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A. Introduction

A.1 Context and general aspects

The goal of Horizon 2020 Societal Challenge 6 is to foster "a greater understanding of Europe, providing solutions and supporting inclusive, innovative and reflective societies in a context of unprecedented transformations and growing global interdependencies" by addressing 21st century issues like social innovation, growth, employment, migration, etc. It also aims to reduce the gap between citizens and institutions in order to build a trustful European society.

In 2017, four calls for proposals have been organised to address those issues:

- **The call CO-CREATION FOR GROWTH AND INCLUSION (CO-CREATION)** encourages co-creation between different societal actors to deliver growth and employment in all sectors of society;
- **The call REVERSING INEQUALITIES AND PROMOTING FAIRNESS (REV-INEQUAL)**, through a sound understanding of inequality trends, seeks different options for policies and measures to reverse territorial inequalities, equal enjoyment of human rights and comprehensive urban policies;
- **The call ENGAGING TOGETHER GLOBALLY (ENG-GLOBALLY)** seeks to maximise the EU’s clout in global affairs. Maximising its clout also presupposes understanding Europe in a global context and its historical and cultural legacy;
- **The call UNDERSTANDING EUROPE - PROMOTING THE EUROPEAN PUBLIC AND CULTURAL SPACE (CULT-COOP)** seeks to understand Europe's cultural past, its social unity and diversity in order to tackle today's societal challenges and find solutions for shaping Europe's future.

Within the CULT-COOP call, nine topics have been delegated to the Research Executive Agency (REA) and will be evaluated following the two-stage evaluation procedure. In the table below, you will find the nine topics together with the responsible REA Project Officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic identification</th>
<th>Topic title</th>
<th>REA Project Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-1</td>
<td>Democratic discourses and the rule of law</td>
<td>Paloma MARTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-2</td>
<td>Improving mutual understanding among Europeans by working through troubled pasts</td>
<td>Hinano SPREAFICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-3</td>
<td>Cultural literacy of young generations in Europe</td>
<td>Ellen SCHRAUDOLPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-4</td>
<td>Contemporary histories of Europe in artistic and creative practices</td>
<td>Luis GARCIA DOMINGUEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-5</td>
<td>Religious diversity in Europe - past, present and future</td>
<td>Jarkko SIREN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-6</td>
<td>Participatory approaches and social innovation in culture</td>
<td>Hinano SPREAFICO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-7</td>
<td>Cultural heritage of European coastal and maritime regions</td>
<td>Ellen SCHRAUDOLPH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-9</td>
<td>European cultural heritage, access and analysis for a richer interpretation of the past</td>
<td>Giorgio COSTANTIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-12</td>
<td>The significance of cultural and sacred values for the migration challenge</td>
<td>Luis GARCIA DOMINGUEZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The Horizon 2020 SC6 calls for proposals (as defined in the bi-annual 2016-2017 Work Programme) are subdivided into topics. A topic defines a specific research and innovation subject or area for which applicants are invited to submit proposals. The topic description comprises the specific challenge, scope, expected impact and type of action of the projects to be funded.
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".

Please read also the General Annexes to the Work Programme where you will find some complementary essential information that you should take into account when evaluating the proposals, such as the Evaluation rules and Award criteria.

A.2 The two-stage evaluation process

The two-stage submission scheme implies an evaluation that is performed in two phases:

At the first stage, applicants submit a short proposal (only 10 pages) which is evaluated against two award criteria: the entire "excellence" criterion and only the first subcriterion of the "impact" criterion. There is no panel review for stage one. The evaluation is carried out completely remotely.

At the second stage, only the successful applicants i.e. the ones who have passed the individual thresholds as well as the overall threshold are invited to submit a full proposal. The full proposal must be consistent with the short proposal of stage one and may NOT differ substantially (i.e. obvious change concerning a substantial part of the proposed project).

This rule should ensure fair and equal treatment of competing proposals. It should prevent applicants from deliberately setting out false promises in the first stage that are not reflected in the second stage.

The table below shows, for each of the 9 CULT-COOP topics, the number of proposals received and the number of proposals invited to the second stage. It also indicates the call total budget (36,5 million €) which is divided into two different budget-splits (9 million € for CULT-COOP-9 and 27,5 million € for the all the other topics). From the overall available budget, it is estimated that approximately 12 projects will be funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic identification</th>
<th>Available budget</th>
<th>Recommended EU contribution (in WP)</th>
<th>Estimated number of projects to be funded</th>
<th>Number of proposals received in the first stage</th>
<th>Overall threshold applied</th>
<th>Number of above-threshold proposals (invited to the second stage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-1</td>
<td>27,50 M€</td>
<td>5,00 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,00 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-6</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,50 M€</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2017-9</td>
<td>9,00 M€</td>
<td>2,00 to 3,00 M€</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>9,5/10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36,50 M€</td>
<td>20,50 to 21,50 M€</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 The individual thresholds are set at 4 out of 5 points for each award criterion.
3 For each budget-split identified in the Work Programme, the overall threshold for stage one is set at a level that allows the total requested budget of proposals admitted to stage two be as close as possible to 3 times the available budget (and not less than 2,5 times).
A.3 Evaluation calendars

First stage of the evaluation

The call deadline for stage-one was 02/02/2017. In response to the call, a total of 478 proposals were submitted. The evaluation was carried out completely remotely.

The remote evaluation took place between 01/03/2017 and 21/03/2017. This means that experts had three weeks to evaluate all proposals assigned to them and find a consensus on 100% of them.

