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What is an Executive Agency?

Executive agencies assist the European Commission in the implementation of EU Programmes

No policy-making

Set up for fixed period

Based in Brussels and Luxembourg

Distinction from Regulatory and other decentralised Agencies
Why an Executive Agency?

- Specialisation and focus on Programme Management
- Service-oriented approach
- Close contact with beneficiaries and experts
- Economies of scale & cost savings
- Feedback into policy

Confirmed by an external evaluation of the REA and the ERCEA
### Six Executive Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Executive Agency</th>
<th>In FP7</th>
<th>In H2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research Executive Agency</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Research Council Executive Agency</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; Networks Executive Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Agency for Small &amp; Medium-sized enterprises</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers, Health and Food Executive Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Executive Agency

- Started its operations in 2009; mandate extended in 2013
- Mission:
  - Provide efficient and effective service to clients
  - Ensure tangible impact through research
  - Increase visibility of the EU
- Broad spectrum of clients: applicants, beneficiaries, experts, Commission
- Budget share in Programme management: 12% (FP7) → 18% (H2020)
The REA's activities

Research Programme Implementation

Support services

H2020 implementation

Evaluation support

FP7 legacy management

Participant validation*

Handling of expert evaluators

Horizon 2020 Helpdesk

*For the whole research family and beyond
The REA in H2020 implementation

- Excellent Science
  - FET-Open
  - MSCA

- Industrial Leadership
  - Leadership in industrial technologies
  - Space

- Societal Challenges
  - Food
  - Europe in changing world
  - Inclusive, Innovative and Reflective Societies
  - Security

Specific objectives: Spreading Excellence & Widening Participation
Science with and for Society
The REA's extended mandate for support services

Evaluation support
- Call planning
- Call publication
- Planning of the use of facilities
- Logistical support at evaluations
- Handling of expert evaluators
  - Experts contracting
  - Experts payments

Participant validation*
- Validation of the legal existence
- Validation of specific status
- Financial Viability Check

Horizon 2020 Helpdesk
- Handling questions on EU-funded research, projects, proposals & calls

*For the whole research family and beyond
The REA's extended Commission family

DG RTD  DG EAC  DG CNECT
DG AGRI  DG ENTR  DG HOME

* Projected setup under the new Commission 2014-2019
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## Evaluation outcome of SC2 calls in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1*</th>
<th>To Stage 2*</th>
<th>Funded*</th>
<th>Success rate*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Growth</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative, Sustainable and Inclusive Bioeconomy</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* RIA and IA only
### Evaluation outcome of SC2 calls in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Submitted proposals</th>
<th>Retained proposals</th>
<th>Success rate</th>
<th>EU budget Million €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Food Security</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Growth</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative, Sustainable and Inclusive Bioeconomy</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key figures on retained proposals in 2014

Participants by country - EU and AC
Draft work programmes available


Draft work programmes 2016-17

On this page you will find draft versions of the Horizon 2020 work programmes for 2016-2017. These documents are being made public just before the adoption process of the work programme to provide potential participants with the currently expected main lines of the work programme 2016-2017. They are not yet endorsed by the Commission and they do not in any way prejudge the final decision of the Commission.

The adoption and the publication of the work programme by the Commission are expected in mid-October 2015. Only the adopted work programme will have legal value.

This adoption will be announced on the Horizon 2020 website and on the Participant Portal.

- 02. FET 2016-2017
- 03. MSCA 2016-2017
- 04. Infrastructures 2016-2017
- 05. LEIT Introduction 2016-2017
- 05i. LEIT-ICT 2016-2017
- 05ii. LEIT-NMBP 2016-2017
- 05iii. LEIT-Space 2016-2017
- 08. SC1-Health 2016-2017
- 09. SC2-Food 2016-2017
- 10. SC3-Energy 2016-2017
- 11. SC4-Transport 2016-2017
- 12. SC5-Climate Action 2016-2017
- 13. SC6-Inclusive Societies 2016-2017
- 14. SC7-Secure Societies 2016-2017
- 16. SWAFS 2016-2017
- 17. Cross-Cutting Activities 2016-2017
2016-2017 work programme – Rule of 4

Horizon 2020 Societal Challenge 2 – Work Programme 2016-2017

4 challenges

1. Increase by 60% our global agricultural production to feed 9 billion people by 2050
2. Ensure global food nutrition & security by more resilient & resource efficient primary production and industry
3. Unlock the potential of seas which cover 70% of the earth’s surface & host 50% of known species
4. Foster innovation in rural areas which account 55% of jobs in EU & 46% of the Gross Added Value

4 objectives

1. Sustainable food security €406M
2. Blue Growth €127M
3. Rural renaissance €124M
4. Bio-based innovation for sustainable goods and services €27M

