

FREQUENT ERRORS IDENTIFIED IN PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED ON THEME 6 – ENVIRONMENT (INCLUDING CLIMATE CHANGE) AND THEME 3 – INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGIES OF THE 7TH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME OF EUROPEAN UNION

Doina Banciu

National R&D Institute for Informatics
doina.banciu@ici.ro

Viorel Vulturescu

University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu,
viorel.vulturescu@gmail.ro

Nicoleta Dumitrache

University Lucian Blaga of Sibiu
nicoleta.dumitrache@uefiscdi.ro

Daniela Vasile

National Authority for Scientific Research,
daniela.vasile@ancs.ro

Abstract: Within this study it has been identified the frequent errors of consortia who submitted project proposal, in response to the 7th Framework Programme for research and development, theme 6 – Environment (including climate changes) and theme 3 – Information and Communication Technologies. The analysis was performed on more than 450 Evaluation Summary reports, on each evaluation criteria, according to the evaluation ranking of collaborative projects, specified in Rules of Participation to FP 7. The frequent errors were grouped in the following categories: *deluxe* for those project proposals marked between 4 – 5 points and with a total score between 12 and 15, *welldone* – for those project proposals marked between 3,5 – 4,5 points and with a total score between 10,5 and 12, *good* – for those project proposals marked between 3 – 4 points and with a total score between 9,5 and 10,5, *medium* - for those project proposals marked between 2,5 – 3,0 points and with a total score between 9,0 and 9,5, *weak* - for those project proposals marked between 2,5 – 3,5 points and with a total score between 7 and 9, and *garbage* - for those project proposals marked between 1 – 3,5 points and with a total score less than 7 points.

This analysis led us to the conclusion that the errors made by those about 500 consortia who submitted project proposals to the 7th Framework Programme are not dependant on the scientific domain or topic but relates to the writing technique and the consortia that will implement that project in the case that it would be approved by the European Commission. Also, the analysis was used to build up the web platform for project proposal writing and to the pre-screening tool aimed to support the National Contact Points supporting coordinators who submit project proposals in response to call for proposal that will be later opened within the 7th Framework Program.

Key words: frequent errors, projects, research, 7th framework programme, national contact points

Rezumat: Prezentul studiu analizează erorile frecvente ale consorțiilor ce au depus propuneri de proiecte în cadrul Programului Cadru 7 de cercetare al Uniunii Europene, tema nr. 6 - Mediu (inclusiv schimbări globale) –ENV și tema nr. 3 – tehnologiile Comunicațiilor și Informației (ICT) apelurile pentru propuneri din anul 2008. Analiza s-a efectuat pe mai mult de 450 de Evaluation Summary Reports, pentru fiecare criteriu de evaluare, conform grilei de evaluare a propunerilor de proiecte colaborative specificată în regulile de participare la Programul Cadru 7. Erorile comune au fost clasificate în categoriile *deluxe*, pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 4-5 și punctaj total între 12,0 și 15,0; *welldone* - pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 3,5 și 4,5 și punctaj total între 10,5 și 12,0; *good* - pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 3,0 și 4,0 și punctaj total între 9,5 și 10,5; *medium* - pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 2,5 și 3,0 și punctaj total între 9 și 9,5; *weak* pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 2,5 și 3,5 și punctaj total între 7 și 9; *garbage* - pentru acele propuneri de proiecte ce au obținut punctaj între 1 și 3,5 și punctaj total sub 7 puncte.

Prezenta analiză a condus la concluzia că erorile făcute de cele aproape 500 de consorții care au depus propuneri de proiecte la Programul Cadru 7 de cercetare al Uniunii Europene nu depind de domeniul științific sau topica pentru care au fost depuse ci țin strict de tehnica de redactare a proiectului și constituirea consorțiului care va derula acel proiect, în cazul în care acesta ar fi aprobat și finanțat de Comisia Europeană. De asemenea, analiza a fost utilizată la construcția platformei web de redactare a propunerilor de proiecte FP 7 și la pre-screening tool-ului destinat utilizării de către Punctele Naționale de Contact în sprijinirea coordonatorilor ce au depus de propuneri de proiecte în apelurile ulterioare deschise în cadrul Programului Cadru 7.

Cuvinte cheie: erori frecvente, proiecte, cercetare, Programul Cadru 7, Puncte Naționale de Contact

1. Introduction

The EU Framework Programme is the most important pan-European cooperation platform by which the European Commission implements its R&D policies. The first Framework

Programme was carried out within 1994-1998¹ having a tiny budget². The importance of Framework Programmes is indisputable, a contribution of approx. 7 billion EUR for research generating an increase of 200 billion EUR / year in European GDP³

Romania is participating to the Framework Programs since 1994 (FP 4 at that time). Funding for Romanian participants was available only if they participate with „International Cooperation” specific program. (Cooperation with third countries and international organisations⁴). Nevertheless, Romanian participation was also possible in other specific programs but Romanian participants could participate only if they fund their activities by themselves (which was in very rare cases).