To help them through the process, REA Project Officers (POs) were monitoring their work, with the help of specialized experts, whom we refer to as Vice-Chairs. They were intervening in the workflow, for example asking experts to clarify unclear statements, correct inconsistencies, making sure that the drafted consensus reports provide the best feedback possible to the applicants, and that the deadlines are respected (see Section D).

At the end of the remote discussions, we had the list of proposals to be invited for the second stage. All applicants were informed of the results of the evaluation on 10/05/2017. Successful applicants were invited on 09/06/2017 to submit a full proposal that will be evaluated in the second stage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR OF THE EVALUATION - STAGE 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second stage of the evaluation

The call deadline for stage-two is 13/09/2017. In response to the call, a total of 57 proposals were submitted. The evaluation will be carried out in two phases, a remote and a central one.

- The remote phase will be carried out from 05/10/2017 to 23/10/2017. At the end of the remote discussions, we will have a DRAFT ranked list. In order to select the best proposals among the top ranking ones, we will meet a few of you in Brussels for the central phase.

- The central phase will consist of panel meetings which will last one or two days and will be organized in Brussels from 07/11/2017 to 09/11/2017. A maximum of three or five experts per topic will be invited for the central phase. The experts selected for the panels will be informed during the remote phase. During the panels, all top ranking proposals will be discussed and based on the experts' recommendations, we will establish a FINAL ranked list of proposals to be funded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALENDAR OF THE EVALUATION - STAGE 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call closure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/09/2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**B. Description of the evaluation**

Here below you can see the workflow to be implemented in this evaluation:

---

4 Note that the Vice-Chair also does a Quality Check of IERs.
B.1 Experts’ role

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 (i.e. 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 applicant 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.

B.1.1 Evaluator’s role

- To respect the deadlines (both to finish the IERs and the CRs) so as not to jeopardise the overall evaluation schedule.
- To evaluate *individually* a certain number of proposals, giving scores and comments against the evaluation criteria.
- To assess before evaluating a proposal whether it is in scope or not.
- To verify if the topic has been flagged for cross cutting issues, and if so, to take this into account in your evaluation.
- To evaluate proposals in alphabetical order.
- To 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.
- To 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.

B.1.2 Rapporteur’s role

- To respect the deadlines and ensure that the other Evaluators of the same proposal do so, in cooperation with the Vice-Chair.
- To ‘initialise’ the draft CR in SEP.
- To identify points of convergence and propose a consensus wording.
- To 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.
- To 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.
- To write the CR based on the content of the three IERs.
- To 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*).
To inform the Evaluators, once the first draft of the CR is finished, that they can start commenting on it.

- To 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.

To submit the CR as soon as all the Evaluators agree on the version of the draft CR to be submitted.

- To engage newly with the Vice-Chair in order to implement the quality check (QC) modifications, if the Vice-Chair considers they are necessary.

To quickly notify the Vice-Chair if any problems or issues arise that can affect the evaluation of the proposal (e.g. 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...).

- To 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.

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 and is only changed in very exceptional circumstances.

**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.**

### B.1.3 Vice-Chairs' role

**During the remote phase:**

- To actively monitor the whole workflow from the beginning to the end of the remote phase (check IERs, CRs) and to flag any problem or issues to the PO.

- To follow up the schedule to make sure that the remote evaluation is progressing on time.

- To monitor a group of proposals during the remote phase of the evaluation.

- To check carefully that the proposals are evaluated in the right order so as to avoid bottle necks.

- To carry out a quality check (QC) on the first IERs submitted by each Evaluator to ensure consistent quality of all of them and contact the Evaluators via SEP for any issues affecting the quality of the IER.

- To make sure that Evaluators have properly assessed each criterion / sub-criterion; clarify criteria and unclear statements.

- To make sure that all IERs are finished on time in order to progress smoothly through the consensus phase.

- To encourage Evaluators to provide their inputs to the discussion (if they do not react contact them individually through SEP, and, if there is no reaction, inform the PO).

- To carry out QCs on the CRs, engaging with the Rapporteur while he/she drafts the CR to suggest initial changes in the text applying the list of QC criteria.

- To monitor the CR after QC to make sure the QC has been implemented.

- To oversee the consensus phase to ensure that consensus is being reached within the necessary deadlines. This is especially important because most part of the discussion on the CR will take place in the interaction between Rapporteur, Evaluators and Vice-Chair.

- To provide guidance to Rapporteurs-Evaluators in case problematic issues arise (e.g. consensus can't be reached, unexpected conflicts, out of scope etc) and escalate problems to POs if necessary.

- To ensure that the remote phase is finalised within the deadline.

- To provide input for the central phase on specific cases.

- If not attending the panel in Brussels, to provide input to your fellow vice chairs on proposals to be discussed.
During the panel (central phase):

- To produce a clear-comprehensive, concise and complete report on the deliberations of the panel. This report should reflect very clearly the justification of any eventual new comment or score.

B.1.4 Code of Conduct

Please find below the main points regarding the code of conduct for experts. For the full details please see Annex I Code of Conduct for Evaluators of the Model Contract for Experts:

- You should work independently on your personal capacity only and not on behalf of any organisation or country applying the highest ethical and moral standards.
- You should follow any instructions and time-schedules given by the REA.
- You may not delegate your tasks to another person.
- If a legal entity involved in a proposal approaches you during the evaluation of that proposal you should contact REA immediately.
- You must perform your work impartially and you should notify the REA immediately if there is any conflict of interest as soon as you become aware of it. The REA will decide whether a conflict of interest exists, taking account of the objective circumstances, available information and related risks.

Confidentiality

The work 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 and Vice-Chairs must return and/or erase any confidential documents once the evaluation exercise is over.

