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1. PURPOSE OF THIS GUIDE

1.1 Introduction

Welcome to the 2018 evaluations of Societal Challenge 6!

The Research Executive Agency (REA) is a funding body for research and innovation. It manages a large share of Horizon 2020 (EU Research and Innovation Framework Programme, 2014-2020).

The focus of REA B3 Unit is Societal Challenge 6 (SC6) 'Europe in a changing world – Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies'. In 2018, three Calls for proposals of SC6 will be evaluated:

1. MIGRATION
2. SOCIOECONOMIC AND CULTURAL TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION
3. GOVERNANCE FOR THE FUTURE

1.2 The purpose of this guide

This guide is intended to support the expert evaluators. The evaluator’s role is to assess the proposals submitted in response to the SC6 calls for proposals. Proposals are allocated to expert evaluators who need to assess them against pre-defined evaluation criteria.

This guide provides a detailed overview of each aspect of the evaluation process and detailed information on each task to be performed by expert evaluators during the evaluation exercise. It contains information on our 3 Calls for proposals including their requirements, evaluation criteria, scoring principles, eligibility criteria. A chapter will explain the use of this IT tool SEP. Another chapter is dedicated to tips for the drafting and the quality of the different reports (individual evaluation reports, consensus reports etc.) that expert evaluators will have to submit while assessing the proposals via our evaluation online IT tool SEP.

After having read this guide, should you need any additional information or clarification, please contact your Project Officer or your Vice Chair (experts supporting REA staff during the evaluation) who will be your main contact during the entire evaluation process.

1.3 Societal Challenge 6

The specific objective of the Societal Challenge 6 'Europe in a changing world – Inclusive, innovative and reflective societies' (SC6) is to foster a greater understanding of Europe, provide solutions, and support inclusive, innovative and reflective European societies in a context of unprecedented transformations and growing global interdependencies.

Pressure from increased migration flows, socio-economic and cultural transformations from new forms of human-technology interaction under the fourth industrial revolution, and new developments in European, national and global governance have the potential to significantly impact Europe's future at many levels. At the same time, and linked to these developments, the citizens' trust in many public institutions and their capacities to
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address effectively these challenges is weakening while their concerns are increasing.

Horizon 2020 calls for proposals are subdivided into topics. In 2018, 14 topics have been delegated to the Research Executive Agency.

More details on the calls and the different topics can be found in the Work-Programme (WP).

- **SC6 Work Programme**
- **General Annexes to the WP**
  - Call Migration – [topics description](#)
  - Call Transformation – [topics description](#)
  - Call Governance – [topics description](#)
- **Frequently Asked Questions**

Please read also the [General Annexes to the WP](#) where you can find essential information that you should take into account when evaluating the proposals.

As our schemes are highly competitive, your role as an expert is **crucial** to help us selecting the best proposals to fund.
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2. Evaluation details and call overview

The call deadline for the three SC6 calls was March 13th 2018. The proposals will be evaluated under 14 different topics. Please find below a summary of the key aspects of the evaluation.

**FULL REMOTE phase** (i.e. you work at your place) is divided in 2 phases:

- **a) Remote IER Individual evaluation Report phase**
  - **Check & confirm absence of Conflict of Interest**;
  - **Evaluate** all proposals assigned to you;
  - **Prepare** an Individual Evaluation Report (IER) for each proposal.

- **b) Remote CR Consensus Report phase:**
  - **Actively participate** to the remote consensus discussion in SEP with the rapporteur and the other evaluator;
  - **Rapporteur draft and submit the final Consensus Report (CR)**;
  - **100% Consensus Report signed by all experts fully remotely**;

⚠️ Consensus discussions may also be organized via teleconferences, in particular in case of specific issues (exceptional funding, operational capacity...), or any difficulties to reach consensus. REA Project Officer and/or Vice Chair will decide on case by case basis which consensus.

**CENTRAL phase**

At the end of the remote phase, we will have a DRAFT ranked list. In order to select the best proposals among the top ranking ones, panel review meetings will be organized in Brussels.

A maximum of 5 expert's evaluators per topic will be invited. The evaluators selected to attend the panels will be selected during the course of the remote evaluation. Based on their recommendation, we will establish a final ranked list of proposals for funding.

In addition, Experts invited to the panels will have some additional days to cross-read the proposals which will be discussed in Brussels.

**The REA Project Officer and Vice Chairs** (which are specialized experts contracted by REA’s staff) will supports you throughout the process, providing guidance where necessary including via the Evaluation Tool (SEP) during the full remote phase. They are the person of reference in case of questions or doubts.
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Please find below an overview table of the calls.

## TABLE 1: OVERVIEW OF THE CALLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Topic title</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
<th>2018 budget (million euros)</th>
<th>Estimated proposals to be funded</th>
<th>Responsible Project Officer/Topic Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALL 1 - Migration</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIGRATION-02</strong> Towards forward-looking migration governance: addressing the challenges, assessing capacities and designing future strategies</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cristina MARCUZZO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MIGRATION-05</strong> Mapping and overcoming integration challenges for migrant children</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eugenia STRANTZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MIGRATION-06</strong> Addressing the challenge of migrant integration ICT-enabled solutions</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hinano SPREAFICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>MIGRATION-08</strong> Addressing the challenge of forced displacement</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Luis GARCÍA DOMÍNGUEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Their email addresses are: name.surname@ec.europa.eu
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Topic title</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
<th>2018 budget (million euros)</th>
<th>Estimated proposals to be funded</th>
<th>Responsible Project Officer / Topic Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONS-01</td>
<td>Research for inclusive growth: addressing the socio-economic effects of technological transformations</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kerstin WILDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-02</td>
<td>Transformative impact of disruptive technologies in public services</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Giorgio COSTANTINO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONS-05</td>
<td>Cities as a platform for citizen-driven innovation</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bart NEERSCHOLTEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONS-06</td>
<td>Inclusive and sustainable growth through cultural and creative industries and the arts</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rodrigo MARTÍN GALÁN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-12</td>
<td>Curation of digital assets and advanced digitisation</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ellen SCHRAUDOLPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSFORMATIONS-14</td>
<td>Supply and demand-oriented economic policies to boost robust growth in Europe - Addressing the social and economic challenges in Europe</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Petri BACKMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Topic title</th>
<th>Type of action</th>
<th>2018 budget (million euros)</th>
<th>Estimated proposals funded</th>
<th>n° of to be funded</th>
<th>Responsible Project Officer / Topic Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-02</td>
<td>Past, present and future of differentiation in European governance</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Paloma MARTÍN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-03</td>
<td>Addressing populism and boosting civic and democratic engagement</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jarkko SIREN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-06</td>
<td>Trends and forward-looking scenarios in global governance</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Andreas OBERMAIER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-08</td>
<td>Partnering for viability assessments of innovative solutions for markets outside Europe</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Danila CONTE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⚠️ Please read carefully the description of the topic under which the proposals you will evaluate were submitted.

More details on the calls and the different topics can be found in the Work programme. You should carefully read the topics you will be evaluating. Pay special attention to the explanations on "Scope" and "Expected impact".
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3.1 Who's is who

There are 3 roles envisaged for the independent expert in these calls:

**Experts Evaluators**
- Read the topic and the proposals;
- Evaluate proposals using evaluation criteria (section 5);
- Submit Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs) remotely;
- Participate actively in the remote consensus discussion with the other expert and Rapporteur in order to agree and finalise fully remotely the consensus report.

**Evaluator and Rapporteur**
- Under request of Project Officer and Vice-Chair, some Evaluators will be asked to act also as Rapporteur and draft a Consensus Report (CR) remotely. The Rapporteur will be chosen among one of the 3 experts assessing a proposals, they will be informed during the first part of the remote phase. The Rapporteur shall:
  - Write Individual Evaluation Report (IER), Write Consensus Report (CR) and lead process to arrive at a consensus remotely.

