THE FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

HORIZON 2020

Tips for proposers

Cécile Huet, PhD
Deputy Head of Unit A1
Robotics & AI
European Commission

What are you looking for?

- ***MAXIMISE IMPACT*** *OF PROGRAMME on R & D & I*
- *INCREASED VISIBILITY OF EUROPEAN FUNDING*
- *IMPROVE THE EXPLOITATION OF SCIENTIFIC & TECHNOLOGICAL RESULTS*
- *STRONGER INDUSTRY/USER PARTICIPATION & COMMITMENT*

TIPS FOR PROPOSERS: DO & DON'T

What works 1	What fails
Ambitious yet realistic objectives	Describing numerous diverse goals without clarifying how they tie together
Target the **Call**	→ Using keywords from the call, rather than more specific terminology in line with the specific intent → Re-submission from other challenges artificially re-shaped for this challenge

What works 2	What fails
Follow-up: explain clearly the new added-value.	Mere continuation of an existing project
Partial or full resubmissions of previously rejected proposals are allowed, and treated like all other (new) proposals – but need to be adapted to current call	Not taking into account comments from previous Evaluation Summary Report Resubmitted to a different call without adaptation

What works 3	What fails
Precise position with respect to the **State-of-the-Art** (literature/funded projects) ▪ Where it stands ▪ How it will be advanced	➔Lack of discussion of SoA ➔Promising something too far beyond SoA, or already done ➔Proposing a large effort on literature survey within the project
Justify the specificity / contribution in the "FP7-H2020 landscape" ▪ Situate the proposal in reference to ongoing projects ▪ Build on them ▪ Identify potential synergies and/or possible cooperation ▪ Identify gaps	Apparent "Double funding"

What works 4	What fails
Convincing description of methodology: make clear what you want to do and **HOW**	Insufficient description of methodology, proposals tell WHAT they want to do but not **HOW**
Be honest when the way forward is not clear, don’t deny or underestimate difficulties	Believing that the evaluators won't notice that you don’t know how to proceed

What works 5	What fails
Clearly specified **success criteria** ▪ Milestones/expected functionalities/benchmarks/metrics	Vague promises to solve all the open issues
Need for integration well taken into account - concrete mechanisms: integration weeks, exchange of staff, etc.	Underestimated integration
➔Spell out the management risks and the specific technological risks in a realistic and concrete way. ➔Provide a credible contingency plan.	Claiming that a research project is almost risk-free.

What works 6	What fails
Bring the right partners on board from the start One single rule: three mutually independent partners from three different Member States or participating countries.	Artificial Add-on: ▪ Attempt at "Good geographical coverage" ▪ Un-manageable / inefficient project with large number of partners ▪ Consultant for administration / finance only without proven cost efficient/ added value ▪ Dissemination delegated to partner without any experience with specifics of the field

What works 7	What fails
➔3 possible motives for industrial participation: ▪ Involvement of R&D departments ▪ Providing platforms ▪ Enabling validation scenarios ➔Demonstrated commitment to the project ➔Genuine interest in the project outcome	Industry artificially-added with no clear role / added value or no clear commitment to the project

What works 8	What fails
CVs of key PIs and references to most relevant publications	➔Missing CVs of key PIs or references to most relevant publications ➔"Big names" without any real involvement
Match the human resources and management to the proposal needs	➔Over or under-estimation of the budget ➔Management too complex or too generic

What works 9	What fails
Creative dissemination of results: ▪ Potential impact for the EU ▪ Use of modern media, social networks, summer schools…	Dissemination too restrictive or generic
Explain the expected concrete impact: ▪ On S&T ▪ On business & society…	Description of the impact vague & generic

Don't

- *Improvise:*
  - *If you are a scientist – don't draft the exploitation plan*
  - *If you are an engineer, don't invent the problems, consult the users!*
  - *You are a scientist/Engineer, don't spend your time improvising the role of communication expert – collaborate with them -> Instead, exploit the expertise of people: use them where they are the best at*

Myths

- *You need a partner from East West North South*
- *You need an SME*
- *You need a consulting company*
- *You cannot have a partner with more than 30% of the budget*
- *A follow-up project gives you advantage*
- *Declaring a re-submission is a bad thing*

Tips

- *Read the call text*
- *Read the background document*
- *Attend the specific brokerage event/infoday for the topic you plan to submit too*
- *70 pages **(including references)** is plenty provided you go to the point, and avoid repetition*