B.1.5 Conflict of Interest

You should inform the REA immediately of any conflict or potential conflict of interest you might have. For the full details related to conflicts of interest please see Annex I Code of Conduct for Evaluators of the Model Contract for Experts.

A clear conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- stands to benefit directly or indirectly if the proposal is accepted
- has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant legal entity
- is a director, trustee or partner, or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant legal entity
- is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities or any named subcontractors
- is a member of an Advisory Group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU or Euratom Horizon 2020 work programmes, or work programmes in an area related to the call for proposals in question
- is a National Contact Point, or is directly working for the Enterprise Europe Network
- is a member of a Programme Committee
In the following situations, the relevant service will decide whether a conflict of interest exists if the Evaluator:

- was employed by one of the applicant legal entities in the last three years
- is involved in a contract or grant agreement, grant decision or membership of management structures (e.g. member of management or advisory board etc.) or research collaboration with an applicant legal entity or the fellow researcher, or had been so in the last three years
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on their ability to participate in the evaluation of the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

Consequences:

- If a conflict of interest is reported and established, then the expert must not evaluate the proposal concerned or take part in any part of the evaluation where the proposal is being discussed.
- If it is revealed during an evaluation that an expert has knowingly concealed a conflict of interest, the expert will be immediately excluded, and sanctions will apply.

B.2 Admissibility, Eligibility and Obvious Clerical Errors

After the call deadline, all proposals are checked to see if they comply with the admissibility and eligibility criteria defined in the General Annexes to the Work Programme.

The admissibility and eligibility checks are carried out by the REA. But as an Evaluator, you are in charge of assessing whether the proposal is in scope and its content corresponds to the topic description which you can find in the Work Programme.

If you consider that a proposal is not in scope, please inform us 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 in scope, it will need to be evaluated.

For your information, the admissibility and eligibility conditions are described in sections B and C of the General Annexes to the Work Programme (see link above).

B.2.1 Admissibility

1. To be considered admissible, a proposal must be:
   (a) submitted within the deadline given in the call conditions;
   (b) readable, accessible and printable.

2. Incomplete proposals may be considered inadmissible.

3. The following supporting documents will be required to determine the operational capacity of each participant for grant proposals:
   - CV or description of the profiles of participants.
   - List of up to 5 relevant publications (including datasets and software).
   - List of up to 5 relevant previous projects or activities connected to the subject of this proposal.
   - Description of significant infrastructure or technical equipment relevant to the proposed work.
   - Description of any third parties.

4. Proposals shall include a draft plan for exploitation and dissemination of results

5. Page limits will apply to proposals (70 in this case) and excess pages which are overprinted with "watermark" will need to be disregarded.

6. Proposals must be written in a legible font.
7. The structure of proposals must correspond to the requirements specified under each section of the proposal template.

**B.2.2 Eligibility**

A proposal will be considered eligible if:

a. **its content corresponds to the topic description**

b. it complies with the eligibility conditions set below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research &amp; innovation actions (RIA)(^5)</th>
<th>Eligibility conditions for participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least three legal entities. Each of the three must be established in a different EU Member State or Horizon 2020 associated country(^6). All three legal entities must be independent of each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.2.3 Obvious Clerical Errors**

If you detect (at any moment of the process) an "obvious clerical error" that would clearly disadvantage the proposal, please inform us immediately. We will ask the coordinator to provide the missing information or to clarify the supporting documents.

The assessment is done on a case-by-case basis; if the information provided changes substantially the proposal, we will not take it into account. Nevertheless, the idea is that if the missing information does not substantially change the proposal, the benefit of the doubt should be given to the applicants who will be allowed to provide the necessary clarifications.

**B.3 Remote evaluation & panel review meetings**

**B.3.1 Remote evaluation**

During the remote evaluation, each proposal will be first assessed independently by three Evaluators against pre-determined award criteria.

During this first step, you will be acting individually; you will not discuss the proposal with each other nor with any third party. You will record your individual opinion in an Individual Evaluation Report (IER), giving comments and scores against the pre-defined award criteria. The Vice-Chair will monitor the quality of each Evaluator's first IER to assure that they are in line with the programme requirements and the recommendations given in this manual. You should make sure that you finish all of them on time in order to avoid delays in the consensus phase.

Once all three IERs are submitted, the consensus phase will start. One of you will be assigned as Rapporteur, in charge of drafting a Consensus Report (CR). The consensus report will need to represent your individual views on the proposal but also the outcome you have reached on the proposal with your fellow Evaluators. In order to reach consensus, you will be helped by the Vice-Chair and the REA Project Officer monitoring the process. The Vice-Chair will perform timely QC of each CR in order to assure a high quality feedback to the applicants.

We expect that the Evaluators will endeavour to reach 100% consensus on all the proposals during the remote phase.

---

\(^5\) Projects funded under Horizon 2020 can take different pre-defined shapes referred to as "types of action". The topics that will be evaluated during this exercise will only include one type of action: Research and Innovation Action (RIA). For further explanations on their characteristics see section B.4.2.

\(^6\) The latest information on which countries are associated, or in the process of association to Horizon 2020 can be found [here](#).
Should there be a case of **re-submission**, once the proposal’s CR is drafted, a copy of the Evaluation Sumary Report (ESR) of the previous evaluations will be provided to the Rapporteur. The Rapporteur should read it carefully. In case of markedly deviations of the scoring, you should comment on them and justify your scores, specially if lower that the ones given to the previous version of the proposal.

Re-submission is indicated by the applicants in the part A of the proposal.

B.3.2 Panel review meetings

The panel review meetings will be organized in Brussels between from 07/11/2017 to 09/11/2017, they will be chaired by the REA Project Officer, assisted by a Vice-Chair.

