

Proposal full title

proposal acronym

December 21, 2015

Abstract

What is this document: a list of the most common questions / metrics that reviewers use for assessing proposals.

How to use this document: the structure of the document (number and names of the sections) follows the H2020 proposal template. If your funding body imposes an other template then first re-adapt this document so that the structure is the same one of the funding body (absolutely don't do something different), and move the questions around accordingly to your template. Then for every section answer to the various questions, being careful to rearrange and tie them together as needed to make the speech fluid.

How is this document structured: the first part contains some questions. The appendix reports instead the definitions of the most important keywords, other generic hints and some evaluation criteria for common funding bodies.

1 Concept and objectives

1.1 Introductory questions

- What is the societal / technological need that one wants to solve? (Make the reader interested!)
- In which context does this need arise?
- Why is it important to solve this need?
- What will solving this need cause, beyond this specific research project?
- Who will use the results?
- What are the impacts?
- Who are the users?
- What are the social effects of project?

1.2 Questions on the concept

- What is the concept of the project?

1.3 Questions on the objectives

- What are the main ideas of this work?
- What are the scientific and technological objectives?
- Are the objectives achievable within the project?

- Are the objectives measurable and verifiable?
- Are the objectives connected with the milestones described below?

2 Progress beyond the state-of-the-art

- What is the previous work that has been done to solve this problem?
- What is the state-of-the-art?
- Why is the previous work and the current state-of-the-art failing solving the problem addressed here?
- What are the proposed advances?

3 Work plan

- How is the project divided into workpackages & milestones? (major sub-divisions with verifiable end-points?)
- Is the workplan following the logical phases of the implementation of the project, with descriptions on how to assess progress and results?
- How are workpackages and milestones interdepending?
- Are the milestones connected with the objectives described above?
- What are the significant risks and associated contingency plans?

3.1 Work Package 1

TODO

4 Participants

- Which profiles do the participants have?
- Which main tasks have been attributed to them?
- Which previous experience relevant to those tasks do the participants have?
- What are the organizational structure and decision-making mechanisms of the project?
- Why are you the applicant? Why not somebody else?
- Why are you the main applicant? Why not somebody else?

5 Implementation

- Which resources are committed?
- Are the resources integrated in a coherent way?
- Is the overall financial plan for the project adequate?
- How much do the equipments cost?
- (if appropriate) Which industrial/commercial involvement will ensure the exploitation of the results?

A Definitions

achievable:

contingency plan:

exploitation:

goal:

impact:

measurable:

milestone:

objective:

participant:

resource:

result:

risk:

user:

verifiable:

workpackage:

workplan:

B General hints

- Use the same terms that are used in the call;
- consider the application also as a way of structuring your research;
- it is very important to write in the application an updated literature review that contains and describes also the projects that have been granted to other groups;
- write in a popular way;
- the objectives should be measurable, and they should be one (preferable), or maximum 2 or 3;
- keep the budget lower the first year, and increase it after;
- be short but not too short;
- think and explicit (if you find some) the couplings between the objectives and the methods;
- think and explicit (if you find some) how the competence and experience of the research group is instrumental for reaching the objectives;
- make the title be a mini abstract.

C H2020 evaluation criteria

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence, i.e.:
 - soundness of the concept, and quality of the objectives;
 - progress beyond the state-of-the-art;
 - quality and effectiveness of the scientific and technological methodology and associated work plan;
2. quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management, i.e.:
 - appropriateness of the management structure and procedures;
 - quality and relevant experience of the individual participants;
 - quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance);
 - appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed;
3. potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results, i.e.:
 - mid-term and long term effects of the innovation at the target level (including possible adverse effects, e.g., on health, environment, economy...).