Information Society Technologies
In the 6th Framework Programme

General staff briefing

Evaluation IST Call 1

24 April 2003

European Commission

Information Society

ist

Stages of evaluation

1. Set-up of evaluation

2. SHAG assignment to Strategic objective

3. Eligibility check

4. Evaluator assignment

5. Experts' individual readings

6. Consensus group

7. Panel meeting

8. Report writing

9. Archiving

10. Last reminders

1. Set-up of evaluation

- Strategic objective coordinators are appointed, one for each Strategic objective (FET = Proactive initiative)

- Each SO coordinator plans a number of panels to evaluate his proposals - by a technical sub-category within the Strategic objective, as a particular instrument or instruments within the SO, or by a combination of the two

- He/she appoints Panel coordinators for each panel

- The Panel breakdown is communicated to Unit 02

- Names of personnel (Coordinators, POs, secretaries) are also communicated to Unit 02 for password set-up in PESS

European Commission

Information Society

ist

2. SHAG assignment

- One "eligibility" copy of each proposal is supplied by the ESP to the Special Handling and Assignment Group

- The SHAG supervisor extracts the pre-printed Acknowledgement of receipt form from the eligibility copy, signs it *pp* and sends it

- The Group agrees each proposal's assignment to <u>one SO only</u> to supervise its evaluation and reporting

- If it is a cross-objective proposal, that SO invites evaluators from the other SOs, proportional to their importance in the proposal

- This can include evaluators from non-open SOs ! (so long as the centre of gravity of the proposal is in open SOs)

- The SHAG supervisor passes the eligibility copy to the SO and enters the SO assignments in the SHAG tool

2. SHAG assignment

- During the evaluation, the SHAG remains in operation, to supervise SO to SO transfers if necessary (Transfer form procedure described in Vademecum)

- The SHAG will also supervise any possible transfers to/from other Priorities

- Transfers from Panel to Panel within a Strategic objective do not involve the SHAG

- Paper copies of all evaluation forms are available in the SHAG office

3. Eligibility check

- The SO coordinator checks that each proposal
  - is complete with a Part A and a Part B
  - arrived before the deadline
  - is in scope for the call
  - is composed of an eligible consortium
- There is no signature check
- There is no anonymity check (except FET Open)
- He/she enters the result of the check on the eligibility form, which is signed when the eligibility check is completed and archived together with the proposal file.

3. Eligibility check

Completeness

- If <u>all</u> of Part A or <u>all</u> of Part B are missing, the proposal is ineligible

- If only <u>some</u> information is missing, the proposal goes to evaluation. If the evaluators find they cannot score a criterion because of missing information, they should score 0 on that criterion

3. Eligibility check

Arrival before deadline

- If ESP indicates in-time arrival - OK

- If ESP indicates late arrival electronically - OK

- If ESP indicates late arrival by post/courier - Check !

- Late arriving proposals do not go to evaluation

- In cases of uncertainty, the proposal will go to evaluation. If it is subsequently found to have arrived late, its evaluation result will be declared null and void

3. Eligibility check

Proposal in scope of call

- A proposal which is clearly out of scope of the call (both in its declared activity codes and its content) will not go to evaluation

- In cases of uncertainty (i.e. the activity code is eligible but the content is dubious) the proposal will go to evaluation. If the evaluators find the centre of gravity of the proposal is in fact not within the call, they should score 1 on the criterion "Relevance"

3. Eligibility check

Consortium composition

- **IP, NOE, STREP, CA** - Two mutually independent organisations from two different MS or candidate states, plus a third from another MS, CS or other Associated state.

- **SSA** - No specific requirement (May even be one partner from a non-Associated state!)

- Not yet associated states (Czech Rep., Israel, Switzerland) are treated as associated for the purposes of the evaluation. Final decision concerning funding and eligibility will be made at the negotiation stage

4. Evaluator assignment

- Panel coordinator selects evaluators from the list of names in EMM (Evaluator Management Module)

- Evaluators not on the list may also be used (the Panel coordinator is responsible for telling them to register in the "Experts" call)

- List of names is forwarded to Director for approval

- List is communicated to Unit 02, who transfer each Panel's selected evaluators to PESS

- Evaluators are assigned to proposals by Panel coordinator using the unit tool

European Commission

Information Society

ist

5. Individual readings

- Evaluator receives whole proposal (no Part B / Part C split)

- Readings are individual, without discussion

- Total score is the arithmetic sum of the criteria scores

- Evaluator completes his form IAR (Individual Assessment Report) on paper form,

- One signed hard copy of IAR retained for archive

- Submission and signature on form IAR closes that stage. No later retrofitting of forms to accommodate changed views

5. Individual readings

DIRECT CONFLICT OF INTEREST (has participated in the preparation of a proposal)

- Send him to another panel, or send him home

- And re-evaluate any proposal he has already evaluated

INDIRECT CONFLICT OF INTEREST (works for an organisation which participates in a proposal, or other reasons)

- Does not participate in the evaluation of proposals in which his organisation participates, or (where possible) competing proposals

- Does not participate in the ranking panel meeting or, if this is impractical, participates only for the other proposals, with his conflict of interest openly declared to the panel

6. Consensus Group

- Evaluators meet in Consensus group with moderating PO (Moderator)