The **role** of the panels will be to:

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

At the end of the remote evaluation and in order to prepare the panel review meetings in Brussels, the panel Evaluators selected will **cross-read** the proposals which will be discussed in Brussels.

Vice-Chairs invited to Brussels will be briefed by their peers in order to provide the best feedback possible on all proposals discussed. They will produce a clear-comprehensive, concise and complete report on the deliberations of the panel. This report should reflect very clearly the justification of any eventual new comments or scores.

B.3.3 Prioritization of proposals with the same score

The following approach will be applied successively for every group of ex aequo proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

(a) Proposals that address topics, or sub-topics, not otherwise covered by more highly-ranked proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.

(b) The proposals identified under (a), if any, will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion excellence. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion impact. In the case of Innovation Actions, this prioritisation will be done first on the basis of the score for impact, and then on that for excellence.

If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on the following factors, in order: size of EU budget allocated to SMEs; gender balance among the personnel named in the proposal who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the research and/or innovation activities.

If a distinction still cannot be made, the panel may decide to further prioritise by considering how to enhance the quality of the project portfolio through synergies between projects, or other factors related to the objectives of the call or to Horizon 2020 in general. These factors will be documented in the report of the Panel.

(c) The method described in (b) will then be applied to the remaining ex aequo in the group.
B.4 Proposal structure, type of actions and award criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the award criteria 'Excellence', 'Impact' and 'Quality and efficiency of the implementation'. Moreover, each award criterion refers to a specific section of the proposal. In section B.4.1, you will find the description of the proposal structure; in B.4.2 the different types of actions and finally in section B.4.3 the award criteria.

B.4.1 Proposal structure

Proposals have 2 parts; both need to be assessed.

**Part A** contains:
- The general information, including in particular the abstract
- Information on participants and point of contacts
- The proposed budget
- An Ethics questionnaire (which you do not need to assess)
- Call specific questions – Open Research Data Pilot (which is not part of the evaluation)

**Part B** is divided into 5 sections. Each award criterion refers to a specific section of the proposal where applicants need to demonstrate that they have adequately addressed the criterion in question. If they haven’t, this must be reflected in a lower score.

- Section 1: **Excellence** (objectives; relation to WP; concept & approach; ambition)
- Section 2: **Impact** (expected impacts; measures to maximize impact which include dissemination & exploitation of results and communication activities)
- Section 3: **Implementation** (work plan; management structure & procedures; consortium; resources)
- Section 4: **Members of the consortium**
- Section 5: **Ethics and Security**

B.4.2 Type 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 actions depending of the scope of the topic. However, the nine topics that will be evaluated during this exercise will only include one type of action:

**Research and Innovation Action (RIA):** Action consisting of activities aiming at establishing 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 but limited demonstration or pilot activities aiming to show the technical feasibility in a near operational environment.

B.4.3 Award criteria and sub-criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the award criteria 'Excellence', 'Impact' and 'Quality and efficiency of the implementation'.

Underneath the award criteria bellow, a precise description of the information expected from the proposals is provided, as it was outlined in the proposal templates which can be found under the "Templates and Forms" heading of the documents page of H2020.

---

7 Use this to assess the operational capacity of the beneficiaries.
8 Ethics and Security are not part of the evaluation.
The text in green represents the award sub-criteria and indicates the areas of the proposals in which information relating to these sub-criteria should be found.

### Section 1 – Excellence

#### Clarity and pertinence of the objectives.

**1.1 Objectives**
The objectives should be clear, measurable, realistic and achievable within the duration of the project. Objectives should be consistent with the expected exploitation and impact of the project.

**1.2 Relation to the work programme**
Applicants should explain how the proposal addresses the specific challenge and scope of the topic, as set out in the work programme.

#### Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology.

**Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge.**

**1.3 Concept and methodology**

**a) Concept**
- Applicants should describe and explain the overall concept underpinning the project. They should describe the main ideas, models or assumptions involved. They should identify any inter-disciplinary considerations and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge;
- Applicants should describe the positioning of the project e.g. where it is situated in the spectrum from ‘idea to application’, or from ‘lab to market’ and they should refer to Technology Readiness Levels where relevant (see General Annex G of the work programme);
- Applicant should describe any national or international research and innovation activities which will be linked with the project, especially where the outputs from these will feed into the project;
(b) Methodology
- Applicants should describe and explain the overall methodology, distinguishing, as appropriate, activities indicated in the relevant section of the work programme, e.g. for research, demonstration, piloting, first market replication, etc;
- Where relevant, they should describe how sex and/or gender analysis is taken into account in the project’s content.

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).

1.4 Ambition
- Applicants should describe the advance their proposal would provide beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent the proposed work is ambitious.
- They should describe the innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models) which the proposal represents. Where relevant, they should refer to products and services already available on the market.
- They should refer to the results of any patent search carried out.

Section 2 – Impact

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.

2.1 Expected impacts
Applicants should be specific, and provide only information that applies to the proposal and its objectives. Wherever possible, the use of quantified indicators and targets is encouraged.

Applicants should describe how their project will contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the Work Programme, under the relevant topic (attention: this is the only part to be addressed for this first stage of two-stage evaluation procedure).

Applicants should describe any barriers/obstacles, and any framework conditions (such as regulation, standards, public acceptance, workforce considerations, financing of follow-up steps, cooperation of other links in the value chain), that may determine whether and to what extent the expected impacts will be achieved.