In its way towards a full EU membership, one of the conditions requested in order to close negotiations for chapter 17 – science and research, was participation to the Framework Programs in the same conditions with EU member states. Therefore in the first semester of 2000, during the Portuguese chairmanship, Romania opened and provisionally closed 5 chapters: 16 - Small and medium enterprises, 17 – science and research, 18 – education, professional training and youth, 26 – foreign affairs, 27 – Foreign policy and common security⁵. Within this context, starting with the 5th Framework Program, Romanian participants had the same rights and obligations as their homologues from any EU member states, while Romania had some payment facilities to the FP 5 budget. 1997 (just before the start of FP 5) and 1998 were 2 important years when all Programs and pan-European frameworks for science and technology cooperation (EUREKA and COST) were opened for research organisations, universities and companies from Romania⁶, The legal framework (contribution payment and support for Romanian participants) was set during 1999, 1 year after the start of FP 5⁷. Regarding FP 6, the main legal act which set the participation to FP 6 and supported Romanian participants was the Governmental Decision nr. 368 of 2 April 2003⁸.

7th Framework Program started in 2007,⁹ and for the first time in EU its duration is 7 years instead of 4 like its predecessors with a structure of 4 specific programs: Cooperation, Ideas, People, Capacities. The specific Program “Cooperation” has the following themes: (1) Health, (2) Food Agriculture and Fisheries and biotechnologies - KBBE, (3) Information and Communication Technologies – ICT (4) Nanosciences, nanotechnologies, materials and new production technologies - NMP, (5) Energy, (6) Environment (including climate change) - ENV, (7) Transport (including Aeronautics), (8) Socio-economic and humanistic sciences - SSH, (9) Space, (10) Security - SEC¹⁰.

2. Methodology

The analysis on frequent errors is made by consortia who submitted project proposals in response to call for proposals launched under ENV and ICT (e-health) themes on more than 480 Evaluation Summary Reports (ESR) written down by panels of independent evaluators. The

¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Framework_Programmes_for_Research_and_Technological_Development#cite_note-0

² http://ec.europa.eu/research/rtdinfo/special_fp7/fp7/01/article_fp709_en.html

³ Muldur, U., et al., “A New Deal for an Effective European Research Policy,” Springer 2006 ISBN 978-1-4020-5550-8

⁴ <http://ec.europa.eu/research/intco/intco2.html>

⁵ http://www.sgg.ro/docs/File/integrare_eu/NegociereRO.pdf

⁶ Ordinance nr. 5 / 20.01.1998 on participation of Romania to Declaration of Hanover on 6 noiembrie 1985, regarding the EUREKA initiative, Governmental Decision nr. 164/05.05.1997 on stimulation of Romanian participation to EUREKA published in Official Journal nr. 83/07.05.1997, Law on Romania’s participation to the general resolution of European ministers of research Bruxelles, 22-23 November 1971, on European cooperation in science and technology COST, published in Official Journal nr. 37/29.01.1998

⁷ Governmental Decision nr. 1043 / 17.12.1999 regarding the approval of payment of Romanian contribution to Framework Programme 5’ budget and Framework Programme 5 Euratom’s budget as well as approval of financial support for Romanian participants, published in Official Journal nr. 635 / 27.12.1999

⁸ Governmental Decision nr. 368 / 2 April 2003, regarding the approval of payment of Romanian contribution to Framework Programme 5’ budget and Framework Programme 5 Euratom’s budget (Euratom), as well as approval of financial support for Romanian participants, including measures for stimulation of their participation, published in Official Journal nr. 238 of 8 April 2003

⁹ Decision No 1982/2006/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 concerning the Seventh Framework Programme of the European Community for research, technological development and demonstration activities (2007-2013), Official Journal of the European Union, L 412/1, 30 December 2006

¹⁰ According to Art. 2, alin. 1. al of Decision Nr. 1982/2006/EC

analysis for theme 6 – Environment (including global changes) was made as an activity within workpackage 6 (WP 3) of „Environmental NCP cooperating to improve their effectiveness” acronym ENV-NCP-TOGETHER, funded by Directorate General Research, Grant Agreement-ul 212494, coordinated by the National Authority for Scientific Research, by dl. Viorel Vulturescu¹¹. For theme 3 – ICT (e-health), the analysis was made using the same methodology as for theme 6 but not within ENV-NCP-TOGETHER.

Each ESR was analysed and it was set a table where all comments of the evaluator were collected (important errors found).

