

National information day

Prague, 18th October 2021

Horizon Europe

Life Sciences

New opportunities for widening countries

Recommendations to the applicants from the expert evaluators

Ing. Alena ŠIMKOVÁ

C4Construction

Expert and Consultancy Office

Prague

The Czech Republic

The new Horizon Europe 2021-2027




was designed to

- **remove barriers** to innovation,
- establish **fairer conditions** with international partners,
- **enhance the impact** of research and innovation,
- **support better dissemination** of excellent knowledge and technology.

Standard evaluation process

Involvement of experts in the evaluation process



Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Excellence / Strengths

Project

- Well balanced with **the project capabilities**
- Objectives **clearly described** + logically planned and **refer to the scope of the call**

Innovative methods/technology

- **Ambitious, realistic and comprehensive** proposal
- **New** methods/technology
- **Replicability** of the results

Ambition of the project

- **Engagement of different regions**
- **Follow-up activities**/plans
- Well justified + proofed by **references**

Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Excellence / Weaknesses

Project

- **Inconsistent** with the scope
- **Unrealistic** (overly or unambitious) **goals**
- **Limited** trans-disciplinarity

Innovative methods/technology

- **Described in rather general or insufficient ways**
- Proposed approach is **not in line with ambitions of the project**

Ambition of the project

- **Over ambitious targets** at the limited time scale
- The ambitions of the project are **difficult to assess**
- **limited** or not **beyond the state-of-the-art**

Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Impact / Strengths

Expected impacts

- Well outlined
- Proposed **measures for exploitation, dissemination and communication** of the project results are extensive and **adequate**

Potential

- High potential to enable **new knowledge integration and transfer**
- High potential to enhance **innovation capacity**

IPR

- Properly addressed, with a convincing description and **IPR strategy**

Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Impact / Weaknesses

Expected impacts

- Impact **after** the project: **questionable**
- Limited generation of **new** knowledge
- Limited engagement of **stakeholders**

Potencial

- **Quantification of impacts** insufficiently justified
- **Impact measurement** missing/insufficient
- Impact addressed in very **narrow scale**

IPR

- **Lack of detailed IPR management**

Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Implementation / Strengths

Consortium

- Good **balanced** between expertise
- **Complementarity** between the participants
- **Experienced** coordinator

Management of the project

- **Focused**, transparent
- Work plan + WPs: **coherent and complementary**
- Expected **deliverables**: presented in a detail

Budget

- **Justified** + detailed
- Resources: planned + **properly** distributed

Good practices & common mistakes from the evaluator perspective

Implementation / Weaknesses

Consortium

- Poorly **ballanced** between expertise
- **Lack of complementarity** between the participants
- **Unexperienced** coordinator

Management of the project

- **Risk management**: inadequately addressed
- Work Plan + WPs: **mistakes**, e.g. too complicated, overlaps, missing interconnections between WPs
- Milestones + deliverables not **aligned** with WP

Budget

- Not in **accordance** with ambitions of the project
- Not ballanced or **overestimated**

Real example of an applicant's proposal **NOT supported** by an evaluator

SWOT analysis

Common mistakes :

- general inconclusive description
- general phrases
- missing or insufficient justification
- editorial errors

D1.1 SWOT analysis

Section 1.1 describes and sufficiently describes the weaknesses.

Section 1.3 **does not describe the strengths to the extent necessary, no justification is provided.**

Formal inconsistency identified:

The first sentence erroneously refers to section 1.2, instead of section 1.4.

Hints & Ticks

- **analyse** the call text in depth beforehand
- ensure that **your project is exactly aligned** with the objectives of the programme and the specificities of the topic
- do not recycle old projects but **propose innovations and novelties** by exploiting their results and synergies with existing projects
- define objectives **clearly**
- **be ambitious, but stay realistic**
- choose **appropriate** methodology

Be aware of

- general **inconclusive description**
- general **phrases**
- missing or insufficient **justification**
- editorial/or other **errors**

Thank you for your attention

Ing. Alena Šimková

Expert – evaluator of the Horizon programmes

C4Construction Prague

Expert and Consultancy Office

E-mail: alena.simkovaa@gmail.com