- Proposal rapporteur completes Consensus Report form CR, Consensus Meeting Minute CMM and (if appropriate) Ethical Issues Report form EIR

- All the Consensus group plus the Moderator sign a hard copy of the CR. Only the rapporteur and the Moderator sign the CMM and EIR

- In clear cases, forms can be completed and signed without a formal meeting

European Commission

Information Society

ist

6. Consensus Group

- Panel Coordinator selects consensus group to be expert, well-balanced, free of conflict of interest, free of national self-interest

- The Moderator ensures the consensus meeting is fair, all voices are heard, records are accurate

- The Moderator ensures a consensus, or a clear majority view. Adds evaluators if needed

- Specialist rapporteurs (if used) report the conclusions, they don't supply them*. Nor does the Moderator

- Submission and signature on forms CR, CMM and EIR (if used) closes this stage. No later retrofitting of forms to accommodate changed views

*in exceptional cases, if suitably qualified, the specialist rapporteur may be asked by the Moderator to contribute an opinion

6. Consensus Group

Proposal flagged as containing ethical issues by the Consensus group require special handling

- If the proposal is below threshold anyway, no further action need be taken

- If the proposal is above threshold, one copy must be taken to the SHAG, along with the EIR form of the evaluators.

- The SHAG will arrange a specific ethical review. This is done in parallel with the normal evaluation of the proposal, which does not stop

- The outcome will be a written ethical review

- This review becomes an annex to the ESR of the proposal. It is sent to the proposer with his ESR

7. Panel meeting

Have available for the panel meeting

- For the panel as a whole, one copy of each eligible proposal to be consulted if necessary
- For each evaluator, a complete set of all the CR forms
- Several copies of IST Workprogramme 2003-2004, and any other useful supporting material
- IAR forms, CMM forms and EIR forms should be available for consultation. Information from these can be supplied as required by the panel - no need to copy a full set of all of this material to everybody

7. Panel meeting

Drafting of ESRs

- Panel reviews all the CR forms and drafts an ESR for each proposal, based on the conclusions on the CR form modified as the panel thinks best

- But the CR form does not change!

7. Panel meeting

Prioritisation for above-threshold traditional instruments

- Panel coordinator prepares ordered lists of all above threshold STREP, CA and SSA proposals (separate list per instrument) based on their now-agreed total scores

- Panel prioritises between any proposals with tied scores

- Panel then proceeds to report writing

7. Panel meeting

Hearings for above-threshold new instruments

- Panel adjourns

- Panel coordinator issues hearing invitations to all above-threshold IP and NOE proposals, containing questions agreed in the Consensus groups (with additions by Panel if any)

- The hearing is run on a question and answer basis (<u>not</u> presentation followed by questions)

- Proposers are supported by a limited number of their own PowerPoint slides

7. Panel meeting

Hearings for above-threshold new instruments

- After each hearing, panel agrees contents of Hearing Report form, and then immediately finalises the ESR based on it (HR form and ESR form are completed by the Proposal rapporteur)

- As a result of the hearing, scores on the ESR can go down as well as up!

7. Panel meeting

Prioritisation for new instruments

- After all hearings, the Panel coordinator prepares ordered lists of all above threshold IP and NOE proposals (separate list per instrument) based on their now-agreed total scores

- Panel prioritises between any proposals with tied scores

- Panel then proceeds to report writing

7. Panel meeting

Contents of the ESR

- **If ineligible** - Only an overall remark identifying the reason(s) for ineligibility

- **If below threshold** - Scores and comments on all criteria; <u>a total score</u>; an overall remark only identifying the failed criterion/criteria

- **If above threshold** - Scores and comments on all criteria; a total score; an overall remark identifying any modifications needed in negotiations

European Commission

Information Society

ist

7. Panel meeting

Not on the ESR !

- Criticism on horizontal issues

Do not give a failed proposer the opportunity to complain that his proposal has been rejected on any grounds other than the official evaluation criteria !

- Any reference to the relevance of the instrument to the SO

All SOs are open to all instruments ! Do not give any proposer the impression that he wasted his time and money preparing a proposal you decided in advance to reject *

(*Selection is made in the Implementation Plan, not in the Evaluation report !)

8. Report writing

- Each panel writes a Panel report according to the pre-determined structure. It contains their prioritised list(s)

- Delegates from each panel write the overall Strategic objective report to the pre-determined structure. If merged lists are required, this is done here.

- All ESRs are appended to the SO report, and are covered by the signatures on the Panel reports and SO report

- Unit 02 will prepare the global Evaluation report with introductory texts, summary statistics etc.

9. Archiving

The ESP already has a proposal dossier containing the Proposal Part A and Part B, the Acknowledgement of receipt and the proposal wrapping/envelope

At the end of the evaluation you will also supply them with the <u>originals</u> of:

- The eligibility form

- The IAR forms

- The CR, the CMM (and the EIR form if used)

- The ESR (and the Hearing report form if used)

- Any correspondence with the proposer

- If an ethical review was made, the ethical review report

- Any other relevant material

10. Last reminders

- The evaluation Vademecum is online, If in doubt, consult it !

- The SHAG stays in business throughout the evaluation to tackle any special handling problems

- **No ESRs, no evaluation information of any sort is released until 24 hours after the dispatch of the final Evaluation report to the ISTC**

Information Society

ist