No.	Activity Code	Funding Scheme	Proposal Number:	Acronym	1st Criterion	Mark1	2nd Criterion	Mark2	3rd Criterion	Mark3	Total	Qualifier
-----	---------------	----------------	------------------	---------	---------------	-------	---------------	-------	---------------	-------	-------	-----------

The meaning of each column is¹²:

- No: Number of the assessed ESR
- Activity Code: The activity code mentioned in the work program of theme 6 – ENV call FP 7 – ENV- 2008 - 1¹³, respectively theme 3 - ICT
- Funding Scheme: Type of project, respectively Collaborative project (large or small and medium size), CSA (Collaborative and Support Action),
- Proposal Number: (number given by the EC when the project proposal was submitted) using E.P.S.S.¹⁴
- Acronym: Proposal acronym
- 1st criterion – 1st evaluation criterion
- Mark 1 – number of points received for the 1st criterion
- 2nd criterion – 2nd evaluation criterion
- Mark 2 - number of points received for the 2nd criterion
- 3rd criterion – 3rd evaluation criterion
- Mark 3 - number of points received for the 3rd criterion
- Total – the overall mark granted to the project proposal
- Qualifier – category under which the project proposal falls (deluxe, welldone, good, medium, weak, garbage)

Qualifiers granted to a project proposals were given based on the following criteria:

- *deluxe* for those project proposals marked between 4 – 5 points and with a total score between 12 and 15,
- *welldone* – for those project proposals marked between 3,5 – 4,5 points and with a total score between 10,5 and 12,
- *good* – for those project proposals marked between 3 – 4 points and with a total score between 9,5 and 10,5,
- *medium* - for those project proposals marked between 2,5 – 3,0 points and with a total score between 9,0 and 9,5,
- *weak* - for those project proposals marked between 2,5 – 3,5 points and with a total score between 7 and 9, and
- *garbage* - for those project proposals marked between 1 – 3,5 points and with a total score less than 7 points.

¹¹ <http://www.env-ncp-together.eu/>

¹² On confidentiality reasons it will not be published errors and data from each project proposals or data that will make the project proposal identifiable but only conclusions, statistics for all ESR and authors comments

¹³ European Commission C(2007)5765 of 29 November 2007

¹⁴ EPSS – Electronic Proposal Submission System

3. Results and Discussions

Following the analysis, the following data and information were obtained:

	Category	% of total
PASSED ALL TRESHOLDS ≥ 4	DELUXE	24.81
PASSED ALL TRESHOLDS ≥ 3.5	WELLDONE	19.30
PASSED ALL TRESHOLDS ≥ 3	GOOD	22.06
FAILED ONE TRESHOLD	MEDIUM	16.29
FAILED TWO TRESHOLDS	WEAK	7.77
FAILED ALL TRESHOLDS	GARBAGE	9.77
TOTAL		100.00

Based on the above mentioned methodology, the following errors were identified:

Theme 6 - ENV

Category DELUXE

	1 st criterion	2 nd criterion	3 rd criterion
1	the work plan and work packages should be revised because either their description is not clear or they present some weak points	allocation of the budget raises some concern and need to be revised, to be detailed or amounts to be shifted between tasks	impact is limited either because of the lack of information provided in the project or because of the methodology used
2	technological issues should be better explained and revised before submitting the proposals	budget is often over dimensioned and needs adjustments and to be reduced sometimes	IPR issue is either missing or weak
3	some of the methodological issues need to be clarified and detailed	management structure need to be detailed	management need to be revised,
4	innovation is rather limited (in methodology, in technology used or in the solution of the project)	the allocation of the resources need to be revised, justified, detailed	dissemination plan need to be revised, clarified, detailed or it presents low level of novelty, or the resources for this activity should be increased
5	deliverables should be detailed	the consortium is unbalanced either geographically or technically	contingency plan is either not included or not addressed properly
6	the case studies should be better presented	the duration of the project need to be revised	it is sometimes not clear which stakeholders are targeted or their involvement should come at an earlier stage
7	some environmental issues should be better addressed and explained	the role of the advisory board should be clarified	the objectives are not presented in a clear manner and this may limit the expected impact
8	socio-economical and ethical issues are not well described	the management budget need to be reduced	communication strategy need to be revised since interaction between modules are not specified properly

			and more detail is needed
9	the references or the literature is rather limited or missing	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)	
10	the allocation of resources need to be revised (either too low or too high the number of person-months)	lack of specialised partners	
11	lack of contingency plan / risk analysis		
12	the strength between the objectives and the tasks are too low or need to be clarified		

Category WELL DONE

	1 st criterion	2 nd criterion	3 rd criterion
1	the work plan and work packages should be revised because either their description is not clear or they present some weak points, the timing need also to be detailed	allocation of the budget raises some concern and need to be revised, to be detailed or amounts to be shifted between tasks	impact is limited either because of the lack of information provided in the project or because of the methodology used
2	technological issues should be better explained and revised before submitting the proposals	budget is often over dimensioned and needs adjustments and to be reduced sometimes; it is also poor described, detailed or not well allocated amongst partners	IPR issue is either missing or weak
3	some of the methodological issues need to be clarified and detailed	management structure need to be detailed; management work package is missing	some tasks of the proposal lacks detail, clarity and credibility
4	innovation is rather limited (in methodology, in technology used or in the solution of the project)	the allocation of the resources need to be revised, justified, detailed; it is often imbalanced and contain some inconsistencies	dissemination plan need to be revised, clarified, detailed or it presents low level of novelty, or the resources for this activity should be increased
5	deliverables should be detailed	the consortium is unbalanced either geographically or technically; it is either too small or too large; there is concern about the roles identified for some partners within the consortium	contingency plan is either not included or not addressed properly
6	the case studies should be better presented	the duration of the project need to be revised	it is sometimes not clear which stakeholders are targeted or their involvement should come at an earlier stage
7	some environmental issues should be better addressed and explained	an advisory board is required or the role of this should be clarified or detailed	the objectives are not presented in a clear manner and this may limit the expected impact

