better elaborated. The innovative aspects of the proposed tools/measures were not always well explained. In addition, in some proposals the method for impact evaluation could have been better explained.

Logistics: in a number of proposals the challenges and barriers to be overcome were not clearly explained and their link to the project's objectives in some cases not well presented. In some proposals the role of and the links between the test sites could have been better elaborated. The link between the project activities and the expected impacts was not always well presented.

Intelligent transport systems: many proposals did not adequately address the aspect of business models and commercial viability of the proposed solutions. In several instances the rationale behind the choice of the exact services, demonstration sites, and methodological approaches was not well explained. Some proposals did not sufficiently consider the wider scope of MaaS, which includes both "hard" technological aspects and "soft" aspects such as user acceptance and travel behaviour.