4 calls

1. Resource-efficient value chains, climate smart primary production, competitive agro-food industry, healthy/safe food & diets
2. Innovation for emerging Blue growth activities, healthy oceans for healthy people
3. New governance, new value chains and business models, rural innovation and skills
4. Sustainable biomass supply, biobased markets of the future

4 deliverables

1. Boost bio-based market to create over 3% growth / year in this sector & 90,000 new jobs
2. Re-industrialise EU through new bio-based value-chains, securing sustainable biomass
3. Foster innovation in rural areas which account 55% of jobs in EU & 46% of the Gross Added Value
4. Unlock the potential of seas which cover 70% of the earth’s surface & host 50% of known species
Evaluation process for each call

Max. 5 months

Receipt of proposals
- Eligibility/admissibility check
- Allocation of proposals to evaluators

Individual evaluation
- Individual Evaluation Reports
  (Usually done remotely)

Consensus group
- Consensus Report
  (May be done remotely)

Panel Review
- Panel report
- Evaluation Summary Report
- Panel ranked list

Finalisation
- Final ranked list composed and information sent to applicants
REA's Role

Call Coordinator:

- Planning
- Coordination with parent DGs and Agencies
- Expert selection
- Responsibility for the whole evaluation exercise
  - Eligibility – Admissibility
  - Evaluation Reports
  - Letters to applicants
  - Evaluation Review
Eligible proposal

Individual Evaluation Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Individual Evaluation Report

Consensus group

Minimum 3 experts ...
but can be more

Individual evaluation

Consensus

Panel meeting

Consensus Report

Rapporteur

Evaluation Summary Report
Evaluation criteria

RIA, IA, SME instrument

Excellence
- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology
- Extent that proposed work is beyond the state of the art and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models).
- Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge.

Impact
- The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;
- Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity; create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society.
- Quality of the proposed measures to: (i) Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant. (ii) Communicate the project activities to different target audiences

Implementation
- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management.
- Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role
Scores

The proposal **fails** to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

**Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

**Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

**Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

**Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

**Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.
Thresholds apply to individual criteria...

- The default threshold is 3 (unless specified otherwise in the WP)
- And the default overall threshold is 10 (unless specified otherwise in the WP)

For Innovation actions and the SME instrument, the criterion Impact is given a weight of 1.5 to determine the ranking

For first stage of a two-stage procedure

- Only evaluate the criteria Excellence and (part of) Impact
- Default threshold for individual criteria is 4 (unless specified otherwise in the WP)
- Default overall threshold is 8 (unless specified otherwise in the WP)
A maximum TTG of 8 months

5 months
for informing all applicants on scientific evaluation

3 months
for signature of GA
## 2016 evaluation timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Single stage topics</th>
<th>Two-stages topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadline:</strong> 17/02/2016</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> short proposal: 17/02/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remote evaluation:</strong> March 2016</td>
<td>Remote evaluation: March-April 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-site evaluation:</strong> April 2016</td>
<td><strong>Info to applicants:</strong> May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Info to applicants:</strong> by 17/07/2016</td>
<td><strong>Deadline</strong> full proposal: 13/09/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First GA signed:</strong> October 2016</td>
<td>Remote evaluation: September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>On-site evaluation:</strong> October 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Info to applicants:</strong> by 13/02/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>First GA signed:</strong> May 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What does this mean for the evaluation of proposal?

– Experts evaluate each proposal as submitted not on its potential if certain changes were to be made

– Shortcomings (other than minor ones and obvious clerical errors), are reflected in a lower score for the relevant criterion

– Proposals with significant weaknesses that prevent the project from achieving its objectives or with resources being seriously over-estimated will not receive above-threshold scores

– Any proposal with scores above the thresholds and for which there is sufficient budget will be selected as submitted
Tips to write good proposals

• Start in time
• Check for eligibility
• Respect the page limits
• Be concise, less can be more
• Excellent science is not enough: consider all the criteria
• Consider sub-criteria
Tips to write good proposals

• No guide for applicants, instructions are in the forms

• However, useful info available on Participant Portal

• Equal score priority
  • Coverage of WP
  • Criteria
    • Excellence>impact>implementation (RIA & CSA)
    • Impact>Excellence (SME, IA)
  • Highest SME funding goes first
  • Gender

• Get impartial colleagues to read it before

• Check consistency between Part A and Part B
After the evaluation...

- Information is sent to applicants within 5 months from call deadline: trigger for Grant Agreement Preparation phase
- 3 months available until the signature of the Grant Agreement
- Close interaction with beneficiaries:
  - Minor modifications in content, only if necessary
  - Administrative procedure (e.g., validations, financial viability check, if needed) with minimised administrative burden for applicants and high reliance on electronic submissions
- Internal procedure: award decision, budgetary commitment
- Grant Agreement signature
- Pre-financing to consortium
Thank you for your attention
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