

INFODAY ARAGÓN HORIZONTE EUROPA

Clúster 6 (Alimentación, Bioeconomía, Recursos Naturales, Agricultura y Medioambiente) y Clúster 5 (parte de Clima)

**Experiencia en
evaluación de
propuestas europeas**

Dr. Jose Pablo Zamorano Rodríguez
Dpto. Transferencia



iMiDRA
Instituto Madrileño de Investigación
y Desarrollo Rural, Agrario y Alimentario

pablo.zamorano.rodriguez@madrid.org

jpablozamorano@hotmail.com

Tu objetivo debe ser que los evaluadores sientan tu propuesta como si fuera suya



- Dashboard
- Personal Data
- CV
- Bank Account
- Contracts and Invitations
- Payments
- Help

 Dr. JOSE PABLO ZAMORANO (EX2002B [redacted])

 Born on [redacted] 2, [redacted]  jpablozamorano@hot[redacted]

Nationality: Spain Alcal: [redacted]  +346345 [redacted] 1

28807 Spain

No representamos a nuestro país, ni a nuestra empresa / institución

Modify CV

Area of expertise **7**

- Copyrights [IPR management]
- Innovation policy [Innovation management]
- Intellectual property rights [Social studies ...]
- Knowledge and Technology transfer [Tech...]
- Patents [IPR management]
- Rural Development Programme (co-funde...)
- Spin-off companies [Business manageme...]

Languages **2**

	Basic	Intermediate	Proficient
Spanish	●	●	●
English	●	●	●

-  Area of expertise ✓
-  Education ✓
-  Current Employment ✓
-  Publications/books/articles ✓
-  Who can see my profile ✓

La experiencia científica no es la única relevante para poder ser evaluador



Thank you, European Commission!!!

¿Cómo se eligen?

1. Posibles evaluadores contactados por correo-e

- *Disponibilidad y Conflicto de Interés (Col)*

2. Cierre de la convocatoria

- *La CE comprueba si las propuestas son admisibles y elegibles*

3. Evaluadores contratados considerando

- *Nº propuestas por temática (1 propuesta ⇔ 3-5 evaluadores)*
- *Capacidades, experiencia y conocimiento*
- *Equilibrio de género, diversidad geográfica, equilibrio sector privado - público*
- *Col declarados*
- *Rotación*

Principios a seguir por los evaluadores



Guiding principles

Independence

INDEPENDENCIA

- You are evaluating in a personal capacity.
- You represent neither your employer, nor your country!

Impartiality

IMPARCIALIDAD

- You must treat all proposals equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants.

Objectivity

OBJETIVIDAD

- You evaluate each proposal as submitted, meaning on its own merit, not its potential if certain changes were to be made.

Accuracy

PRECISIÓN

- You make your judgment against the official evaluation criteria and the call or topic the proposal addresses and nothing else.

Consistency

CONSISTENCIA

- You apply the same standard of judgment to all proposals

Evaluación individual telemática

The screenshot shows the 'Individual Evaluation Report' page in the 'Funding: Evaluation Services' portal. The page is for a task owned by JOSE PABLO ZAMORANO. It features a sidebar with 'Task Details' and 'Task Comments'. The main content area is divided into two criteria sections: 'Criterion 1 - Excellence' and 'Criterion 2 - Impact'. Each section includes a 'Your score' dropdown menu and a text area for comments. The 'Criterion 1 - Excellence' section lists evaluation aspects such as 'Clarity and pertinence of the objectives' and 'Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology'. The 'Criterion 2 - Impact' section lists aspects like 'The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts'. A 'Go to task list' button is visible in the top right corner.

ES UN TRABAJO SOLITARIO: No sabemos qué otras personas están evaluando y no podemos comentar con nadie lo que estamos evaluando

No se permiten recomendaciones de mejora de la propuesta (tampoco si son de 1ª Fase)

Haz la vida del evaluador más fácil

La correspondencia entre la plantilla de la propuesta y la del informe de evaluación no es total.

Prioriza que al evaluador le sea fácil encontrar donde está la información



Horizon Europe Programme

Standard Application Form (HE RIA and IA)

Project proposal – Technical description (Part B)

Version 3.2
15 November 2022

18

to be taken into account.

...ence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed ... and goes beyond the state of the art.

...proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, ... disciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender ... arch and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, ... and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil ... sers where appropriate.

...ill be taken into account only to the extent that the proposed work is within the ... imme topic.

