



Horizon Europe MSCA - Staff Exchanges 2021

Evaluation Process

Dr. Kristian Rahbek Knudsen

Knudsen Scientific Consulting, Cambridge





Staff Exchanges, formerly known as RISE

Evaluation Process

External Independent Experts

No conflict of Interest

Thorough, professional and highly transparent evaluation



Role of experts:

Read proposals - apply expertise - write IER

Independent, impartial, objective, accurate, consistent, factual,
confidential, professional

During meetings:

Flexible, polite, listen to and respect the opinion of peers

Take advice from VCs onboard



Experts **evaluate**, we do not decide funding

Quality of proposal - scoring - enabling quantitative comparison- ranking

Weighting:

Excellence (50%), Impact (30%), Implementation (20%)

Threshold >70

Evaluation - fail/poor/good/very good/excellent (0 – 5)

Accompanied by comments: Strengths and weaknesses

Quality is paramount: - Comments should be clear, precise, accurate and justified.

Do not write a novel!

Quality control follows, but we need quality from the start.



Remote phase:

Three experts per proposal – each writes IER

One rapporteur *drafts* CR

Vice Chair oversees process and performs QC

VC provides support for Experts

All Work in SEP (Closed Encrypted EU system)

Central Phase in Bruxelles – (In Covid times online):

Experts discuss draft CR during consensus meeting + moderator
(VC or REA Staff)

Rapporteur writes final CR based on discussion

Final CR approved by all experts

Whole process overseen by independent observer who is also
available to experts

CR checked by VC QC

Double quality check by other VC - final CR

Ranking list based on objective facts (global score, threshold)

Ex aequo? Excellence, Impact, Implementation

Still ex aequo: The two groups meet to decide

Ethics are addressed by separate panel

Decision goes to proposer

Complaints: redress procedure (very rare)





Important points for experts and proposers:

Check Artificial collaborations (we are not a travel agency)

Is division of industry/academia, countries, etc. justified

Only evaluate information provided in the proposal (do not google, do not look up references, etc.) Do not expect experts to click links – we don't!

Does proposal meet evaluation criteria? In scope?

We do not give advice, evaluate and comment on strengths and weaknesses

Gender issues, operational capacity, Letters of commitment

General comments?

How to write IER:

Be brief and concrete; DO NOT Write a Novel

No opinions, only facts: I think...; it should be funded; the work plan does not deal with climate change - nowadays ...

Do not paraphrase the proposal: evaluating \neq describing -
Good, bad? Why

Do not contradict yourself!

Avoid repetitions and double penalising

Use whole spectrum of scores

Avoid “good, but ...” Either strength or weakness

Language must be professional and courteous - text goes back to the proposer in the end





How to Write Better Proposals:

Hundreds of submissions – Competitive

Concise, precise and readable

- Clearly state the objectives of the proposal
- Claims: prove them, convince us!
- Justify the composition of the consortium, in particular interaction of academia and industry; do not forget “Administration” with active link with R&I (technical, administrative or managerial).
- You need to address **all** criteria thoroughly and convincingly

Excellence:

What is the SOTA currently?

How will your project go beyond the current SOTA

Use figures, reaction schemes, tables etc.

Remember, we are experts in the field but you still have to convince us

Scientific excellence must be obvious to the reader!





Impact:

Be specific not generic

Describe what you intend to do

Describe how!

How concrete measures in your proposal generate impact

Implementation:

Describe management structures and procedures in detail

Be convincing – Demonstrate to us that you have thought it through

How will you handle difficulties and conflict? IP?

Thorough Risk Assessment, please

Give REA staff (and yourself) some concrete measures to work with

Gantt chart, Clear, detailed and check consistency with text and WPs

Do resources allocated to work packages correspond with tasks etc.





Advice:

- Use clear diagrams and tables to illustrate (check if smudged from copy-paste)
- Page limit: 30pages for 3 criteria, excluding appendices, i.e.. letters of commitment, infrastructure descriptions, etc.): * excess pages will be **disregarded**
- Check that all letters of commitment are present, dated and signed!
- Observe minimum font size (tables) and margins! Non observance does not give any advantage! Potentially detrimental.

Bonne chance!

Questions?