8	socio-economical and ethical issues are not well described	the management costs should be better justified, it is high in many proposals	communication strategy need to be revised since interaction between modules are not specified properly and more detail is needed
9	the references or the literature is rather limited or missing	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)	end user community is missing or its involvement is not demonstrated
10	the allocation of resources need to be revised (either too low or too high the number of person-months)	lack of specialised partners, of expertise and experience	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)
11	risk assessment and contingency plan are missing	the consortium lacks integration (of the components, of the results)	technical, technological and methodological issues need to be detailed
12	the strength between the objectives and the tasks are too low or need to be clarified	work plan and work packages need to be detailed	
13	more detail required in WPs, in methodology, in tasks	SME are not sufficiently presented in the consortium	
14	sustainability assessment is not well described	the consortium could be improved by including few partners from different regions of Europe	
15	objective is not clear defined		
16	interaction between WP is not enough elaborated		
17	models proposed are not clear presented		
18	strategy should be clarified and the state-of-the-art is not properly covered		

Category GOOD

	1st Criteria	2nd Criteria	3rd Criteria
1	it only partially covers the requirements of the call	allocation of the budget raises some concern and need to be revised, to be detailed or amounts to be shifted between tasks, it is over dimensioned sometimes and need to be reduced	impact is limited either because of the lack of information provided in the project or because of the methodology used
2	the work plan and Work packages should be revised because either their description is not clear or they present some weak points, the timing need also to be detailed	the allocation of the resources need to be revised, justified, detailed; it is often imbalanced and contain some inconsistencies	IPR issue is either missing or weak
3	technological issues should be better explained and revised before submitting the proposals	management structure and procedures need to be detailed; revised since there are projects in which all management tasks are concentrated on one partner; management work package is missing; it is sometimes overcomplicated	some tasks of the proposal lacks detail, clarity and credibility

4	some of the methodological issues need to be clarified and detailed	there are issues regarding the work plan and the work packages (structure is unclear, resources are not properly allocated, work packages seems unbalanced)	dissemination plan need to be revised, clarified, detailed or it presents low level of novelty, or the resources for this activity should be increased
5	innovation is rather limited (in concept, methodology, in technology used or in the solution of the project)	the consortium is unbalanced either geographically or technically; it is either too small or too large; there is concern about the roles identified for some partners within the consortium	contingency plan is either not included or not addressed properly
6	deliverables should be detailed, it does not match with the tasks described	the duration of the project need to be revised	it is sometimes not clear which stakeholders are targeted or their involvement should come at an earlier stage
7	the case studies should be better presented, their role should be clarified	an advisory board is required or the role of this should be clarified or detailed	the objectives are not presented in a clear manner and this may limit the expected impact
8	some environmental and health issues should be better addressed and explained, they must be taken into account	the management costs should be better justified, it is high in many proposals	communication strategy need to be revised since interaction between modules are not specified properly and more detail is needed
9	socio-economical and ethical issues are not well described	the risk section and the quality control is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)	end user community is missing or its involvement is not demonstrated
10	the references or the literature is rather limited or missing	lack of specialised partners, of expertise in certain domain and of experience	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)
11	the allocation of resources need to be revised (either too low or too high the number of person-months)	the consortium lacks integration (of the components, of the results)	technical, technological and methodological issues need to be detailed
12	risk assessment and contingency plan are missing or are not described properly (risk management, market risk, environmental risks)	deliverables should be revised - they are not timed efficiently, their number is too high	
13	the strength between the objectives and the tasks are too low or need to be clarified;	SME are not sufficiently presented in the consortium	
14	more detail required in WPs, in methodology, in tasks, regarding the implementation of the project, regarding the scientific background of the approach,	the consortium could be improved by including few partners from different regions of Europe	
15	sustainability assessment is not well described	there are several issues regarding the objectives (either too complex explained or too briefly)	

16	objective is not clear defined and the outcomes are not clearly described	issues referring to subcontractors (number is too high or their role is not clear defined)	
17	the integration between the WP should be properly described, clarified and more focused	no short profiles of individual participants are provided	
18	models proposed are not clear presented		
19	strategy should be clarified and the state-of-the-art is not properly covered		
20	cost/benefit analysis is not clear		