...@#PU-0BJ-POB@# [e.g. 4 pages]

...ctives of your proposed work. Why are they pertinent to the work programme ... ble and verifiable? Are they realistically achievable?

...ject goes beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent the proposed work is ... exceptional ground-breaking R&I, novel concepts and approaches, new products, ... f organisational models. Where relevant, illustrate the advance by referring to ... ready available on the market. Refer to any patent or publication search carried ...

...osed work is positioned in terms of R&I maturity (i.e. where it is situated in the ... application', or from 'lab to market'). Where applicable, provide an indication of ... is Level, if possible distinguishing the start and by the end of the project.

...ind that advances beyond the state of the art must be interpreted in the light of ... f the project. Expectations will not be the same for RIAs at lower TRL, compared ... tations at high TRLs.

...@#@#CDM-PLC-CP@# [e.g. 14 pages]

- ...overall methodology, including the concepts, models and assumptions that ... underpin your work. Explain how this will enable you to deliver your project's objectives. Refer to any ... important challenges you may have identified in the chosen methodology and how you intend to ... overcome them. [e.g. 10 pages]
- ▲ This section should be presented as a narrative. The detailed tasks and work packages are described below under 'Implementation'.
 - ▲ Where relevant, include how the project methodology complies with the 'do no significant harm' principle as per Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 2020/852 on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment (i.e. the so-called 'EU Taxonomy Regulation'). This means that the methodology is designed in a way it is not significantly harming any of the six environmental objectives of the EU Taxonomy Regulation.



Horizon Europe

Evaluation Form (HE RIA and IA)

Version 2.0
26 April 2022

EVALUATION	
...ation model:	[/single] /step 1] /step 2]
...it:	[insert panel identifier]
...ators:	[name NAME], [name NAME], [name NAME]

EVALUATION

...ations must be evaluated as they were submitted, NOT on their potential if certain changes were made ... do NOT recommend any modifications (e.g. consortia composition, resources or budget, or inclusion of ... work packages). Shortcomings should be reflected in lower score.

...application is partly out of scope, this should be reflected in the scoring and explained in the comments.

excellence

...llowing aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the ... tion in the work programme:

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, and goes beyond the state of the art.
- Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end users where appropriate.

Comments:

Score 1 (0-5):	Threshold: 3/5
2. Impact	
The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from to the project. 	

Haz la vida del evaluador más fácil

Resalta cómo crees que tu propuesta se relaciona con cada criterio

EXCELENCIA

...and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, and goes beyond the state-of-the-art

The proposal is ambitious because the technology will be validated under 5 different conditions by each of 4 teams, thus ensuring it is able to work under different environments

- ✓ **The innovation potential lies in** facilitating the technology uptake by increasing efficiency and reducing waste (i.e. capital costs can be recovered earlier by investors)
- ✓ **The proposal is beyond the state of the art because** the technology has never been applied under so many different conditions and this will likely result in identifying new synergistic factors

Puntuación

Se pueden dar medios puntos

0	The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information
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
	Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present
4	Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present
5	Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor

↓ 3 = **BIEN por ese criterio = la propuesta está muerta**
↓ 4 = **MUY BIEN por ese criterio, pero si todos están "sólo" muy bien, la propuesta está muerta**

Si no somos EXCELENTES en al menos un criterio, la propuesta "corre un gran peligro"

Puntuación

1	...or there are serious inherent weaknesses
2	...but there are significant weaknesses
3	...but a number of shortcomings are present
4	...but a small number of shortcomings are present
5	Any shortcomings are minor

MI PROPIA EXPERIENCIA (¡¡NO ES OFICIAL!!!)

DEBILIDAD (WEAKNESS)

Problema que hará que el Proyecto falle en ese aspecto (criterio)

≥ 1 debilidad ➔ no puede llegar al límite (3) ➔ Puntuación ≤ 2,5



DEFECTO (SHORTCOMING)

Minimizará el éxito del proyecto en ese aspecto (criterio)

* Un número de “shortcomings” ➔ 3-5 ➔ 3,0 - 3,5 

* Un número pequeño de “shortcomings”

➔ 3-4, algunos son menores ➔ 4,0

➔ 1-2 (no menores) ➔ 4,5

* 1-3 “shortcomings” menores ➔ 5

Muchos “shortcomings” ≠
“weakness”
Muchos “minor shortcomings”
≠ “shortcomings”

Fases de evaluación conjuntas

1. Consenso por grupos de evaluadores

➤ “Rapporteur”

- Evaluador que escribe el Informe de Consenso (CR)
- Dirige las discusiones para alcanzar el consenso