2.2 Measures to maximise impact

Quality of the proposed measures to:
Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant

a) Dissemination and exploitation of results
- Applicants should provide a draft ‘plan for the dissemination and exploitation of the project’s results’.
- They should show how the proposed measures will help to achieve the expected impact of the project.
- The plan, should be proportionate to the scale of the project, and should contain measures to be implemented both during and after the end of the project. For innovation actions, in particular, a credible path to deliver these innovations to the market should be described;
- They should include a business plan where relevant;
- They should outline the strategy for knowledge management and protection. Include measures to provide open access (free on-line access, such as the ‘green’ or ‘gold’ model) to peer reviewed scientific publications which might result from the project.

Communicate the project activities to different target audiences.
b) Communication activities
They should describe the proposed communication measures for promoting the project and its findings during the period of the grant. Measures should be proportionate to the scale of the project, with clear objectives. They should be tailored to the needs of different target audiences, including groups beyond the project's own community. Where relevant, they should include measures for public/societal engagement on issues related to the project.

Section 3 – Implementation

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables.

3.1 Work plan — Work packages, deliverables
Applicants should provide the following:
- a brief presentation of the overall structure of the work plan;
- a timing of the different work packages and their components (Gantt chart or similar);
- a detailed work description, i.e.:
  ✓ a description of each work package (table 3.1a);
  ✓ a list of work packages (table 3.1b);
  ✓ a list of major deliverables (table 3.1c);
- a graphical presentation of the components showing how they inter-relate (Pert chart or similar).

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management.

3.2 Management structure, milestones and procedures
- Applicants should describe the organisational structure and the decision-making (including a list of milestones (table 3.2a))
- Explain why the organisational structure and decision-making mechanisms are appropriate - to the complexity and scale of the project.
- Describe, where relevant, how effective innovation management will be addressed in the management structure and work plan.
- Describe any critical risks, relating to project implementation, that the stated project's objectives may not be achieved. They should detail any risk mitigation measures and provide a table with critical risks identified and mitigating actions (table 3.2b).

Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise.

3.3 Consortium as a whole
Applicants should describe the consortium. They should clarify the following questions:
- How will it match the project's objectives, and bring together the necessary expertise? How do the members complement one another (and cover the value chain, where appropriate)?
- In what way does each of them contribute to the project? They need to show that each has a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.
- If applicable, they should describe the industrial/commercial involvement in the project to ensure exploitation of the results and explain why this is consistent with and will help to achieve the specific measures which are proposed for exploitation of the results of the project (see section 2.2).
- Other countries and international organisations: If one or more of the participants requesting EU funding is based in a country or is an international organisation that is not automatically eligible for such funding (entities from Member States of the EU, from Associated Countries and from one of the countries in the exhaustive list included in General Annex A of the Work Programme are automatically eligible for EU funding), they should explain why the participation of the entity in question is essential to carrying out the project.
Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.

3.4 Resources to be committed
Applicants should provide the following:
- a table showing number of person/months required (table 3.4a)
- a table showing ‘other direct costs’ (table 3.4b) for participants where those costs exceed 15% of the personnel costs (according to the budget table in section 3 of the administrative proposal forms).

B.4.4 No Recommendations

Please bear in mind that for each award criterion, the comments and scores must be clear, sufficiently detailed, consistent and suitable for feedback to the applicants.

Any shortcomings (except minor ones) must be reflected in lower scores. Significant shortcomings (i.e. shortcomings that prevent the project from reaching its objective or imply a serious overestimation of resources) must lead to a below-threshold score for the criterion concerned. The comments must explain the shortcomings that justify lower scores.

You may NOT make any recommendations as in H2020 there is no negotiation procedure. The Commission/REA can no longer request applicants to address and correct shortcomings. Bear in mind that any proposal with scores above the thresholds and for which there is sufficient budget will be selected and funded as submitted.

Applicants are required to respect page limits. Excess page(s) are watermarked and easy to recognize and you should disregard them from your assessment and mention in your IER that the information in question is not sufficiently substantiated within the given page limit.

The REA will ensure that each proposal is evaluated fairly according to the award criteria and we will make sure that the report, which will serve as feedback to the applicants, is clear and coherent.

B.4.5 Scoring

Proposals for projects to be funded in Horizon 2020 are evaluated on the basis of selection criteria and award criteria.

Evaluation scores will be awarded for the criteria, and not for the different sub-criteria listed under each criterion. Each criterion will be scored out of 5. The threshold for individual criteria is 4.

What do the scores mean:
0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information (unless the result of an ‘obvious clerical error’).
1 - Poor: the criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2 - Fair: the proposal broadly addresses the criterion but there are significant weaknesses.
3 - Good: the proposal addresses the criterion well but with a number of shortcomings.
4 - Very good: the proposal addresses the criterion very well but with a small number of shortcomings.
5 - Excellent: the proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; any shortcomings are minor.

Half-marks can be used.
B.4.6 Cross-cutting issues

H2020 aims to better address cross-cutting issues and certain calls have been flagged as particularly relevant. Therefore as an Evaluator you should consider cross cutting issues if they are mentioned in the scope of the call/topic (see the table below).

If cross-cutting issues are explicitly mentioned in the scope of the call/topic and not properly addressed (or their non-relevance not justified), you must reflect this in a lower score for the relevant criterion. In other words:

- A successful proposal is expected to address them, or convincing explain why not relevant in a particular case;
- Proposals addressing cross-cutting issues which are not explicitly mentioned in the scope of the call or topic can also be evaluated positively (but cannot be penalised).