**Vice-Chair**
- They are specialized experts appointed by REA staff. They do not evaluate proposals and cannot give an opinion on proposals.
- The Vice-chair shall:
  - Quality check IERs and CRs – monitor the evaluation with the support of REA Project Officers (POs)
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The Independent Observer (IO)
- Observes the evaluation process;
- Provides advice, suggestions for improvement to the REA;
- You can be contacted by the IO at any time during the process; therefore, full support is expected from you.

REA Actors
- Project Officers (POs): lead for topic and some tasks (quality control and moderator) shared with Vice-Chair (external expert). For the full list of POs, see table 1;
  - Call Coordinators: responsible for the overall evaluation exercise (Margaux Genachte and Amélie Birot-Courcy)
  - Call Assistant: provides support in terms of the call organisation and logistics (Barbara Bisaro)
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3.2 Principles and Confidentiality

As an expert assisting REA on the evaluation process, you are bound to respect the following principles of the code of conduct for Evaluators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNCONSCIOUS BIAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relying on our prior experiences, assumptions, and interpretations - whilst being unaware of it - helps us make quick choices without thinking, and may have a potential impact on critical decisions such as evaluating proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Studies prove that the following tips should decrease unconscious bias:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Place yourself in a quiet environment where you can be focused while evaluating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Dedicate a sufficient amount of time to each proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Communicate with other Evaluators during the consensus phase, because we detect unconscious bias in others more easily than in ourselves.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPLICATIONS OF GENDER BIASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implicit biases based on gender stereotypes can affect both men and women and influence behaviour and decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to strength the evaluation and guarantee a fair process, <strong>it is imperative to mitigate the effects of implicit gender biases and avoid biased judgements</strong>. Please have a look at these videos for more info:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Royal Society (UK): Understanding unconscious bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Université de Lausanne (CH): Éviter les biais de genre lors de nominations professorales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Institució CERCA (ES): Recruitment Bias in Research Institutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CONFIDENTIALITY

The expert contract also requires experts to maintain strict confidentiality with respect to the whole evaluation process.

They must follow any instruction given by the REA to ensure this. Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times: before, during and after the evaluation.

Under no circumstance may an expert:

− Attempt to contact an applicant on his/her own account, either during the evaluation or afterwards.
− Disclose any information on proposals / applicants.
− Disclose any detail on the evaluation outcomes.
− Disclose names of other experts involved.

The Evaluators or Vice-Chairs must return and/or erase any confidential documents once the evaluation exercise is over.
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3.3 Conflict of interest (CoI)

Under the terms of your signed expert contract, all experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform the responsible REA staff member should one become apparent during the course of the evaluation. The REA will take whatever action is necessary to remove any conflict of interest with the proposals submitted to this call.

You have a CoI if you:

- were involved in the preparation of the proposal;
- stand to benefit directly/indirectly if the proposal is successful;
- have a close family/personal relationship with any person representing an applicant legal entity;
- are a director/trustee/partner of an applicant or involved in the management of an applicant’s organisation;
- are employed or contracted by an applicant or a named subcontractor;
- are a member of an Advisory Group or Programme Committee in an area related to the call in question;
- are a National Contact Point or are directly working for the Enterprise Europe Network.

In the following situations, the EC/Agency will decide whether a CoI exists:

- You were employed by an applicant or sub-contractor over the last 3 years;
- You were involved in a grant agreement/decision, the membership of management structures or research collaboration with an applicant over the last 3 years;
- You are in any other situation that casts doubt on your impartiality or that could reasonably appear to do so.

How to react in case of CoI?

- You must inform the REA as soon as you become aware of a CoI, at any moment during the evaluation, and in particular:
  - Before the signature of the contract;
  - Upon receipt of proposals
  - During the course of your work;

The REA then determines if there is a CoI on a case-by-case basis, deciding the course of action to follow.

- If there is a CoI for a certain proposal you cannot evaluate it:
  - Neither individually;
  - Nor in the consensus group;
  - Nor in the panel review.

- If you knowingly hide a CoI, you will be excluded from the evaluation and your work declared null and void. As a consequence of this:
  - The allowance/expenses you claimed may be reduced, rejected or recovered;
  - Your contract may be terminated;

You will not be considered for future evaluations.
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4.1 Workflow

The figure below shows the workflow of the full remote evaluation + central panel review meeting.
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4.2 Timeline

INTERNAL DEADLINES FOR THE EVALUATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Remote Evaluation</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Individual Evaluation Reports (April 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – April 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of the IER phase</td>
<td>April 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Evaluators start drafting their IERs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First IER ready and submitted</td>
<td>April 20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; EOB</td>
<td>Evaluators draft and submit their first IER. Evaluators should assess proposals following the alphabetical order, starting from A to Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC perform QC on the first IER of each Evaluators</td>
<td>April 23&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1st IER has been quality checked by VC and green light has been given to continue the drafting of IERs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All IERs ready and submitted</td>
<td>April 30&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>If for a proposal all the IERs are ready, the consensus phase can start earlier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Remote Consensus (May 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; – May 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drafting of CRs by the Rapporteurs</td>
<td>As of May 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Rapporteurs prepare and write CRs to be submitted to the other 2 experts and the VC: from 01/05 to 07/05 Evaluators interact with Rapp. during the drafting of the CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRs finalised</td>
<td>May 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>All CRs are quality checked and approved by the three Evaluators by this date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Central Evaluation</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Cross-reading (May 19&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Only for Evaluators selected to attend the panels. They will be informed during the remote evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Panel meetings (June 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-June 8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel meetings</th>
<th>Individual panel meetings will be held in 1-2 days. Exact dates to be provided during the remote evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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4.3 Admissibility and Eligibility checks

After the call deadline, REA staff checks if the submitted proposals comply with the admissibility and eligibility criteria defined in the General Annexes to the WP (Sections B-C). Only afterwards the (complying) proposals will be assigned to the experts.

The admissibility and eligibility checks are carried out by the REA.

A proposal is admissible if it complies with the following requirements:

a) It is readable, accessible and printable;

b) It is complete and includes all requested forms;

c) It includes a plan for exploitation and dissemination of results (unless otherwise specified in the WP).

A proposal is eligible if it complies with the following requirements:

a) Its content corresponds to the topic description (in scope/out of scope)

b) It complies with the eligibility conditions, which depend on the type of actions and are set up in page 7 of the General Annexes.

Although the admissibility and eligibility checks are carried out by the REA staff, as an Evaluator, you are in charge of assessing whether the proposal is in scope (eligibility criterion point a) above).

If you spot an issue relating to eligibility, please inform your PO and VC immediately!

“Out of scope” – you need to check if the content of a proposal corresponds, wholly or in part, to the description of the call or topic;

A proposal will only be deemed ineligible in clear-cut cases. If you consider that a proposal is not in scope, please inform your PO immediately. We will check whether it is indeed the case and, if it is, we will declare the proposal ineligible.

If nevertheless the proposal is partially within the scope of call, it will need to be evaluated in any case. If the proposal addresses the ‘Scope’ of the topic text only partially you shall reflect this in the comments and score under the criterion ‘Excellence’. Always compare the proposals to the topic text, and ask yourself the question: (how) does the proposal address the topic text?

As an expert, you might think that the topic text should have been written differently, or should have included other elements.

