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• Implementation Part
• Evaluation
• Q&A
1. Excellence
1.1 Objectives and ambition
1.2 Methodology

2. Impact
2.1 Project’s pathways to impact
2.2 Measures to maximise impact Dissemination
   Exploitation and Communication
2.3 Summary

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation
3.1 Work plan and Resources
3.2 Capacity of participants and consortium as a whole
3.1 Work plan and Resources

Content:

• brief presentation of the *overall structure of the work plan*;

• timing of the different work packages and their components (*Gantt* chart or similar);

• graphical presentation of the components showing how they inter-relate (*Pert* chart or similar).

• detailed work description, i.e.:
  
  • a list of work packages (tables 3.1a);
  
  • a description of each work package (table 3.1b);
  
  • a list of deliverables (table 3.1c);
3.1 Work plan – work packages, deliverables and milestones

- Brief presentation of the overall structure of the work plan
- Timing of the different work packages and their components (*Gantt Chart*)
- Graphical presentation of the components showing how they inter-relate (*Pert Chart*)
- Detailed work description
  - A description of each work package (including tasks)
  - A list of work packages A list of major deliverables

![Table 3.1: Work package description]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work package title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short name of participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person months per participant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start month</td>
<td>End month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

**Description of work** (where appropriate, broken down into tasks), lead partner and role of participants

**Deliverables** (brief description and month of delivery)
B3.1 Work plan and Resources (2)

Content:

• a list of milestones (table 3.1d);

• a list of critical risks, relating to project implementation, that the stated project's objectives may not be achieved. Detail any risk mitigation measures. You will be able to update the list of critical risks and mitigation measures as the project progresses (table 3.1e);

• a table showing number of person months required (table 3.1f);

• a table showing description and justification of subcontracting costs for each participant (table 3.1g);

• a table showing justifications for 'purchase costs' (table 3.1h) for participants where those costs exceed 15% of the personnel costs (according to the budget table in proposal part A);

• if applicable, a table showing justifications for ‘other costs categories’ (table 3.1i).
### Tables for section 3.1

#### Table 3.1a: List of work packages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package No</th>
<th>Work Package Title</th>
<th>Participant No</th>
<th>Participant Short Name</th>
<th>Person-Months</th>
<th>Start Month</th>
<th>End Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total person-months**

#### Table 3.1c: List of deliverables

- Only include deliverables that you consider essential for effective project monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable (number)</th>
<th>Deliverable name</th>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>Short name of lead participant</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dissemination level</th>
<th>Delivery date (in months)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**KEY**

Deliverable numbers in order of delivery dates. Please use the numbering convention: [WP<sup>n</sup>]. For example, Deliverable 4.2 would be the second deliverable from work package 4.

**Type**

List one of the following codes:

- W: Work deliverables (excluding the periodic and final report)
- DRA: Demonstration, photo, prototype, plan designs
- DEC: Websites, patents filing, press & media advertisements, etc.
- DAT: Data sets, microdata, etc.
- DEM: Data management plan
- ETHICS: Deliverables related to ethics issues
- SECURITY: Deliverables related to security issues
- OTHER: Software, technical diagrams, equations, models, etc.

**Dissemination level**

List one of the following codes:

- P1: Public, fully open, on-line. Deliverables tagged as public will be automatically published in ECON's project's page
- P2: Confidential, subject to the conditions of the Grant Agreement
- S1: Restricted. Status: further conditions of the Grant Agreement. Classified: C/MAINT, IN RESTRICED under the Commission Decision No 2015/444

#### Table 3.1b: Work package description

For each work package:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work package number</th>
<th>Lead beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participant number**

**Short name of participant**

**Person months per participant:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start month</th>
<th>End month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

**Description of work** (where appropriate, broken down into tasks), lead partner and role of participants

**Deliverables** (brief description and month of delivery)

---

Example, not to complete
3.2 Capacity of participants and consortium as a whole (1)

- **Describe the consortium.** Show how this includes expertise in social sciences and humanities, open science practices, and gender aspects of R&I, as appropriate. Include in the description affiliated entities and associated partners.

- **Show how the partners will have access to critical infrastructure needed to carry out the project activities.**

- **Describe how the members complement one another** (and cover the value chain, where appropriate).

- **In what way does each of them contribute to the project?** Show that each has a valid role, and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.
3.2 Capacity of participants and consortium as a whole (2)

- **Other countries and international organisations**: If one or more of the participants requesting EU funding is based in a country or is an international organisation that is not automatically eligible for such funding (entities from Member States of the EU, from Associated Countries and from one of the countries in the exhaustive list included in the Work Programme General Annexes B are automatically eligible for EU funding), **explain why the participation of the entity in question is essential to successfully carry out the project.**
HORIZON EUROPE

• Evaluation
What evaluators of Horizon EUROPE proposals are looking for

The evaluators pay particular attention to:

- Expected impacts described for the topic of the project
- Key performance indicators (KPIs) including target values
- Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge
- Strengthening competitiveness and growth of industrial partners by developing and delivering innovations meeting market needs
- Other environmental or social impacts...

They evaluate effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project...
Evaluation (award) criteria

Same criteria as in H2020

Same three award criteria: ‘Excellence’, ‘Impact’ and ‘Quality and efficiency of the implementation’. (Excellence only for ERC proposals)

Adapted following lessons learnt

- The number of ‘aspects to be taken into account’ have been reduced, ensuring that the same aspect is not assessed twice
- **Open Science** practices assessed as part of the scientific methodology in the excellence criterion
- **New approach to impact**: Key Impacts Pathways (KIPs)
- The assessment of the **quality of applicants** is assessed under ‘implementation’, rather than as a separate binary assessment of operational capacity
- Assessment of **management structures** has been removed.
There are three evaluation criteria for full proposals:

| EXELLENCE | IMPACT | IMPLEMENTATION |

The eligibility criteria are also set out in the call conditions on the Topic page.
What else you need to know about the evaluation process

- The European Commission organises the evaluation and moderates the process.

- Independent observers check the functioning and running of the overall process and advise, in their report, on the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions and, if necessary, suggest possible improvements.

- An ethics review takes place for proposals above threshold and considered for funding. Only proposals that comply with the ethical principles and legislation may receive funding.
Overview of the evaluation process

- Eligibility check
- Allocation of proposals to evaluators

- Individual Evaluation Reports
  - (Usually done remotely)

- Consensus Report
  - (May be done remotely)

- Panel Report
  - Evaluation Summary Report
  - Panel ranked list

- Final ranked list
Evaluation scores

• 0: Proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information

1: **Poor** – criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses

2: **Fair** – proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses

3: **Good** – proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present

4: **Very good** – proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present

5: **Excellent** – proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor
Thank you!
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