You can find guidance on cross-cutting issues in the Guidance for Evaluators on H2020. The cross-cutting issues affecting our calls for proposals are:

- **Social Science and Humanities research (SSH):** Under Horizon 2020, SSH is given an enhanced role as a cross-cutting issue aimed at improving our assessment of and response to complex societal issues. Therefore, where relevant, the research and innovation chain should include contributions from SSH disciplines such as sociology, economics, psychology, political science, history and cultural sciences. Find guidance on SSH as cross-cutting issue here: [https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-938.html](https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-938.html)

- **Gender issues:** in order to rectify imbalances between women and men, and to integrate a gender dimension in research and innovation programming and content. Applicants are invited to explore whether and how the gender dimension is relevant to their research. In the proposal template (section 1.3), they are asked to “describe how sex and/or gender analysis is taken into account in the project's content”. The way sex and/or gender analysis is taken into account in the proposal should be assessed by the Evaluators alongside the other relevant aspects of the proposal. This is particularly important if the proposal is submitted to a topic where gender-related issues are explicitly mentioned. Find guidance on Gender as cross-cutting issue here: [https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-977.html](https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-977.html)

- **International Cooperation:** is a crucial and open aspect for research and innovation. There is a clear benefit and interest in engaging in international cooperation. Evaluators should assess whether the participation of the entity is essential, with clear benefits for the project (see section B.4.10). Find guidance on International Cooperation as cross-cutting issue here: [https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-980.html](https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/desktop/en/support/faqs/faq-980.html)

The nine topics under the CULT-COOP call have been flagged as relevant for the above-mentioned cross-cutting issues, as shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic identification</th>
<th>Topic title</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SSH</th>
<th>International Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-1</td>
<td>Democratic discourses and the rule of law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-2</td>
<td>Improving mutual understanding among Europeans by working through troubled pasts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-3</td>
<td>Cultural literacy of young generations in Europe</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-4</td>
<td>Contemporary histories of Europe in artistic and creative practices</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-5</td>
<td>Religious diversity in Europe - past, present and future</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-6</td>
<td>Participatory approaches and social innovation in culture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-7</td>
<td>Cultural heritage of European coastal and maritime regions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-9</td>
<td>European cultural heritage, access and analysis for a richer interpretation of the past</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-COOP-12</td>
<td>The significance of cultural and sacred values for the migration challenge</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B.4.7 Substantial changes**

The full proposal submitted in stage-two must be consistent with the short outline proposal submitted in stage-one. It may NOT differ substantially i.e. **obvious change concerning a substantial part of the proposal.**

Applicants shall declare any substantial difference between both proposals in Part A, Section 5 (Call specific questions). However, some of them might have omitted to do so; or might consider the changes as not substantial. Consequently, it is important that you check if there are no substantial change between the two proposals, even if not self-declared by the applicants.

This rule should ensure fair and equal treatment of competing proposals. It should prevent applicants from deliberately setting out false promises in the first stage that are not reflected in their second stage proposals. Therefore, when deciding on consistency, you should follow these basic rules:
- The assessment must be done on a **case-by-case basis,** since each situation is different.
- Examine any **justifications** that the applicant has given for changes at stage-two.
- Remember that the stage-one evaluation only concerns the criteria ‘excellence’ and part of ‘impact’. It does not cover the consortium composition (except for the minimum number of partners needed for eligibility), nor the detailed work plan.

- **Examples of no substantial difference:** the absence of one or two of the partners that had been mentioned at stage 1; the change of a coordinator
- **Examples of substantial difference:** conceptual basis, or methodology, has completely changed; objectives of the work have been significantly altered (especially if the degree of innovation/advance beyond the state-of-the-art is greatly reduced); expected impact no longer corresponds at all to that set out at stage 1

**How to proceed in practice?**
- Your Project Officer will provide you (the Evaluators) with stage-one proposals (Part A and B) by email at the beginning of the evaluation.
- At IER stage, before starting to evaluate their proposals, Evaluators should quickly compare the two versions to make sure that there is no substantial change.
- Evaluators should check all the proposals assigned to them, not only the ones which self-declared substantial changes in Part A, in order to ensure equal treatment.
- If you spot a substantial change you should immediately contact your Project Officer and also inform the Vice-Chair.
B.4.8 Innovation

Innovation is vital to European competitiveness in the global economy. Innovation relates to the successful exploitation of new creations, which when used produce tangible benefits, satisfying needs and wants. The benefits can be societal, environmental, technical, commercial, educational, financial or anything that delivers a benefit to someone or addresses a need.

Evaluators are expected to take innovation into account in their assessment of the proposals and the role of innovation is assessed in the relevant criteria:

Criteria 1: Excellence:
Subcriteria:

*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).

- What is the potential of the project to deliver an innovation (i.e. something new which when used will deliver a benefit)?

B.4.9 Open Research Data Pilot

Proposals submitted under these calls are part of the Open Research Data Pilot but this aspect is not relevant for the evaluation. It is dealt with at a later stage by EU officials.

B.4.10 EU funding and eligibility of non EU-countries and international organisations

Horizon 2020 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 particularly encourage cooperation with non-EU partners. However, all non-EU countries do not automatically qualify for funding.

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.

- **Developing countries** - Research organisations in some 130 developing countries are automatically eligible for funding. The full list of these countries is provided in Annex A of the General Annexes of the Horizon 2020 Work Programmes.

Countries which are not automatically eligible for funding:

- **Third countries** not in the list provided in Annex A of the General Annexes of the Horizon 2020 Work Programme can participate and they will be eligible for funding:
  - When funding for such participants is provided for under a bilateral scientific and technological agreement or any other arrangement between the Union and an international organisation or a third country
  - When the Commission deems participation of the entity essential for carrying out the action funded through Horizon 2020.