However, as an Evaluator your job is to compare each proposal with the topic text, and evaluate – based on your expertise – if and how (well) the proposal addresses the challenge, scope and impact found in the topic text.
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5.1 Types of Actions

Projects funded under Horizon 2020 can take different pre-defined shapes, in terms of requirements on partnership (mono- or multipartner), purpose (research, innovation, networking, fellowship ...), reimbursement rate etc. These pre-defined project shapes are referred to as "types of action".

The SC6 calls are addressed by 3 types of actions depending on the scope of the topic.

Research and innovation actions (RIA):

Description: Action primarily consisting of activities aiming to establish new knowledge and/or to explore the feasibility of a new or improved technology, product, process, service or solution. For this purpose they may include basic and applied research, technology development and integration, testing and validation on a small-scale prototype in a laboratory or simulated environment.

Projects may contain closely connected but limited demonstration or pilot activities aiming to show technical feasibility in a near to operational environment.

Funding rate: 100%

Innovation actions (IA):

Description: Action primarily consisting of activities directly aiming at producing plans and arrangements or designs for new, altered or improved products, processes or services. For this purpose they may include prototyping, testing, demonstrating, piloting, large-scale product validation and market replication.

A ‘demonstration or pilot’ aims to validate the technical and economic viability of a new or improved technology, product, process, service or solution in an operational (or near to operational) environment, whether industrial or otherwise, involving where appropriate a larger scale prototype or demonstrator.

A ‘market replication’ aims to support the first application/deployment in the market of an innovation that has already been demonstrated but not yet applied/deployed in the market due to market failures/barriers to uptake. 'Market replication' does not cover multiple applications in the market of an innovation that has already been applied successfully once in the market. ‘First’ means new at least to Europe or new at least to the application sector in question. Often such projects involve a validation of technical and economic performance at system level in real life operating conditions provided by the market.

Projects may include limited research and development activities.

Funding rate: 70% (except for non-profit legal entities, where a rate of 100% applies)
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Coordination and support actions (CSA):

Actions consisting primarily of accompanying measures such as standardisation, dissemination, awareness-raising and communication, networking, coordination or support services, policy dialogues and mutual learning exercises and studies, including design studies for new infrastructure and may also include complementary activities of strategic planning, networking and coordination between programmes in different countries.

**Funding rate:** 100%

Please refer to TABLE 1 to see which is the type of action of the topic you are evaluating a proposal.

For more information about H2020 types of action, please consult the [General Annexes of the Horizon 2018-2020 WP](#) (sections D and H) of the Horizon 2020 WP.

**Important:** Evaluation criteria (and proposal templates) differ for CSA than for RIA and IA proposals which are the same.

### 5.2 Award criteria

During the remote evaluation, each proposal will be first assessed independently by at least three Evaluators against predetermined award criteria. The same 3 main award criteria are used for all Types of Action: Excellence, Impact, and (quality and efficiency of the) Implementation. Each main criterion is subdivided in a set of sub-criteria, which are adapted to the different Types of Action.

In the next page please find the table with more information about the award criteria and the corresponding sub-criteria of the different type of actions.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXCELLENCE</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION (common field only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IA, RIA, CSA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Clarity and pertinence of the objectives; Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology;</strong></td>
<td><strong>The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IA, RIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the WP, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society;</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, <strong>where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge and gender dimension in research and innovation content.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Note: Second sub-criterion of impact criterion:**

- if the sub-criterion is well addressed, the proposal can be positively assessed.

- if the sub-criterion is not well addressed or not addressed at all, then the expert should remain neutral and not penalise the proposal. In this case, the following sentence should be added: 
  "The project does not demonstrate any substantial impacts that are not mentioned in the work programme."
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5.3 Rating of the proposals

As Evaluator, you are requested to evaluate the proposal by giving a score from 0 to 5 to each criterion based on your comments. Please focus first on comments and then give a score!

Only half-marks can be used;

Evaluation scores will be awarded for the 3 main criteria, and shall reflect the comments provided for each of the sub-criteria listed in the previous table;

For each main criterion the max score is 5 and the threshold is 3;

The whole range of scores shall be used (0, 0.5...4.5, 5);

The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores is 10.

You must evaluate each proposal as submitted and not on its potential if certain changes were to be made. If you identify shortcomings (other than minor ones and obvious clerical errors), identify them in your comments and provide concrete examples, then reflect those shortcomings in a lower score for the considered criterion. Your comments must not include recommendations for improvement.

The interpretation of the scores is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Half scores given</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EXCELLENT. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>VERY GOOD. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>GOOD. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>FAIR. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>POOR. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Innovation actions (IA) to determine the ranking, the score for the criterion ‘impact’ will be given a weight of 1.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Threshold</th>
<th>IA factor (ranking)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Other aspects: Operational Capacity, Cross-cutting issues, Open Innovation and financial support to third parties (cascade funding)

In addition to the award criteria, other aspects of the proposal need to be assessed and explicitly mentioned in the IERs and CRs at respective places.

a. Operational capacity

As a distinct operation, carried out during the evaluation of the award criterion ‘Quality and efficiency of the implementation’, Evaluators are asked to evaluate whether each applicant has, or will have in due time, a sufficient Operational Capacity (OC) to successfully carry out its assigned tasks in the proposed work plan.

The assessment of the OC is based on the competence and experience of the applicant, including its operational resources (human, technical and other) and, if applicable, exceptionally the concrete measures proposed to obtain it by the time of the implementation of the tasks.

To assess the OC, you need to refer to the section in the proposals describing the members of the consortium and check the competence and experience of the individual participants (cv or description of the profile of the applicant; relevant publications or achievements; relevant previous projects or activities and description of any significant infrastructure or any major items of technical equipment).

If applicable, you can exceptionally assess the concrete measures proposed for a given partner to obtain sufficient OC by the time of the implementation of the tasks.

If you believe that one or more partners lack the basic OC when you are carrying out your Individual evaluation in remote, you should evaluate the proposal including the parts related to the applicant(s) concerned. You have to flag in your IER the lack of basic OC by ticking the specific box for this issue and adding your reasons.

At remote consensus stage, the issues will be discussed to reach a common view regarding the concerned applicant(s). If there is consensus on the lack of OC of one or more applicants, the proposal will need to be evaluated without taking these applicants into account, i.e. you evaluate the proposal without taking into account this applicant and its associated activity(ies).

The relevant information to assess OC is provided in PART B – Section 4 of each proposal.
### 5. AWARD CRITERIA AND OTHER ASPECTS

#### TABLE 2: OVERVIEW OF CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Social Sciences &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>International Cooperation</th>
<th>Open Innovation</th>
<th>Financial support to third parties in the form of grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALL 1 - Migration 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGRATION-02-2018</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGRATION-05-2018-2020</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-MIGRATION-06-2018-2019</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIGRATION-08-2018</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Social Sciences &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>International Cooperation</th>
<th>Open Innovation</th>
<th>Financial support to third parties in the form of grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CALL 2 - Socioeconomic and Cultural Transformations of the Fourth Industrial Revolution 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONS-01-2018</strong></td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-02-2018</strong></td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONS-05-2018</strong></td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFORMATIONS-06-2018</strong></td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DT-TRANSFORMATIONS-12-2018</strong></td>
<td>IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calls for proposals</th>
<th>Type of Action</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Social Sciences &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>International Cooperation</th>
<th>Open Innovation</th>
<th>Financial support to third parties in the form of grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-02-2018</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-03-2018</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-06-2018</td>
<td>RIA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNANCE-08-2018</td>
<td>CSA</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALL 3 - The governance for the future**
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b. Cross-cutting issues

H2020 aims to better address cross-cutting issues and certain topics have been flagged as particularly relevant. This means that cross-cutting issues, if highlighted in the topic description as stated in the WP, have to be considered during the evaluation process (see TABLE 2 above to check which CCI is flagged for the topic you have to evaluate). As a result, if they are not properly addressed (or their non-relevance not justified), you must reflect this in a lower score for the relevant criterion.

SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES (SSH)

Integrating SSH research across Horizon 2020 is essential to maximise the returns to society from investment in science and technology. Integrating the socio-economic dimension into the design, development and implementation of research itself and of new technologies can help find solutions to societal problems. The idea to focus Horizon 2020 on 'challenges' rather than disciplinary fields of research illustrates this new approach.

How should Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) be addressed and evaluated in H2020 proposals?

Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) are needed to tackle many of the complex societal challenges addressed in H2020, and contributions from one or more of these disciplines are frequently necessary for a successful proposal. These contributions are usually part of an interdisciplinary approach, involving either:

- collaboration between SSH disciplines and/or

SSH disciplines include sociology, psychology, economics, law, political science, public and business administration, demography, anthropology (except physical anthropology), geography (except physical geography), peace and conflict studies, human rights, education science, journalism and communication, cultural studies, religion, linguistics, literature, cultural studies, history, archaeology, philosophy, ethics, arts and crafts (list adapted from the UNESCO International Standard Classification of Education, ISCED 2011).

Topics where SSH contributions are required are flagged as SSH-relevant topics which means that these topics would particularly benefit from a SSH dimension.

Proposals under these topics must take account of the social, economic, political, legal, behavioural, institutional, historical or cultural dimensions of a given issue, as appropriate for the topic.

In these cases, the evaluators will assess how the SSH contributions are reflected in the proposal under the 'Excellence' criterion notably whether there is an appropriate consideration of an interdisciplinary approach (i.e. collaboration between SSH disciplines and/or between SSH and non-SSH disciplines) in relation to the topic description and/or the involvement of SSH partners under the 'Implementation' criterion when evaluating the complementarity of participants.
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When a topic is not flagged for SSH, applicants can still decide to address it in their proposal if they find it relevant. In these cases, evaluators will deal with the proposed SSH issues like any other relevant aspects of the proposal.

**GENDER**

An in-depth understanding of men and women’s needs, behaviours and attitudes contributes to improve the scientific quality and societal relevance of the produced knowledge, technology and/or innovation. It also leads to produce goods and services better suited to potential markets.

Applicants are encouraged to develop a gender dimension in their projects whenever relevant.

Gender dimension means integrating sex and gender analysis into research and innovation content. The gender dimension is a dynamic concept that ensures that researchers question gender norms and stereotypes and address the evolving needs and social roles of women and men. Addressing the gender dimension in research and innovation entails taking into account sex and gender in the whole research process, when developing concepts and theories, formulating research questions, collecting and analyzing data and using the analytical tools that are specific to each scientific area.

**How should gender be addressed and evaluated in Horizon 2020 proposals?**

Gender dimension in Research and Innovation content

A topic is considered gender relevant when it can be expected that its findings affect women and men or groups of women and men differently.

In these cases, applicants should integrate sex and/or gender analysis and, when relevant specific studies, as part of the proposals. This is what we call the ‘gender dimension’ in research and innovation content. Addressing the gender dimension will contribute to the scientific quality and societal relevance of the produced knowledge, technology and innovation.

In Horizon 2020, the gender dimension is explicitly integrated in a number of topics across sections of the Work Programme. This means that each of these topics specifies under its scope and/or under its expected impact in what way gender is relevant, in order to ensure a clear understanding by applicants.

In these cases, evaluators will check how sex and/or gender analysis is taken into account in the proposal and consider this while giving a score under the “excellence” and/or the “impact” criteria.

When the gender dimension is not explicitly integrated into a topic, applicants can still decide to address it in their proposal if they find it relevant.

In these cases, evaluators will deal with the proposed gender issues as they will with other relevant aspects of the proposal.

**Gender balance in research teams**
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Applicants in Horizon 2020 are encouraged to promote equal opportunities in the implementation of the action and to ensure a balanced participation of women and men at all levels in research and innovation teams and in management structures.

Alongside other factors, gender balance also comes into play as a ranking factor to prioritise ex-aequo proposals with the same scores for the three criteria, as set out in Part H of the General Annexes to the work programme.

If ex-aequo proposals cannot be prioritised on the basis of work programme coverage or budget allocated to SMEs, the relative gender balance of the consortium teams will be used to rank the proposals; this refers to section 4.1 of the proposal template (“Participants”), where applicants are asked to specify the gender of the persons who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the proposed research and/or innovation activities.

Unconscious Gender Bias during evaluations

Gender stereotypes are scientifically documented and correspond to socially and culturally constructed pre-conceptions of the needs, roles and abilities of men and women, boys and girls. Stereotypes may lead to "unconscious gender biases", such as the under-evaluation of women’s roles and abilities. Experts should guard against the risk of unconscious gender bias in the evaluation process. All proposals will be assessed on equal terms, impartially on their merits and irrespective of the origin, identity and gender of the applicants.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION (IC)

International cooperation has always been a key feature of the scientific endeavour. In a rapidly evolving global context, Research and Innovation are increasingly linked internationally, demanding new forms of cooperation.

Horizon 2020 is open to the world, allowing European researchers, to cooperate with their counterparts around the world in H2020 projects on any topic. In addition, in some parts of Horizon 2020, topics have been flagged as being particularly suitable for international cooperation and consortia are encouraged to include non-EU partners.

How should international cooperation (i.e. cooperation with organisations outside the EU or associated countries) be addressed and evaluated in Horizon 2020 proposals?

International cooperation ensures that European partners have access to talent and resources wherever they are located; that they can tackle global societal challenges effectively; that EU companies participate in global value chains and can access new and emerging markets and helps strengthen the EU’s position as a major global player. As a general rule, all actions under Horizon 2020 are open for participation of third countries and international organisations. This is the principle of general opening of Horizon 2020. For some topics in the work programme, however, it has been clearly identified that there is a clear interest and benefit in engaging in international cooperation, both for the Union and the partner in question. These topics have therefore been flagged in the work programme as being particularly relevant for international cooperation.
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Evaluation Experts will consider the following aspects in particular:

In some cases, topics in the work programme encourage international cooperation and state explicitly that 'this will be positively considered during the evaluation of proposals'.

Part A of the General Annexes to the work programme includes the list of countries from which legal entities are automatically eligible for receiving EU funding. International European organisations are also eligible for funding. Unless otherwise stated in the work programme, legal entities from other countries and international organisations can only be funded in exceptional cases where the Commission deems the participation of the entity in question essential for carrying out the action. This exceptionality needs to be justified in the proposal and will be judged on whether or not the participation of the entity in question in the project is essential, with clear benefits to the consortium. These benefits may include, for example, outstanding competence and expertise, access to unique, know-how, access to research infrastructures, access to geographical environments, involving key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.

Some third countries have lined up national funding that will be made available to their national participants, if, and when they are successful in European consortia applying to Horizon 2020 calls.

OPEN INNOVATION

Open innovation in one of the three priority areas of the Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation Moedas.

Open innovation was defined by Chesbrough as the use of purposive inflows and outflows of knowledge to accelerate internal innovation, and expand the markets for external use of innovation, respectively.

Open innovation is characterised by the combined power of ideas and knowledge from different actors (whether private, public, third sector) to co-create new products and find solutions to societal needs. Open innovation is also characterised by the creation of shared economic and social value and the implications of mega-trends such as digitisation, mass participation and collaboration, and sustainability.

How to evaluate cross-cutting issues:

If cross-cutting issues are explicitly mentioned in the scope of the call/topic and not properly addressed (or their non-relevance justified), you must reflect this in the score for the relevant criterion (this is has to be decided by you, the expert).