Category MEDIUM

	1st Criteria	2nd Criteria	3rd Criteria
1	it only partially covers the requirements of the call	allocation of the budget raises some concern and need to be revised, to be detailed or amounts to be shifted between tasks, it is over dimensioned sometimes and need to be reduced	impact is limited either because of the lack of information provided in the project or because of the methodology used
2	the work plan and Work packages should be revised because either their description is not clear or they present some weak points, the timing need also to be detailed	the allocation of the resources need to be revised, justified, detailed; it is often imbalanced and contain some inconsistencies	IPR issue is either missing, vague or weak
3	technical and technological issues should be better explained and revised before submitting the proposals since there are in many proposals major weaknesses	management structure and procedures need to be detailed; revised since there are projects in which all management tasks are concentrated on one partner; management work package is missing; it is sometimes overcomplicated	some tasks of the proposal lacks detail, clarity and credibility
4	some of the methodological issues need to be clarified and detailed; in general the methodology of the study is poor or vague	there are issues regarding the work plan and the work packages (structure is unclear, resources are not properly allocated, work packages seems unbalanced)	dissemination plan need to be revised, clarified, detailed or it presents low level of novelty, or the resources for this activity should be increased
5	innovation is rather limited and even lacks in some proposals (in concept, methodology, in technology used, in the case studies presented or in the solution of the project)	the consortium is unbalanced either geographically or technically; it is either too small or too large; there is concern about the roles identified for some partners within the consortium	contingency plan is either not included or not addressed properly
6	deliverables should be detailed, it does not match with the tasks described	the duration of the project need to be revised	it is sometimes not clear which stakeholders are targeted or their involvement should come at an earlier stage

7	the case studies should be better presented, their role should be clarified	an advisory board is required or the role of this should be clarified or detailed	the objectives are not presented in a clear manner and this may limit the expected impact
8	some environmental and health issues should be better addressed and explained, they must be taken into account	the management costs should be better justified, it is high in many proposals	
9	socio-economical and ethical issues are not well described	the risk section and the quality control is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)	end user community is missing or its involvement is not demonstrated
10	the references or the literature is rather limited or missing	lack of specialised partners, of expertise in certain domain and of experience	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)
11	the allocation of budget and resources need to be revised	the consortium lacks integration (of the components, of the results)	technical, technological and methodological issues need to be detailed
12	the overall concept is not clearly presented or it is impossible to identify	deliverables should be revised - they are not timed efficiently, their number is too high	the European added value is unclear and not elaborated
13	risk assessment and contingency plan are missing or are not described properly (risk management, market risk, environmental risks)	SME are not sufficiently presented in the consortium	the exploitation strategy is very unconvincing
14	the strength between the objectives and the tasks are too low or need to be clarified;	the consortium could be improved by including few partners from different regions of Europe	
15	links between call topics and proposal objective are not visible	there are several issues regarding the objectives (either too complex explained or too briefly)	
16	more detail required in WPs, in methodology, in tasks, regarding the implementation of the project, regarding the scientific background of the approach,	issues referring to subcontractors (number is too high or their role is not clear defined)	
17	sustainability assessment is not well described	partner's role is not clearly described and also are missing the short profiles of individual participants	
18	objective is not clear defined and the outcomes are not clearly described	information flow between project partners is not uniform	
19	the integration between the WP should be properly described, clarified and more focused	objectives and concept is not properly described	
20	models proposed are not clear presented		
21	strategy should be clarified and the state-of-the-art is not properly covered		

22	cost/benefit analysis are not clear		
23	business and marketing plan are missing or the strategy is very weak		
24	the proposals lack detail		

Categories WEAK and GARBAGE were not taken into consideration as failed to pass at least 1 threshold (mark to at least 1 criterion was less than 3 out of 5). If the proposal fall at least 1 threshold the proposal will not be listed as being possible to be funded by the EC.

On each evaluation criteria, the frequent errors are:

a) First criterion (Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call))

Nr.	
1	methodological issues need to be clarified and detailed
2	work plan and Work packages should be revised because either their description is not clear or they present some weak points, the timing need also to be detailed
3	detail required in WPs, in methodology, in tasks, regarding the implementation of the project, regarding the scientific background of the approach,
4	objective is not clear defined and the outcomes are not clearly described
5	it only partially covers the requirements of the call
6	the progress beyond the state of the art is not expected to be too significant, or it is not properly described
7	innovation is rather limited (in concept, methodology, in technology used or in the solution of the project)
8	contingency plan / risk analysis is missing
9	economic, environmental and health issues should be better addressed and explained, they must be taken into account
10	technological issues should be better explained and revised before submitting the proposals
11	strategy should be clarified
12	risk assessment and contingency plan are missing or are not described properly (risk management, market risk, environmental risks)
13	case studies should be better presented, their role should be clarified
14	references or the literature is rather limited or missing
15	deliverables should be detailed, it does not match with the tasks described
16	socio-economical and ethical issues are not well described
17	interaction between the WP should be properly described, clarified and more focused
18	timing of WP
19	allocation of resources need to be revised (either too low or too high the number of person-months)
20	outcomes are not clearly addressed
21	cost/benefit analysis is not clear
22	sustainability assessment is not well described
23	strength between the objectives and the tasks are too low or need to be clarified;

b) 2nd criterion (Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management)