➤ “EC Officer” = moderador ⇒ NO INFLUYE EN LAS DECISIONES

2. Informe-resumen de la evaluación

3. Paneles temáticos

4. Panel de Evaluación - Priorización

- *Representantes de cada panel temático*
- *Revisa las puntuaciones y comentarios de las mejores puntuadas*
- *Prioriza las propuestas con las mismas puntuaciones (según reglas descritas en el WP)*

No escribas la propuesta pensando en que la evaluarán sólo personas tan expertas como tú



- Es imposible que en el grupo de consenso todas lo sean
- Puede que esas personas no asuman un papel relevante en las discusiones para el consenso
- Ese enfoque suele conducir a propuestas complejas, con demasiada información
 - Si tu propuesta no ha sido clara para el resto, sus explicaciones no valdrán durante la reunión

Comunicación, difusión y explotación

■ Deben reflejarse también en:

- Tareas descritas en la sección de descripción de WP (no limitarse a repetir las descripciones más generales de la parte 2.2)
- Hitos y entregables
- Gestión de riesgos
- Recursos
- Personal (con “nombres y apellidos”)
- Resumen

KEY ELEMENT OF THE IMPACT SECTION

SPECIFIC NEEDS	EXPECTED RESULTS	D & E & C MEASURES
<p><i>What are the specific needs that triggered this project?</i></p> <p>Example 1 Most airports use process flow-oriented models based on static mathematical values limiting the optimal management of passenger flow and hampering the accurate use of the available resources to the actual demand of passengers.</p> <p>Example 2 Electronic components need to get smaller and lighter to match the expectations of the end-users. At the same time there is a problem of sourcing of raw materials that has an environmental impact.</p>	<p><i>What do you expect to generate by the end of the project?</i></p> <p>Example 1 Successful large-scale demonstrator: Trial with 3 airports of an advanced forecasting system for proactive airport passenger flow management.</p> <p>Algorithmic model: Novel algorithmic model for proactive airport passenger flow management.</p> <p>Example 2 Publication of a scientific discovery on transparent electronics.</p> <p>New product: More sustainable electronic circuits.</p> <p>Three PhD students trained.</p>	<p><i>What dissemination, exploitation and communication measures will you apply to the results?</i></p> <p>Example 1 Exploitation: Patenting the algorithmic model.</p> <p>Dissemination towards the scientific community and airports: Scientific publication with the results of the large-scale demonstration.</p> <p>Communication towards citizens: An event in a shopping mall to show how the outcomes of the action are relevant to our everyday lives.</p> <p>Example 2 Exploitation of the new product: Patenting the new product; Licencing to major electronic companies.</p> <p>Dissemination towards the scientific community and industry: Participating at conferences; Developing a platform of material compositions for industry; Participation at EC project portfolios to disseminate the results as part of a group and maximise the visibility vis-à-vis companies.</p>

Part B - Page 13 of 23

Call: (insert call identifier) — (insert call name)

EU Grants: Application form (HE RIA and IA): V3.2 – 15.11.2022

TARGET GROUPS	OUTCOMES	IMPACTS
<p><i>Who will use or further up-take the results of the project? Who will benefit from the results of the project?</i></p> <p>Example 1 9 European airports: Schiphol, Brussels airport, etc.</p> <p>The European Union aviation safety agency.</p> <p>Air passengers (indirect).</p> <p>Example 2 End-users: consumers of electronic devices.</p> <p>Major electronic companies: Samsung, Apple, etc.</p> <p>Scientific community (field of transparent</p>	<p><i>What change do you expect to see after successful dissemination and exploitation of project results to the target group(s)?</i></p> <p>Example 1 Up-take by airports: 9 European airports adopt the advanced forecasting system demonstrated during the project.</p> <p>Example 2 High use of the scientific discovery published (measured with the relative rate of citation index of project publications).</p> <p>A major electronic company (Samsung or Apple) exploits/uses the new product in their manufacturing.</p>	<p><i>What are the expected wider scientific, economic and societal effects of the project contributing to the expected impacts outlined in the respective destination in the work programme?</i></p> <p>Example 1 Scientific: New breakthrough scientific discovery on passenger forecast modelling.</p> <p>Economic: Increased airport efficiency Size: 15% increase of maximum passenger capacity in European airports, leading to a 28% reduction in infrastructure expansion costs.</p> <p>Example 2 Scientific: New breakthrough scientific discovery on transparent electronics.</p> <p>Economic/Technological: A new market for touch enabled electronic devices.</p>