



Isdefe

su mejor aliado

Jornada Informativa HE clúster 3

La perspectiva del evaluador en el Clúster 3

ISDEFE EN 1 MINUTO


Ingeniería de Sistemas para la Defensa de España, **Isdefe**, somos una Sociedad Mercantil Estatal creada en el año 1985, propiedad del Ministerio de Defensa y medio propio y servicio técnico de la Administración española. Ofrecemos servicios de ingeniería y consultoría a organismos públicos e instituciones nacionales e internacionales, en áreas de interés tecnológico y estratégico.

Nuestros valores


Independencia
Visión Global
Proactividad
Compromiso
Experiencia y Conocimiento

Sectores de actividad y servicios

Proporcionamos servicios de ingeniería y consultoría en los siguientes sectores de actividad:


 **Defensa y Seguridad**

 **Espacio**

 **Transporte**

 **Administraciones Públicas**

 **TIC**

 **Energía**



Standard evaluation process





Admissibility, eligibility checks and additional requirements

Specific conditions for cluster 3

Consortium composition


- Police Authorities, Forensic institutes, Border or Coast Guard Authorities, Customs Authorities, Government authorities, Infrastructure operators, First responders' organisations, Organisations representing citizens or local communities, Organisations representing practitioners, End-user organisations, Organisation representing local or regional authorities, National standardisation organisation, Training Centres , etc

Technology Readiness Levels


Security

- Some activities resulting from some topics may involve using classified background and/or producing of security sensitive results (EUCI and SEN).

Evaluation process



Standard evaluation process



Guiding principles



Confidentiality



ective of their origin

Objectivity

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




Conflicts of interest



addresses



- You apply the same standard of judgment to all proposals





Evaluation criteria (RIAs and IAs)

EXCELLENCE

- ✓ 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, interdisciplinary 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.

IMPACT

- ✓ 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 due to the project.
- ✓ Suitability and quality of the **measures to maximize expected outcomes and impacts**, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

- ✓ Quality and effectiveness of the **work plan**, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.
- ✓ Capacity and role of each **participant**, and extent to which the **consortium** as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.



Evaluation criteria (CSAs)

EXCELLENCE

- ✓ Clarity and pertinence of the **project's objectives**.
- ✓ Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures, including soundness of methodology.

IMPACT

- ✓ 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 due to the project.
- ✓ Suitability and quality of the **measures to maximize expected outcomes and impacts**, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

- ✓ Quality and effectiveness of the **work plan**, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.
- ✓ Capacity and role of each **participant**, and extent to which the **consortium** as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

Assess the project's objectives:

- Are they clear and pertinent to the topic?
- Are they measurable and verifiable?
- Are they realistically achievable?
-
-
-

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other ToAs, in line with the instructions in the specific applications forms.

Assess the scientific methodology:

- Is the scientific methodology (i.e. the concepts, models and assumptions that underpin the work) clear and sound?
- Is it clear how expertise and methods from different disciplines will be brought together and integrated in pursuit of the objectives? if applicants justify that an inter-disciplinary approach is unnecessary, is it credible?
- Has the gender dimension in research and innovation content been properly taken into account?
- Are open science practices implemented as an integral part of the proposed methodology?
- Is the research data management properly addressed?
- For topics indicating the need for the integration of social sciences and humanities, is the role of these disciplines properly addressed?

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other ToAs, in line with the instructions in the specific applications forms.

Assess the proposed pathways towards impact:

Assess the measures to maximise impact –
Dissemination, exploitation and communication :

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other ToAs, in line with the instructions in the specific applications forms.

- Are the proposed dissemination, exploitation and communication measures suitable for the project and of good quality? All measures should be proportionate to the scale of the project, and should contain concrete actions to be implemented both during and after the end of the project.
- Are the target groups (e.g. scientific community, end users, financial actors, public at large) for these measures identified?
- Is the strategy for the management of intellectual property properly outlined and suitable to support exploitation of results?
 - If exploitation is expected primarily in non-associated third countries, is it properly justified how that exploitation is still in the Union's interest?

Application number (researcher)

guidelines, prototypes, demonstrators, databases and datasets, trained researchers, new infrastructures, networks, etc. Most project results (inventions, scientific works, etc.) are 'Intellectual Property', which may, if appropriate, be protected by formal 'Intellectual Property Rights'

European
Commission

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other ToAs, in line with the instructions in the specific applications forms.