Nr.	
1	advisory board is required or the role of this should be clarified or detailed
2	allocation of the resources need to be revised, justified, detailed; it is often imbalanced and contain some inconsistencies
3	budget is often over dimensioned and needs adjustments and to be reduced sometimes; it is also poor described, detailed or not well allocated amongst partners; some amounts need to be shifted between tasks
4	consortium could be improved by including few partners from different regions of Europe
5	consortium is unbalanced either geographically or technically; it is either too small or to large; there is concern about the roles identified for some partners within the consortium
6	consortium lacks integration (of the components, of the results)
7	deliverables should be revised - they are not timed efficiently, their number is too high
8	duration of the project need to be revised
9	information flow between project partners is not uniform
10	lack of specialised partners, of expertise and experience
11	management costs should be better justified, it is high in many proposals
12	management structure and procedures has important deficiency; should be also revised since there are projects in which all management tasks are concentrated on one partner; management work package is missing; it is sometimes overcomplicated
13	management structure need to be detailed; management work package is missing
14	no short profiles of individual participants are provided
15	objective issues (either too complex explained or too briefly)
16	partner's role is not clearly described and also are missing the short profiles of individual participants
17	risk section and the quality control is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)
18	SME are not sufficiently presented in the consortium
19	specialised partners, of expertise in certain domain and of experience are missing
20	subcontractor issues (number is too high or their role is not clear defined)
21	work plan and the work packages issues (structure is unclear, resources are not properly allocated, work packages seems unbalanced; they sometimes need to be detailed)

c) 3rd criterion (Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results)

Nr.	
1	communication strategy need to be revised since interaction between modules are not specified properly and more detail is needed
2	contingency plan is either not included or not addressed properly
3	dissemination plan need to be revised, clarified, detailed or it presents low level of novelty, or the resources for this activity should be increased
4	end user community is missing or its involvement is not demonstrated
5	exploitation strategy is very unconvincing
6	impact is limited either because of the lack of information provided in the project or because of the methodology used
7	IPR issue is either missing, vague or weak
8	it is sometimes not clear which stakeholders are targeted or their involvement should come at an earlier stage
9	management need to be revised,

10	objectives are not presented in a clear manner and this may limit the expected impact
11	risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)
12	some tasks of the proposal lacks detail, clarity and credibility
13	technical, technological and methodological issues need to be detailed
14	the risk section is inadequate, insufficient described or missing (risk management, risk strategy, contingency plan)

Theme 3 – ICT (e-health)

Category DELUXE

	1 st criterion	2 nd criterion	3 rd criterion
1	methodology is not detailed	explicit mechanism for conflict resolution are not specified	the appointment of a project IP manager is appropriate
2	detail is lacking on the sensors to be developed	the allocation of resources for some WP may need to be reinforced	
3	data processing aspects are insufficiently explained	management procedures and the risk mitigations are not convincing enough	quantitative assessment of targeted impacts is not adequately described
4	the work plan should be more explained regarding the support and contingency mechanisms	the financial implications of involving a chair of the scientific Board from MIT is not sufficiently explained	the future research directions are not adequate described
5	the proposed methodology for building the risk assessment model is insufficiently described	a contingency plan should be considered	not enough attention is given to the dissemination and exploitation measures.
6	from the medical point of view there is need for better documentation	budget allocation needs some adjustments	the proposal is not addressing the opportunities offered by modern dissemination tools
7	the risk of failure of WP2 and the implications on the rest of the project should be considered	better justification of the equipment cost is needed	description of IPR aspects is generic.
8	the need for functional MRI evaluations is not convincingly presented	the overall risk and contingency plan is not sufficiently presented in the proposal	the exploitation strategy is not sufficiently addressed in the proposal
9	the current state of the art in DSS and Data Mining is insufficiently presented		
10	the integration of WP5 within the overall work plan is insufficiently defined in the proposal		
11	the advance in the state of the art are not targeted at innovative functionality	the allocation of human resources requires further justification	the adoption of the standards in the market is questionable
12	the proposal does not fully present the possible drawbacks and complications of the systems	the scientific track record of individual partners is not sufficiently evidenced	most of deliverables are confidential - the dissemination of results is weakened

13	some software components are described in a superficial way		the exploitation plans should be more elaborated
14	sensor technology is not sufficient detailed	partner 1 does not demonstrate sufficient knowledge of prediction and diagnosis	there is no evidence of how industrial exploitation will be achieved
15	the impact on the assessment of the effectiveness is less well described	conflict resolution is not sufficiently elaborated	standards are addressed generically
16	the clinical trials need more concrete details	the appropriateness of resources for clinical trials cannot be judged without a more detailed breakdown of costs and patient no.	the proposal is missing target journals
17	the methodology need more detail	the user-centric design approach needs to be reflected more concretely in the work plan	the plans should be elaborated as the project advances
18	there is no work description on development of imbatable pressure sensors	resource allocation is not adequately justified	
19	it needs more detail regarding the rationale for selection of biomedical parameters and related sensors	operational procedures are not clearly described	exploitation plan need more routes
20		the management resources are not adequate to run the project	
21		subcontracting is not justified	
22	need more detail in the work plan	risk management options are limited	many deliverables are confidential - is not fully justified
23		the budget should be revised	