- **International European interest organisations** may participate (and receive EU funding): international organisation, the majority of whose members are Member States or H2020 associated countries, and whose principal objective is to promote scientific technological cooperation in Europe.

Outcome of the UK referendum and Horizon 2020: State of Play:

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.

---

9 In the case of a short 1st stage proposal, innovation is to be taken into account only in criterion 1.
in Horizon 2020 actions. Experts should not evaluate proposals with UK participants any differently than before.

B.4.11 Ethics

If there are ethics issues, you do not need to assess them. This will be done at a later stage by specialized experts.

C. Evaluation IT Tools (how to login and work in SEP – basics)

You will carry out your tasks as an expert during this evaluation via the European Commission’s online tool called SEP.

C.1 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.\(^{10}\)

C.2 Checking for conflicts of interest

It is very important to review in detail all the proposals allocated to you as soon as the remote evaluation has opened (March – 1st - 2017) so that you are able to quickly identify any potential conflict of interest 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 conflict of interest.

If there is no conflict then please click I accept to evaluate the proposal from the Proposal Details screen. The task "Write IER" (Write IER = Individual Evaluation Report) will change from Assigned to Open in the All Tasks screen.

If there is a clear conflict of interest then please decline the task from the All Tasks screen explaining the conflict of interest in the pop up box. Once you have declined a task this proposal will no longer appear in your All Tasks screen. If you are unsure, please contact your Vice-Chair who will inform us.

Please note that when you start working your IERs, you should start by following the alphabetical order of the proposals.

\(^{10}\) We recommend you 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.
C.3 A quick explanation of the evaluation tasks

C.3.1 Individual Evaluation Report (IER) stage

All 3 Evaluators

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 records.

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 do not submit it yet until the Vice-Chair has carried out a Quality Check of your drafted IER. In order to let the Vice-Chair know that you have finished the first draft of your IER, please introduce a comment in the Task Comment box saying "Draft IER ready for Quality Check". The Vice-Chair may make comments regarding the quality of your IER in draft. 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 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.

C.3.2 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:
Note: Evaluators and Rapporteur must agree on the draft CR saved by the rapporteur before he/she submits the CR to the Vice Chair.

Communication between Evaluators, Rapporteur and Vice-Chair

The bulk of the discussion and exchanges between Evaluators, Rapporteur and Vice-Chair will take place at **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 role**

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 advise 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 submit the agreed version to the Vice-Chair.

**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.**

---

11 Note: If the comments’ notification is not to be sent 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**.
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 QC, 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 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 text. 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.

---

12QC 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.
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.

C.4 Contact and Support

SEP support: DIGIT-EFP7-SEP-SUPPORT@ec.europa.eu
Phone: +32 2 29 92222
The service desk is available on weekdays between 8:00 and 20:00 (Brussels time)

D. Drafting Reports

D.1. Quality of comments

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 Evaluation Summary Report 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. In addition, the CR should not offer feedback which leaves open the possibility of causing a concern on the applicants part that their proposal has been misunderstood and/or misrepresented. High quality reports are crucial for a successful evaluation.

Unfortunately, with the limited budget we cannot fund a lot of proposals and often only one proposal from a specific topic can be funded. In addition, the applicants have spent a lot of time and money in putting a consortium together and preparing a proposal, therefore with your help we would like to ensure that we provide clear, concise and high quality feedback to the applicants.

When writing your reports (IER and CR) please:

- do not use bullet points.
- write complete sentences.
- do not reference specific page numbers, tables or sections from the proposal as this can introduce errors.
- do not summarise/explain the proposal (there is a tendency to do this quite often in the first sentences).
- provide an assessment for each sub-criteria.
- justify your assessment with examples from the proposal.
- write your comments first and then ensure that you provide a score which properly reflects the comments.
- feel free to use the full range of scores including half points.
- always keep in mind what the scores mean (see B4.5 of this manual).
- do not provide recommendations; weaknesses identified in the proposal should be scored down as the selected proposals will be funded as they are and will not be modified during the grant agreement preparation phase.
- do not use absolute statements (e.g. there is no information/information is missing on sustainability, but rather sustainability of the project beyond the end date is not fully addressed - see some examples below).
- verify if the topic has been flagged for cross cutting issues and to take this into account in your evaluation.
### D.2. Examples of good vs poor comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor comments (they are vague or express opinions)</th>
<th>Good comments (they explain the reasons of the assessment and provide evidence)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This proposal does not advance the state of the art. Why?? No justification/example</td>
<td>This proposal fails to advance the state of the art in X or Y and it does not take Z fully into account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methodology is described. This is just a statement of fact not an assessment</td>
<td>The methodology is poorly described as it fails to sufficiently address X and Y and provides little reference to Z.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no discussion of a dissemination strategy. This is an absolute statement and should be avoided</td>
<td>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>
<tr>
<td>A good impact can be foreseen This is vague</td>
<td>The exploitation and dissemination plan addresses well 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal should have included partners with more expertise in digital curation This is a recommendation and should be rephrased as a weakness</td>
<td>The proposal does not fully demonstrate that the necessary expertise relating to digital curation is present and this represents a significant risk to the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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. This is a contradictory statement</td>
<td>The proposal describes the expected impact in a detailed and substantial manner. The project will clearly benefit the participants’ commercial situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor comments include words like: Perhaps, Think, Seems, Assume, Probably, Could, Should</td>
<td>Good comments include words like: Because, Specifically, For example</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D.3 Tips for writing consensus reports