Most common mistakes

- *Explain the **what** but **not the how***
- *Explain the **SoA** but do not **differentiate** from that*
- *Bring a partner that "**look good**", without clear added value*
- *Don't explain the **interdependencies** between WP/tasks*
- *Lack **concreteness***
- ***Improvised Exploitation plan/Business case***
- *Does not DEMONSTRATE the requested **expertise***
- ***Lacking** or (excessive) **overlapping** expertise*

Horizon 2020 – Proposal content

- *A short grant preparation phase – No negotiation → proposal = final project work plan, not a sales brochure*
- *The maturity, specificity and completeness of the work plan will be taken into account at the evaluation stage → weaknesses will be penalised*

Horizon 2020 – Proposal content

- *Risk assessment*
  - Both project management risks and content
  - Credible contingency plan
- *Workpackages description*
  - Measurable Objectives
  - Reflected in the tasks descriptions and deliverables.
  - Self-Assessment of progress and results
  - Interdependencies between tasks
  - Partners contributions to tasks
- *Deliverables and milestones*
  - Keep the list compact + clear description
  - Specify major milestones + corresponding measurable objectives + means of verification

Ethics Review

- *Goal: check:*
  - *compliance with ethical rules and std (National, EU, Intl)*
  - *authorizations and ethics approvals*
  - *proportionality of the research methods*
  - *applicants' awareness of the ethical aspects and social impact*
- *Outcome: If ethics requirements → contractual obligations*

Important points note

- *Impact*
  - *Assess the expected impact given the whole package: the objectives, approach, work plan, consortium, dissemination & exploitation activities, etc. – i.e., what can be realistically achieved within the timeframe of the project*

- *Value for money is an important factor*

Expected impact →check AGAINST WP TEXT

- *No single proposal is expected to address the whole list*
- *Check whether the proposal is **concrete and specific** about what the project results would **achieve** in the areas described in the Work Programme (section "Expected Impact"), during the project lifetime and beyond*
- *Which concrete actions will be carried out **during** the project to **achieve such impact***
- *Do the proposers stress their (**competitive**) **positioning** / technical advantage in possible future markets or applications?*
- *Assess the **need for industry participation** and provide evidence of their **commitment***

Measures to maximise impact – exploitation of results

- *Should be well **thought-out** and properly **resourced***
- *Involves people with the right **expertise** (for technology transfer, patents etc.)*

Measures to maximise impact – exploitation of results

- *Exploitation mechanisms – for example:*
  - Analysis of current **market**
  - Management of the **IPR**
  - Analysis of existing **patents** – plans for patenting
  - **Credible business plan or business case** clearly defined and sufficiently detailed
  - Also projects with a **more scientific** approach have to make clear what the **eventual exploitation** outcomes and **impact** will be.

Exploitation plan - Crucial

- *Concrete exploitation strategy:*
  - *potential exploitable results*
  - *target users*
  - *mechanism planned DURING the project for attracting them*
  - *credible business case (as appropriate)*
  - *involvement of people with the right expertise (for technology transfer, patents etc.) is highly encouraged where appropriate*
  - *projects closer to innovation: describe the path towards exploitation (at partner level & project level).*

Role of industries and end users

- ***Industry*** *has a far* ***greater role*** *to play in R&I than before. Involvement of industry as* ***manufacturers****, system* ***suppliers****,* ***integrators*** *or* ***users*** *is welcome, as appropriate, depending on the needs of the project and on the technology readiness level addressed.*
- *The involvement of* ***end users*** *in projects is* ***encouraged****. In some projects, such as* ***Use Cases****, and* ***Pre-commercial Procurement*** *it is a* ***must****.*

Dissemination/exploitation

- *If industrial dimensions -> not necessary to make all deliverables public. In that case, **justify why** and describe the plans to protect and exploit such results.*
- *H2020 rules on IPR assure that "Ownership of background is not affected by participation in a H2020 project", and "Results are owned by the beneficiary that generates them. "*
- *BUT DISSEMINATION -> DEMONSTRATE IMPACT OF THE FUNDING*

Measures to maximise impact – dissemination of results

- ***Concrete*** *dissemination plan, scientific and non-scientific, with a coherent* ***vision****, not just a 'shopping list'*
- *Targeting* ***all types of*** *media channels and audiences (website, press releases, publications, exhibits at fairs, social media),* ***as relevant***

Last but not least

- Nothing artificial:
  - **Number of partners, geographic coverage, budget, types of partners (SMEs,…)**
  - **→ ANY CHOICE DICTATED BY THE PROJECT NEEDS**

- Extremely competitive – Be Outstanding!

THANK YOU!