Proposals addressing cross-cutting issues which are not explicitly mentioned in the scope of the call or topic can also be evaluated positively.
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d. Financial support to third parties (cascade funding)

Important: Please note that for this evaluation exercise only the topic Governance-08 allows applicants to offer financial support to third parties (Annex K of the General Annexes to the Work Programme). All the other topics do not allow it.

However as Evaluator, you might notice some cases where the consortium plans to organise open calls, prizes, cascade funding or any other way to offer financial support to third party. Should it be the case, here is the procedure to be followed:

1. First of all, please inform your PO and VC.
2. As Evaluator, you should evaluate the proposal as it is submitted, in its entirety.
3. If you consider that the activities funded under such financial support are essential for the project, the score will be negatively affected.
4. Conversely, if the impact is not significant the proposal might be funded. If it is the case the budget can be adapted accordingly during the Grant Agreement Preparation (either decreased or reallocated within the consortium).

5.5 Other aspects: Third countries and International Organisations, UK applicants, Open Research Data, Ethics

a. Third country applicants and International Organisations

H2020 is open to the World. This means that participants from all over the world, regardless of their place of establishment or residence, can participate in most of the calls of Horizon 2020 and many calls/topics particularly encourage cooperation with non-EU partners. However, not all non-EU participants do automatically qualify for funding.

If your proposals contain such participants, your Project Officer of Vice-Chair will let you know.

Countries which are automatically eligible for funding:

- **Associated countries** - they participate in Horizon 2020 under the same conditions as EU Member States. There are, as of 01 January 2017, [sixteen countries associated to Horizon 2020](#).

- **Third countries** - The full list of third countries automatically eligible for funding is provided in the [General Annexes of the Horizon 2018-2020 WP](#).

- **International European interest organisations (IEIO)** – These are international organisations (see definition below), the majority of whose members are EU Member States or Associated Countries, and whose principal objective is to promote scientific and technological cooperation in Europe.
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Countries which are not automatically eligible for funding:

- **Industrialised countries and emerging economies (ICCE)** – candidates from these countries will generally have to cover their own costs. In case of doubt, please check that the country is **NOT** included in the Annex A.

- **International Organizations (IO)** – Those organizations that have been set up by sovereign states whereby their governments signed an establishing act/treaty (e.g. EU, UN agencies, CERN, WB, IMO, IEA, etc.).

In exceptional cases, entities that are not automatically eligible can receive EU funding. When such entities request EU funding, Evaluators have to assess if the participation of applicants from countries is **essential** for carrying out the action. Examples of elements that can justify exceptional funding are:

- outstanding competence/expertise
- access to research infrastructure
- access to particular geographical environments
- access to data

Where applicable, please add in the dedicated section of your IER (and later on in the CR) the reasons why exceptional funding should be considered or not for a certain participant under: "Exceptional funding of third country participants/ international organisations".

b. UK Applicants

Please note that until the UK leaves the EU, EU law continues to apply to and within the UK, both when it comes to rights and obligations. This includes the eligibility of UK legal entities to participate and receive funding in Horizon 2020 actions. Experts should not evaluate proposals with UK participants any differently than the others.

c. Open Research Data

From 2017 onwards calls for proposals, Open Research Data has been extended to cover all the thematic areas of Horizon 2020.

While Open Access to research data thereby becomes applicable by default in Horizon 2020, the Commission also recognises that there are good reasons to keep some or even all research data generated in a project closed. Therefore it is possible for the project to opt-out at any stage (application phase, Grant Agreement Preparation phase and after the signature of the grant agreement itself).

Participation to Open Research Data is not part of the evaluation of proposals: proposals are not to be evaluated more favourably because they are part of the pilot and are not to be penalised for opting-out of the pilot.
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d. Ethics

If there are ethics issues, you do not need to assess them. Specialized experts will do this at a later stage.
6. THE PROPOSAL: STRUCTURE AND PAGE LIMITS

THE PROPOSAL HAS TWO PARTS:

- **PART A**
  - a. General Information and the Abstract
  - b. Information on participants and point of contacts
  - c. Budget
  - d. Ethics questionnaire (you do not need to assess it);
  - e. Call specific questions – Open Research Data Pilot (which is not part of the evaluation)

- **PART B**
  - Excellence (objectives; relation to WP; concept and approach; ambition);
  - Impact (expected impacts in relation to the topic text; measures to maximize impact which include dissemination & exploitation of results and communication activities);
  - Implementation (work plan; management structure & procedures; consortium;
  - Members of the consortium
  - Ethics and security (not part of your evaluation)

The page limits and sections subject to limits are clearly shown in the proposal templates in the Participant Portal electronic submission system. The page limit is applying only to the first three sections of PART B. The page limit depends on the type of action:

- Coordination and Support Actions (CSA): 50 pages
- Innovation Actions (IA): 70 pages; Research And Innovation Actions (RIA): 70 pages

Excess pages will be automatically made invisible, thus will not be evaluated.
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Here below you can see the workflow to be implemented in these evaluations:

---

2 Note that the Vice-Chair (Quality Controller in SEP) also does a quality check of IERs.

---


As already indicated in section 3, there are 3 roles envisaged for the experts in this call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>Write Individual Evaluation Report (IER) and Review/Approve Consensus report (CR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluator and Rapporteur</td>
<td>Write Individual Evaluation Report (IER), Write Consensus Report (CR) and lead process to arrive at a consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair (ie. Quality Controller in the table above)</td>
<td>Quality check IERs and CRs – monitor the evaluation with the support of REA Project Officers (POs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The aim of the IER and the CR is to provide the applicants with a clear assessment of the proposal based on its merit and to provide clear feedback on the proposal’s weaknesses and strengths which justifies the score awarded.
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BEFORE STARTING ANY EVALUATION you must go through all proposals allocated to you to check whether you have any **Conflict of Interest.** Only once you have confirmed the absence of CoI for ALL proposals you should start assessing them.

At this phase each Evaluator independently assesses the proposals and prepares in Individual Evaluation Report (IER) giving comments and scores against the pre-defined evaluation criteria in the evaluation system SEP.

Please refer to the drafting tips later in this document.

Your Vice-Chair will provide feedback on the quality of your first IER and, if needed, clarify how to better address the evaluation criteria. It is extremely important that you respect internal deadline. Your first IER should be ready **for the 20th of April.**

For the timeline please refer to point 3.2 of this guide.

Here below is a checklist that will help you remember all the important aspects and rules of this evaluation phase.

- Carefully read the topics you will be evaluating. Pay special attention to the explanations on "Scope" and "Expected impact".
- Assess before evaluating a proposal whether it is in scope or not.
- Check the type of action of the proposal (RIA, IA or CSA)
- Read the whole proposal (Part A, B1 and B2)
- Check compliance with all the general rules
- Evaluate and independently assess the proposal according to the 3 evaluation criteria – **see section 4.1.**
- Assess whether the participants possess the basic operational capacity to carry out the tasks allocated to them - **see section 4.12**
- Evaluate whether beneficiaries who are International Organisations (IO) or come from other Third Countries are eligible as beneficiaries and may receive funding
- Verify if the topic has been flagged for cross cutting issues, and if so, to take this into account in your evaluation (see Table 2 of this guide)
- Evaluate proposals in alphabetical order (starting from A to Z).
- When you are satisfied with your first IER please submit it. The Vice Chair will Quality Check it. In order to let the Vice Chair know that you have finished the first IER: Introduce a comment in the Task Comment box saying "IER ready for Quality Check".
- Eventually, the Vice Chair may make comments regarding the quality of your first IER. Please liaise with the Vice Chair via the Task Comments box to further discuss the modifications in your IER proposed by him/her.
- Write and submit an individual evaluation report (IER) for each proposal using the online tool SEP and to submit it as soon as it is ready, respecting the deadline of April 30th to have all IERs finished.