- We recommend that you use the **Merged view** option in SEP (see section C3.2) as it will give you a sense of overview of the assessment of all Evaluators and allow you to easily spot discrepancies/differences/contradictions/omissions etc..
- Depending on the above you might need to go back to the Evaluators and ask them for further clarification (please do so via the **Task comments** box and when the pop up appears you can notify only that specific Evaluator of your request for clarification).
- If you see that the scores of individual Evaluators are massively apart, don't panic, there could be many reasonable explanations for this. First read the IERs, it is very possible that:
  - the comments were 'softer' or 'harder' than the scores awarded and 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 very different from an individual's IER
  - perhaps it was one of the early proposals evaluated and the Evaluator has not yet 'found his/her bearings' with regard to scoring a proposal in the context of their other assigned
proposals (e.g. for the same weakness they were much tougher with one proposal than another)
  o Evaluator 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 has scored 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.
  • In general, it is best to seek further clarification and information, only when a matter is understood
    in greater detail and information is shared can a solution be found.
  • 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 can't be reached then please inform your vice-chair who will find a solution with REA
    PO (e.g. 1 extra Evaluator can be added).
  • Verify that if the topic has been flagged for cross cutting issues that the Evaluators have taken this
    into account.
  • Compile the CR first and forget about the scores.
  • Once you are satisfied with the CR, add 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 the three experts. High quality CRs are reasoned, accurate, informative and explanatory.

E. Quality checks (QC)

During the remote phase the Vice-Chairs will carry out quality checks to ensure that the evaluation
rules and procedures have been properly adhered to and the reports are of sufficient quality.

Please note that the QC will not change the meaning of the IER or the CR as the objective is not to
interfere with the opinion of the Evaluators.

Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs)
IERs are the rough material with which CRs are built. Therefore the Vice-Chair will carry out QCs of the
first IERs produced by each expert and provide feedback if they deviate from the main
recommendations given in this guide or from the objectives of the programme. You should take into
account this feedback for your remaining IERs.

Consensus Reports (CRs)
The Vice-Chairs will carry out a QC on each CR. When the CR is submitted by the Rapporteur, it will first
go through the QC with the Vice-Chair, before being submitted to you for approval.

What will the Vice-Chairs check?:

The Vice-Chairs will check the IERs and the CRs to make sure that:

• all sub-criteria have been addressed, mentioning both strong and weak points
• the comments are included under the correct criterion
• there are no bullet points or references to page numbers, tables or sections of the proposals
• the CR does not summarise or describe the proposal
• the proposal is not penalised twice for the same weakness under different criteria
• the scores match the comments
• there are no recommendations, if there are, they should be rephrased as weaknesses
• there are no absolute statements in the CR (e.g. there is no….., X is missing....) or completely generic
  comments (e.g. The proposal is fair)
• examples and justifications are included to back up the comments (e.g. A good impact is foreseen because…….)
• there are no inappropriate comments (e.g. there are too many partners from Ireland, The Italian partner receives too much money), or disrespectful remarks
• there are no contradictory statements
• the proposal has been checked as 'In scope' (if 'not in scope' please flag to REA PO)
• cases of third country participants and international organizations have been detected (if yes please flag to REA PO)
• cross-cutting issues, where relevant, have been assessed.
• language and style are good (there are no grammatical mistakes, the text is easy to understand)

F. Glossary

Innovation
The process, including its outcome, by which new ideas respond to societal or economic needs and demand and generate new products, services or business and organisational models that are successfully introduced into an existing market or that are able to create new markets and that contribute value to society.

Innovation potential
Innovation potential is the prospective of establishing new knowledge or identifying opportunities by monitoring markets, policies, technologies and IPRs.

Innovation capacity
Innovation capacity focuses on meeting needs and delivering benefits to end-users. The impacts range from being instrumental to more subtle, e.g.:
- Instrumental: influencing the development of policy/practice – shaping legislation – altering behaviour
- Conceptual: shifts of understanding of policy / practice
- Cultural change: willingness to engage in knowledge exchange activities

Innovation management
Innovation management is a process which requires an understanding of both market and technical problems, with a goal of successfully implementing appropriate creative ideas. A new or improved product, service or process is its typical output. It also allows a consortium to respond to an external or internal opportunity. Innovation management covers the whole process (starts with the opportunity and goes through to delivering a benefit). It includes innovation potential and innovation capacity. It is the overall management of activities related to understanding needs, with the objective of identifying new ideas and managing them, in order to develop new products or services which satisfy these needs. Innovation management is NOT IPR management nor Exploitation management.

Work package
Work package means a major sub-division of the proposed project.

Deliverable
Deliverable means a distinct output of the project, meaningful in terms of the project's overall objectives and constituted by a report, a document, a technical diagram, a software etc.

Milestones
Means control points in the project that help to chart progress. Milestones may correspond to the completion of a key deliverable, allowing the next phase of the work to begin. They may also be needed at intermediary points so that, if problems have arisen, corrective measures can be taken. A milestone may be a critical decision point in the project where, for example, the consortium must decide which of several technologies to adopt for further development.
**Interdisciplinary**

There is no official definition of what an interdisciplinary approach entails under H2020. But H2020 is open and challenge-based and it intends to stimulate interdisciplinary projects that bring together different disciplines, knowledge, and methods to stimulate integration and to maximize impact. When addressing societal challenges, Horizon 2020 has to support research in all scientific disciplines, including the social sciences and the humanities to create opportunities for projects that break through disciplinary boundaries to ensure that the research is used to its full potential.

**Communication vs Dissemination**

Dissemination is defined as the public disclosure of results by any appropriate means. It means making research results known to various stakeholder groups in a targeted way, to enable them to use the results in their own work. It is a process of promotion and awareness raising that should occur throughout and after the duration of each project. Communication carries a message to the public, thereby contributing to public and political visibility.
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