Assess the proposed work plan, and the effort and resources:

Assess the quality of participants and the consortium as a whole:
(Note that important information on role of individual participants and previous experience is included in part A of proposal)

Following questions are adapted to RIA and IA type of actions (ToA). Similar questions will be asked for other ToAs, in line with the instructions in the specific applications forms.

- Does the consortium match the project's objectives, and bring together the necessary disciplinary and interdisciplinary knowledge.
- Does the consortium include expertise in open science practices, and gender aspects of R&I, as appropriate?
- For topics flagged as SSH relevant, does the consortium include expertise in social sciences and humanities?
- Do the partners have access to critical infrastructure needed to carry out the project activities?
- Are the participants complementing one another (and cover the value chain, where appropriate)
- In what way does each of them contribute to the project? Does each of them have a valid role, and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role (so they have sufficient operational capacity)?
- Is there industrial/commercial involvement in the project to ensure exploitation of the results?



Gender dimension in R&I content

Gender dimension

Addressing the gender dimension in research and innovation entails taking into account sex and gender in the whole research & innovation process.



Social Sciences and Humanities

Social Sciences and Humanities

Assessing the effective contribution of social science and humanities disciplines and expertise as part of the scientific methodology of the project.



Interpretation of scores

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.

3

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.

25 February 2014

< Hide task details and comments

Task Details

Type	Write IER
Acronym	FIPA
Proposal	604385
Attachments	Part A
Proposal Status	ELIGIBLE
Panel	1.8 (UC)
Deadline	
Task Status	Open
Task Owner	One Expert

Task Comments

Comment	By	When
Adding a comment...		

[Expand / Collapse all criteria](#)

Individual Evaluation Report for a Support Action (CSA-SA) -

[Help](#)

+ Criterion 1 - Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)
Current score: - / 5; Threshold 3

+ Criterion 2 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management
Current score: - / 5; Threshold 3

+ Criterion 3 - Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results
Current score: - / 5; Threshold 3

+ Remarks

+ Ethics issues
Current status:

+ Ethics issues treatment
Current status:

[Expand / Collapse all criteria](#)

[Save](#) [Sign](#)



[Decline](#)

[Print to PDF](#) [Print to DOC](#)

[Go to task list](#)

IER, Individual Evaluation Report

Standard evaluation process



Eligible proposal


Minimum 3 experts ... but can be more

Individual



As a result...



Standard evaluation process



 Standard evaluation process



1. Lee y comprende la convocatoria

Asegúrate de que tu propuesta se alinea perfectamente con los objetivos y los criterios de la convocatoria.

2. Excelencia científica y técnica

Enfoca la propuesta en un problema científico o técnico claro y bien definido. Describe cómo tu propuesta abordará este problema y cuáles serán los resultados esperados.

3. Impacto esperado

Piensa y presenta cómo tu proyecto aportará valor a la sociedad, al sector concreto y a la UE en general. Trata de cuantificar este impacto si es posible.

4. Consorcio equilibrado

Intenta formar un consorcio equilibrado con experiencia complementaria. La experiencia en la temática del proyecto, la capacidad para llevarlo a cabo y la participación geográfica equitativa son aspectos clave a considerar.

5. Claridad y coherencia

Asegúrate de que tu propuesta esté claramente estructurada, sea coherente y fácil de seguir. Recuerda que los evaluadores leerán muchas propuestas, así que procura hacer la suya agradable de leer.

6. Plan de trabajo detallado

Asegúrate de proporcionar un plan de trabajo detallado que incluya roles, responsabilidades, plazos y resultados esperados.

7. Gestión de riesgos

Recuerda, estos son consejos generales y siempre debes referirte a las pautas oficiales y específicas de la convocatoria a la que te estás presentando.

una del proyecto.

9. Presupuesto bien justificado

El presupuesto debe ser claro, bien justificado y coherente con el plan de trabajo.

10. Revisiones y pruebas de lectura

Haz que varias personas lean y revisen tu propuesta.

Es fácil pasar por alto errores cuando se ha trabajado mucho en un documento. Una segunda opinión siempre es útil



Isdefe

su mejor aliado

Raquel Pastor
rpastor@isdefe.es

Isdefe
C/ Beatriz de Bobadilla, 3
28040 Madrid
Tel.: +34 91 411 50 11
Email: general@isdefe.es
www.isdefe.es