We remind you that in H2020, successful proposals are not negotiated and therefore cannot be improved. It is therefore very important to evaluate them as they are, reflecting all weaknesses in the comments and scores and avoid making assumptions on a hypothetical potential if the proposals could be modified. For the same reason no recommendations should be added to the reports. **The quality of each IER is crucial in order to prepare a good CR. Your Vice-Chair will provide feedback on the quality of your first IER and, if needed, clarify how to better address the evaluation criteria. They will interact with you via the SEP comment box.**
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7.2 Remote phase: Consensus Report phase CR

Once all IERs for a given proposal are submitted, the remote consensus phase starts. One of the experts has been assigned as Rapporteur and will have to draft a CR in SEP based on the comments in the individual evaluation reports.

Evaluator’s tasks:

- Respect the deadlines (both to finish the IERs and the CRs) so as not to jeopardise the overall evaluation schedule
- Actively engage in discussions via the Task Comments box in SEP: when the CR is in draft status, the Evaluators engage in the discussion between each other in order to agree on a version to be submitted for Quality Check.
- To regularly check SEP in order to see the latest version of the draft CR via the All Tasks tab in SEP (See section C for more details).
- To be open-minded, flexible and to take on board the comments of your fellow Evaluators, it is common that your opinion can change regarding a proposal once you see the arguments of other Evaluators.

It is extremely important that you write comprehensive reports which address all the sub-criteria as your report forms the basis for the feedback the REA will provide to the applicants.

Rapporteur’s tasks:

- Respect the deadlines and ensure that the other Evaluators of the same proposal do so, in cooperation with the Vice-Chair.
- 'Initialise' the draft CR in SEP
- Identify points of convergence and propose a consensus wording
- Identify divergences as points for discussion or clarification with other experts (via SEP’s task comments box) highlighting strengths and weaknesses of proposals to guide remote consensus and potential scores.
- Request clarifications or information from the Evaluator if one of the IERs is not clear or information on one of the sub criteria is missing.
- Write the CR based on the content of the three IERs.
- Propose a score for each criterion based on the comments of the CR (do not propose the average score - the score should reflect the comments)
- Once the first draft of the CR is finished, inform the Evaluators that they can start commenting on it.
- Interact with the Evaluators at the Write CR phase, saving (not submitting) the draft CR and making changes agreed upon by the Evaluators via the Task Comments box. In this phase, the Rapporteur liaises with the Vice-Chair as well, who can also comment on the draft CR to suggest quality check modifications that would be introduced in the text by the Rapporteur.
- Submit the CR as soon as all the Evaluators agree on the version of the draft CR to be submitted.
- Engage newly with the Vice-Chair in order to implement the quality check (QC) modifications, if the Vice-Chair considers they are necessary.
- Quickly notify the Vice-Chair if any problems or issues arise that can affect the evaluation of the proposal (e.g.
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an Evaluator has stated that the proposal is out of scope, operational capacity issues are identified, Evaluator has not submitted the report, is not responding etc...)

- Inform the Vice-Chair of the presence in the proposal of third country participants or international organizations.
- If Evaluators cannot reach an agreement please notify the Vice-Chair as soon as possible
- VC and PO will decide if a remote consensus meeting via videoconference is needed and will notify the concerned Evaluators and Rapporteurs.

The role of the Rapporteur is absolutely crucial in ensuring that the evaluation can be carried out within the deadlines provided. The quality of the final CR is paramount as it provides the content for the report which is sent to the applicants.

By the end of the remote phase of the evaluation we expect to have all CRs quality checked, finalised and approved by all Evaluators in the system.

Vice-chair tasks:

- Guide experts Evaluators and Rapporteur through the process.
- Ensure timely submission of the reports.
- Perform Quality Check of the evaluation reports (IERs and CRs) to ensure consistency of evaluation methodology, language.
- Ensure fairness, objectivity and accuracy.
- Make sure that the evaluation is based on the assessment of all important aspects and rules. Additionally they help the group reach consensus keeping the consensus report iterations to a minimum. REA Staff will also ensure a proper follow-up and might be contacted in case of any doubts.

Vice-chairs are specialized experts appointed by REA staff. They do not evaluate proposals and cannot give an opinion on proposals.
8. THE PANEL REVIEW MEETING

At the end of the remote phase, we will have a DRAFT ranking list. In order to select the best proposals among the top ranked ones, panel review meetings will be organized in Brussels.

The panel review meetings (one by topic) will be organized between the 4th and 8th of June 2018. They will be chaired by a PO, assisted by a Vice-Chair and composed of some Evaluators.

The role of panels is to:

1. Ensure the consistency of comments and scores given at consensus stage;
2. Resolve cases where a minority view is recorded in the consensus report;
3. Resolve the cases in which the following issues have been flagged: operational capacity of the applicants, out of scope proposals, third country participation;
4. Address the specific cases of resubmitted proposals (if any);
5. Endorse the final comments and scores for each proposal (any new comments and change of scores -if necessary- should be carefully justified);
6. Prioritise proposals with identical total scores, after any adjustments for consistency;
7. Recommend a ranking list of proposals for funding (in priority order).

In case of identical total scores, the panel orders them according to:

- First, their score for Excellence
- Second, their score for Impact

For Innovation Actions this prioritisation will be done first on the basis of the score for Impact (with a weight x1.5) and then on that for Excellence.

If there still are ex aequo cases, the panel takes into account the following factors:

- First, the absolute EU budget allocated to SMEs;
- Second, the gender balance of personnel carrying out the research and/or innovation activities.

For further prioritisation, the panel will agree on further factors to consider: e.g. synergies between projects or contribution to the objectives of the call or of Horizon 2020.
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9.1 A quick explanation of the evaluation tasks

You will carry out your tasks as an expert during this evaluation via the EC’s online tool called SEP (Submission and Evaluation of Proposals), which is used to access the proposal data and where experts can write and submit their reports.

How to access SEP?

https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/evaluation/

Use your ECAS credentials

Please note, the explanations below provide a very brief overview; for screen shots and detailed instructions please see the Proposal Evaluator’s Guide.

We recommend to use Firefox or Chrome browsers when working on SEP. MAC users navigating with Safari when working in SEP will not see some of the features described in this guide.

For technical / IT issues, please contact the SEP helpdesk via e-mail DIGIT-EFP7-SEP-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu or Phone: +32 2 29 92222; the SEP helpdesk is available on weekdays between 8:00 and 20:00 (Brussels time).

How to start working in SEP?

It is very important to review in detail all the proposals allocated to you as soon as you have access in SEP so that you are able to quickly identify any potential CoI and decline the respective task(s) if necessary. By clicking on the All Tasks tab you will access the list of proposals assigned to you (each proposal will have the task "Write IER" with the status Assigned) and by clicking on the Acronym or Proposal title you can access the Proposal Details which provides an abstract of the proposal, the partners involved and links to the full proposal.

Please browse each proposal to make sure that you have no CoI. To assess whether you have a CoI, first check the list of participants and then also Section 4 or Part B.

If there is no CoI, please click "I accept to evaluate the proposal" from the Proposal Details screen. In this way, you will be able to start working on your assignments.

If you have a clear CoI, please decline the task from the All Tasks screen explaining the CoI in the pop up box. Once you have declined a task, this proposal will no longer appear in your All Tasks screen. If you think you have a CoI, please contact your PO before declining the task(s).

Please start working on your IERs by alphabetical order of the proposals (acronym from A-Z). It will ease the task of the rapporteurs who will be able to start drafting only after all IERs are submitted in the system.
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9.2 SEP Tasks

a. Individual Evaluation Report (IER) – REMOTE

By now you have accepted to evaluate the proposals assigned to you and the status in All Tasks for each proposal is Open for the "Write IER" task.