Category WELLDONE

	1 st Criterion	2 nd Criteria	3 rd Criteria
1	some areas of the work plan need further description	allocation of resources to research WPs is underestimated	IPR management issues are generic and lack details specific to this proposed project
2	there are some unclear issues that must be detailed	contribution to partner 1 is high relative to the others	it is not clear how the impacts will be delivered
3	risk analysis is too general		
4	there are some unclear issues that must be detailed	conflict resolution procedures should be more detailed	exploitable results are not identified
5	some WP have some weaknesses	quality and risk management should be more detailed	
6	the prototypes come too late in the proposed schedule	the budget is not sufficiently detailed	
7	some strategies are beyond the state of the art	involvement of clinical end-users is inadequate	quantified impacts for exploitation plans are not included
8		some resources cannot be justified	partner exploitation plan is not available

9	data analysis should be more detailed	risk handling and conflict resolution are not so well defined in the proposal	market analysis is missing
10	the way of mapping the WP is not clear		
11	there is no clear description of which data will be collected and how it will be analysed		
12	there is no evident justification as to whether the validation can proceed with clinical tests without going first through animal tests		
13	some methods cannot be quantified	some of the proposed contingency plans could be more concrete	preliminary market info on closed-loop systems for diabetes is not included in the proposal
14	some WP do not involve some key partners	justification of resources besides personnel costs need more detail	
15	the objectives are insufficiently described	project management procedures do not provide detail	the education aspect in dissemination is not sufficiently addressed
16	the S/T methodology has some weaknesses	effort for project management is underestimated	
17	the clinical evaluation is not convincingly presented	it is not clear how the contributions from some stakeholders will be covered	
18		the allocation of some resources is not sufficiently justified	

Category GOOD

	1st criterion	2 nd criterion	3 rd criterion
1	it does not provide adequate info about the relevance of data obtained from monitoring and integrated devices	not all roles are appropriately defined	the impact is compromised
2	some areas are not fully described in the state-of-the-art	mitigation and contingency plans are not always sufficient	the economic benefits have not been fully described
3	the methodology is too generic		dissemination is poor
4	the associated work plan lacks details of the process		no appropriate exploitation plan is presented
5	it is not clear how some aspects are addressed	quality management is not sufficiently addressed	the proposal does not describe concretely how it will contribute to the other areas of expected impact specific to objective ICT2009.5.1
6	risk assessment is insufficiently addressed	the amount of effort allocated for WP5 is not properly justified	exploitation potential is too optimistic
7	no specific technical risks were identified		a few resources are allocated to the SMEs for

	and no mitigation plans were provided		exploitation tasks.
8	it does not provide sufficient description of the advancements with respect to existing projects	the risk analysis is very generic	no real exploitable results are identified
9	the use cases approach is insufficiently described	the description of the PMO's professional experience does not mention specific project management capabilities	there is no exploitation plan as a deliverable at the end of the proposed project
10	the methodology is not clearly described in some activities		
11	some key deliverables are missing		
12	the integration of different modules of the platform is poorly addressed		
13	the proposal is too generic, often repetitive	the WP are not adequately elaborated	it lacks concrete commitment and specific concrete plans
14	it is lacking in specificity	subcontracting is not justified	
15	there is a gap between the methodology and the output of the objectives		
16	the feasibility of the innovation within the timescale of the proposal is not adequately demonstrated	conflict resolution is described too briefly	the medical impact is unconvincing
17	risk analysis is weak	risk management is weakly described	elements related to a cost analysis or are lacking
18	accuracy of measurement is not discussed in depth	some subcontracting costs are not adequately explained	
19	interoperability is not adequately considered	equipment costs are not convincing	
20	demonstration activities should be more explicitly included in the work plan	resource estimation for some partners is not adequately justified	
21	the selected sample sizes are not clearly justified	not all WP leaders have proven experience in technical management of collaborative work	the exploitation plan fails to describe targets
22	it does not address one requirement of the call	subcontracting is not justified	exploitation plan is generic
23	the project is insufficiently focused on the requirements of the call	the management structure is too complex	the potential impact of individual person is weak
24	it is lacking information on the state of the art for using standards for collecting data from patients	it lacks directly relevant industrial partners	the dissemination and exploitation plan are too generic

25	the work plan do not adequately address all concepts and objectives	it lacks info on how the resources are calculated for each WP	consideration of IPR is too generic to be convincing
26	the lack of in human in-vivo trials in the timescale is a significant weakness	there is no sufficiently strong management line for clinical activities	

Category MEDIUM

	1 st Criterion	2 nd criterion	3 rd criterion
1	the scientific objectives show limited innovation	data acquisition is missing from the consortium	the impact on European medical industry is only marginal
2	the target patients are not clearly identified		impact on interoperability is limited
3	few scientific references given		a description of the market and the target customer organizations is missing
4	the advance in the state of the art is limited		
5	methodology is not detailed		
6	the concept is broadly in scope of the call	the quality of clinical participants was not fully evidenced with appropriate references	the way to reach the goal is generic and not convincing
7	it lacks a lot of details	the resources should be revised	
8	the closed-loop approach is not addressed adequately		
9	the state of the art is described briefly		
10	methodology is not detailed		
11	integrated risk assessment model was neglected		
12	it does not provide sufficient scientific evidence		there is insufficient quantitative analysis to provide convincing evidence
13	it does not provide a detailed description of the current state of the art in technical areas		there is a lack of detail on specific exploitation plans
14	state of the art contains a lack of clarity in various areas		
15	it provides a segmented methodology and introduce risk of success of the project detail is missing		
17	the description of the baseline for the project is insufficient	technical risks should have been more detailed	
18	the WP descriptions	the resources are underestimated	