Click on Edit and you will open the IER screen and can immediately begin writing your IER according to the pre-defined set of criteria.

The actions you can perform from this screen are Save, Submit (to submit to the Rapporteur), Decline (perhaps a conflict is spotted that you hadn’t seen at the beginning and need to decline the proposal at a later stage), and Print to PDF and Print to DOC. Printing a report will generate a PDF/DOC file that you can then print and/or save for your use.

Save regularly your IER. There is a 1000 character limitation for each of the sub-criteria under Criterion 1, 2 and 3.

When you are satisfied with your IER please submit it. The Vice Chair will Quality Check of your first IER. In order to let the Vice Chair know that you have finished the first IER:

Introduce a comment in the Task Comment box saying "IER ready for Quality Check".

Eventually, the Vice Chair may make comments regarding the quality of your IER. Please liaise with the Vice Chair via the Task Comments box to further discuss the modifications in your IER proposed by him/her.

Once the Vice Chair Quality Check comments have been addressed/taken into account, please Re-submit the IER.

Please do it one by one rather than waiting to submit all your reports together which will create delays in the process.

During the drafting of the IERs the Vice-Chair will be able to leave comments that will only be visible by the expert doing the report.
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b. Consensus Report (CR) stage

The CR workflow is made up three main phases: 'Write CR', 'Review CR' and 'Approve CR'.

Below you can see a summary of the CR workflow:

![CR workflow diagram]

Note: Evaluators and Rapporteur must agree on the draft CR saved by the rapporteur before he/she submits the CR to the Vice Chair.

How communication between evaluators, Rapporteur and Vice Chair works?

The bulk of the discussion and exchanges between evaluators, Rapporteur and Vice Chair will take place at the 'Write CR' stage, while the Rapporteur is drafting the CR.

Evaluators discuss the CR via the Task Comments box. Evaluators, Rapporteur and Vice Chair can exchange views via the Task Comments box in every CR phase (i.e. 'Write CR', 'Review CR', and 'Approve CR'). In all phases of the CR stage, when you add a comments you have to select under which category you want to do it (eg. Excellence, Impact, etc) and you can also send a notification (by ticking the 'Send also notification' little box).

Write CR- Evaluator's task

Evaluators should play an active role in the discussion on the draft consensus report. The evaluators must wait until the Rapporteur finishes the first draft CR and notifies them that the draft CR is ready for their comments. As this is not a formal stage of the SEP workflow, evaluator will not have this task in the Active task list in SEP. Therefore they are strongly advised to regularly check SEP in order to see the latest version of the draft CR via the All Tasks tab in SEP, selecting the call and filtering by task "Write CR". All the proposals at the Write CR phase they are involved in will be browsed. Then via the task comment box, they are invited to discuss the content of the draft report and to reach a consensus before the rapporteur submits the agreed version to the Vice Chair.

---

3 Note: If the comments' notification is not to be send after all, but it was already opened, do not press cancel as you will lose the actual comment. Instead, unselect all receivers and click ok.
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**Write CR- Rapporteur’s task**

Once all 3 evaluators have submitted their report the evaluator who is assigned as Rapporteur will receive a "Write CR" (Write CR = write consensus report) task in the All Tasks tab and will be notified by e-mail.

If you are assigned as Rapporteur your All Tasks tab will show a "Write CR" task for a specific proposal which you will have to Accept and the status changes to Open. Rapporteurs will be notified via the system.

Click on Edit and you will open the CR which follows the same layout of the IER but which provides you with extra possibilities which were not available at the IER screen:

* **Merge IERs:** Click here to select IERs to merge into the CR.

* **Initialise:** This allows you to create your first draft of the CR; click on it and then select "New form with expert’s assessments".

Once created you will then need to organise, sort, edit, summarise, paraphrase etc. the CR until you have a first draft of the CR which has captured coherently the opinions of all three evaluators, with whom you interact to reach an agreement on the version of the CR to be submitted for Quality Check.

Once you have finalised the first draft CR notify the evaluators for them to start commenting on it. **Please, do not submit the CR to the Vice Chair until an agreement on the text among the evaluators is reached.** In this regard, use the option Save and inform the evaluators via the Task Comments Box (also ticking the 'Send also notification' box) that you have finalised the draft as well as about the modifications made.

Once the Rapporteur is satisfied with the CR, he/she adds a score for each criterion which reflects the evaluators' comments (it should not necessarily be an average of the 3 individual scores).

When the CR is ready you Submit and the CR is submitted to the Quality Checker, that is, the Vice Chair.

**Review CR-Vice Chair’s task**

The Quality Control (QC) of the CR is carried out by the Vice-Chair who is assigned a monitoring role in SEP. The Vice-Chair will carry out a quality check (see section E) to ensure that the CR adheres to the rules of the programme.

As said in the previous section, while the Rapporteur is working in the draft CR the Vice-Chair can provide his/her comments on the CR via the Task Comments. Interaction with the Rapporteur is highly encouraged so that an early Quality Check can already be applied to the draft CR.

When the Rapporteur submits the CR the Vice Chair will be assigned the task "Review CR". He needs to accept it by clicking on the Edit button of the All tasks tab. If the discussions and
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interactions with the Rapporteur and between the evaluators have led to a quality CR with which the Vice Chair is satisfied, he/she can Approve it and the already quality-checked CR will be sent to the evaluators for final approval.

At the "Review CR" phase the Vice Chair can him/herself make modifications in the CR. The purpose of these modifications must be increasing the quality of the text⁴. If the Vice-Chair approves the CR with modifications introduced by him/her, in the subsequent step, the evaluators will see the modified text with the additions (in green) and the deletions (in red). At this stage Evaluators and Rapporteur can communicate with the Vice Chair via the Task Comments box. In case the Vice-Chair considers that the CR text needs further work from the Rapporteur, he/she will Disapprove the CR. The CR will be sent back to the Rapporteur who will update the CR with the QC modifications, again engaging with the evaluators and informing them on the changes made in the text. When a new agreement on the text is reached between evaluators and the Rapporteur the Rapporteur Submits the CR again, the Vice-Chair carries out the QC and the cycle continues. If the CR is ok the Vice Chair will Approve the CR, and the task 'Approve CR' will be assigned to the evaluators.

Approve CR - Evaluators' task

Once the Vice-Chair approves the CR the evaluators will have access to the quality-checked CR for comments. Individual evaluators will have the option to Approve or Disapprove the CR. CRs should be disapproved by an evaluator only in case of justified differences of opinion and not because of grammatical errors, spelling mistakes etc..

Please note that by approving the CR, you are agreeing that you accept the content and the score of the CR.

⁴ QC criteria, what to avoid: Comments not related to the criterion in question; Comments that are too short or too long or use inappropriate language; Categorical statements that have not been properly verified (e.g. “The proposal doesn’t mention user requirements” – when there is a short reference -Applicants can challenge those through evaluation review procedures-); Scores that don’t match the comments; Making recommendations; Marking down a proposal for the same critical aspect under two different criteria.
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10.1 General information

A guide to clearly write is available at the end of this document. It is a helpful tool for evaluators when drafting IERs/CRs.

What you write in your IER provides the basis for the CR and the quality of the CR is crucial as it is converted to the ESR which is then transferred to the applicant.

It should provide a clear assessment of the proposal based on its merit indicating the proposal’s weaknesses and strengths in a manner consistent with the score.

Please take into account that applicants have invested a lot of time and efforts in putting a consortium together and preparing a proposal, therefore with your help we would like to ensure that we provide clear, concise, high quality feedback to applicants. Therefore please find below the guiding principles related to drafting of IERs and CRs.

General guiding principle:

1. Evaluate the proposal as it is submitted, not what it could be if certain changes would be made, i.e. do not make any recommendations, (do not suggest additional partners, additional work packages, resources that need to be cut or added, etc.), but limit yourself to evaluating what is written in the proposal and justifying why it is excellent, (very) good, a shortcoming, or a weakness. If something is missing, it should be reflected in a lower score.

2. Evaluation of one Criterion should not influence your evaluation of another Criterion, e.g. within the criterion EXCELLENCE: if the proposal only partly addresses the topic text, it is still possible that IMPACT or IMPLEMENTATION are good / very good / excellent.

3. Evaluators might really appreciate a proposal and score it high even if it only broadly addresses the call topic while another evaluator might also appreciate it but because it doesn't fully address the call topic score it low. It's important that the proposals are evaluated in the context of what was requested in the call text, even if an evaluator thinks it is an excellent proposal.

When writing your reports (IER phase) please:

- Do not use bullet points.
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- **Write clear, concise and complete sentences**: provide at most 2-3 specific sentences per sub-criterion. Since you will be evaluating different proposals, having covered all sub-criteria in your IER will greatly benefit / smoothen the work of the Rapporteur and the discussions during the remote consensus discussion, since all evaluators will have covered all sub-criteria in their IERs;

- **Use value judgment**, e.g. do not summarise/explain the proposal/ or copy-paste parts of the proposal text into the IER. The applicants know what they have written in the proposal and are interested in knowing the reasons why you have given a certain score. A useful (facultative) structure to build an argument could be "The proposal aims at doing A and B. However, the proposal does not address C. Therefore, the proposal addresses criterion X fairly [score 3], very well [score 4] or in an excellent manner [score 5]". This way, the inclusion of (parts of) the proposal text in the IER adds value;

- **Justify your assessment** with examples from the proposal;

- **Focus on the content first**, then write your comments and ensure that the score you provide properly reflects those comments;

- **Qualify AND/OR quantify each proposal's shortcomings**. In the scoring table (see 4.3 Rating of the proposals), a qualitative ('(serious) inherent', 'significant', 'minor') or quantitative ('a number', 'a small number') description of the proposal's shortcomings or weaknesses is described for each score. Please use this terminology to guide you during the evaluation process. E.g. a criterion that has significant weaknesses cannot receive a score of 4.

- **Align the score with the evaluation text.** For example, if you mostly use 'good' to describe a criterion, you cannot give it a score of 4 (as a score of 4 is 'very good');

- **Be precise but careful.** Do not use absolute statements (e.g. there is no information/information is missing on X). In the proposal, it is advisable to write X is not fully addressed / proposal does not significantly [or sufficiently] addresses X". - see some examples below.

- Make sure that you have taken into account in your evaluation if the topic has been flagged for **cross-cutting issues**. More instructions will be given by your VC;

- Evaluate and indicate in the IER whether a **beneficiary** who is not automatically eligible for funding should exceptionally receive funding.

**Tips for writing CRs for rapporteurs (CR phase)**

- **Consensus Reports have the same structure as IERs**;
- We recommend using the **Merged view option in SEP** as it will give you a sense of overview of the assessment of all evaluators, allowing to easily spot discrepancies/differences/contradictions/omissions;
- Depending on the above, the **Rapporteurs might need to go back to the Evaluators** and ask them for further
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Clarification (please do so via the Task comments box: when the pop-up appears you can notify only that specific evaluator of your request for clarification);

- Identify points of convergence and propose a consensus wording for each sub-criterion;
- Identify divergences as points for discussion or clarification with other experts (via Task comments box) highlighting strengths and weaknesses of proposals to guide remote consensus;
- It can be useful to have a checklist to ensure that all sub-criteria have been covered;
- If you see that the scores of individual evaluators are massively apart, don't panic: there could be many reasonable explanations. First read the IERs, since it is likely that:
  - the comments were 'softer' or 'harder' than the scores awarded, therefore the evaluators are not so far apart in their comments (remember: first the comments and then the scores);
  - a major failing/strength might have been identified by one evaluator which was not noticed by another and it is perfectly normal that the final scores for a CR are different from an individual's IER;
  - it was one of the early proposals evaluated and the evaluator has not yet 'found bearings' with regard to scoring a proposal in the context of the other assigned proposals (e.g. for the same weakness they were much tougher with one proposal than another).

Depending on the possibilities above and the clarifications you receive, try to draft a compromise report that balances both views and then see how the evaluators feel about it;

- Usually several versions of a CR will be required before it is fully approved;
- If a solution cannot be reached then please inform your Vice Chair (e.g. 1 extra evaluator can be added, minority/majority viewpoint with final decision taken by the panel in Brussels);
- If the topic has been flagged for cross-cutting issues, verify that the evaluators have taken this into account;
- Compare comments within the criterion and between criteria in order to eliminate possible contradictions;
- Crosscheck that there are no weaknesses mentioned twice (no double-penalisation across different criteria);
- Compile the CR first and forget about the scores;
- Once you are satisfied with the CR, suggests a score for each criterion which reflects the comments (it should not necessarily be an average of the 3 individual scores).
- A good CR is not a concatenation of individual IERs, it should be a new report reflecting the shared opinion of all the evaluators. High quality CRs are reasoned, accurate, informative and explanatory.
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### 10.2 Examples of good vs poor comments

**Good comments** explain the reasons of the assessment and provide evidence. They include words like: Because, Specifically, For example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor comments</th>
<th>Good comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor: This proposal does not advance the state of the art. Why? No justification / example.</td>
<td>Good: This proposal fails to advance the state of art in X or Y and it does not take Z fully in account. This is a (minor shortcoming/ a shortcoming/ a significant weakness/...etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor: The methodology is described. Why? This is just a statement of fact not an assessment.</td>
<td>Good: The methodology is poorly (= score 1) described as it fails to sufficiently address X, Y and provides insufficient reference to Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor: There is no discussion of a dissemination strategy. Why? This is an absolute statement and should be avoided.</td>
<td>Good: Dissemination activities are not fully addressed, in particular activities like X, Y, are not clearly described and Z was not properly taken into account</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor comments</th>
<th>Good comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Poor: A good impact can be foreseen. Why? This is vague. | Good: The exploitation and dissemination plan addresses well (=score 3) the key target audiences and provides a detailed and well thought out strategy for engaging with them, for example having confirmed presentation slots at national teacher conferences will ensure a significant impact. However, the lack of detail on XZ is a shortcoming“.
| Poor: The proposal should have included partners with more expertise in digital curation. Why? This is a recommendation and should be rephrased as a shortcoming. | Good: The proposal does not fully demonstrate that the necessary expertise relating to digital curation is present and therefore it is not clear if the project objectives can be met. |
| Poor: The proposal describes the expected impact in a detailed and convincing manner. The project will clearly benefit the participants’ commercial situation. Therefore, the economic impact for the SMEs is not clearly demonstrated. | Good: Dissemination activities are not fully addressed, in particular activities like X, Y, are not clearly described and Z was not properly taken into account |
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Why? This is a contradictory statement.

Good: The expected impacts are excellently (very good addressed in the proposal. The project will clearly benefit the participants’ commercial situation.

10.3 Reference documents

- Societal Challenge 3 Work Programme 2018-2020 (PDF)
- General Annexes to the main Work Programme 2018-2020 (PDF)
- Proposal template for RIA and IA (PDF)
- Proposal template for CSA (PDF)
- Guide for proposal submission and evaluation (PDF)
- FAQ on the Participant Portal
- Glossary on the Participant Portal:
- Also refer to the H2020 Online Manual.
- Claire’s Clear Writing Tips in English.