	are partly repetitive		
19	the information provided is less concise		
20	regulatory issues are poorly addressed		
21	the proposal does not convincingly describe how the progress beyond the state of the art will be achieved	the conflict resolution procedure and the quality management procedures are not sufficiently addressed	the proposal fails to convince that the implementation will achieve the impact
22	the overall methodology is not convincingly presented	the project coordinator is not clearly identified in the proposal	target groups are not sufficiently described
23	the work plan lacks specificity	the risk contingency plan is not convincing	there is no clear global exploitation plan
24	some WP do not provide sufficient description	the purchase of equipment is not sufficiently justified	
25	the concept is broadly in scope of the call	the technical focus leaves dissemination and exploitation with a very restricted role	potential routes to market and outline business plans would have been desirable
26	the state of the art is described briefly	the allocation of resources seems insufficient for dissemination and exploitation activities	
27	ICT support tools are insufficient described		
28	in light of complexity of the project more detail is necessary		
29	accuracy of the lithium measurement device is not sufficiently convincing	issues concerning conflict resolution procedures and IP management procedures are insufficiently described	the dissemination plan is described in general terms
30	the methodology of WP6 is not sufficiently described	no SME involved	
31	the methodology for long term monitoring and data acquisition is not adequately described		
32	the progress beyond the state of the art is not presented		the impact is dependent on general widespread use among the concerned population
33	it is very questionable and unrealistic		it is not clear if the IPR management fully addresses the impact
34	S/T methodology is described in general terms, details are lacking		
35	the proposed method of treatment lacks evidence		
36	there is no clear evidence that the system is implemented either by hardware or	the management structure is not satisfactory	dissemination is generic and lacks details

	medical intervention		
37	significant shortcomings to development of complete systems	management procedures and the risk mitigations are not convincing enough	
38	insufficient detail is given on how to implement the project	the management structure is inadequate for such a big project	the dissemination activities are planned and described at a very general level
39	the work plan lacks detail	the risk analysis and contingency plan are not tailored to the actual challenges of the proposal	the exploitation plans are not clearly pointed out
40	the DOW lacks explicit division of work	budget specification is insufficient for such a project	
41	the clinical aspects are not sufficiently addressed	the conflict resolution procedure is not sufficiently addressed	the impact is rather generic described
42	the WP should be more descriptive	the consortium is imbalanced	
43	there is insufficient consideration given to clinical aspects	the role of SMEs is not sufficiently described	
44	it is too generic in its approach to health problems	conflict resolution is not addressed	the impact is described in very general terms
45	the proposed methodology is weak	the subcontracting cost is low	exploitation plan is not described in sufficient detail
46	it needs more detail regarding technical and social part	contingency plan needs detail	
47	the concept is not clearly substantiated in the work plan	practical arrangements for peer review of deliverables are not sufficiently identified	the dissemination strategy does not sufficiently target the wider and influential audiences needed
48	the state of the art is weak in some technical areas	the reasons for subcontracting are not sufficiently clear	the exploitation do not adopt common objectives
49	the innovative contribution is not convincing	there are inconsistencies between WP, partner roles and efforts assigned	
50	the timing sequence is not consistent with the activities in the work plan	some costs need to be more detailed	
51	some methods needs to be more detailed		
52	the risks are not sufficiently developed		
53	the project approach is too generic	risk analysis is not satisfactory	the impact cannot be quantified or evaluated
54	the description of the objective knowledge representation and cognitive architectures is unclear	there are no contingency plans	dissemination is poorly explained
55	the project proposal needs to be described in more detail	the individual technical competences are not sufficiently proved	the exploitation plan is insufficient
56	the project proposal only partially reflects	the relative high indirect costs is not well explained	the IP expected result from the project are not clearly

	to the objectives		defined and lacking important decisions on property sharing
57	the scientific objectives are not succinct	no proper risk management is given	the impact statement is generic and is not aligned with the content of the proposal
58	the coverage of sensors and ICT components is inadequate	conflict resolution process are limited	the results to be exploited are not clearly identified at this stage
59	existing R&D should be more detailed	the experience of one partner is not demonstrated in the proposal	
60	methodology is not clearly described	there is no proper justification of subcontracting and other direct costs	
61	some technical and clinical concepts are poorly described		
62	technical innovation is limited and insufficiently described	management structure is insufficiently addressed	the dissemination plan is not sufficiently targeted to achieve maximum impact
63	a detailed description of some WP is missing	the diagram of all structures is missing	
64		budget for demo activities is missing	
65	the overall concept is inadequately explained	the role of partner 2 is not clear	it fails to demonstrate the the impacts could be achieved
66	the roles of the components and the functionalities of the system are not sufficiently explained	the need for subcontractors is superficially explained	the figures provided in the business plan are not convincingly substantiated
67	the current state of the art is not adequately addressed	the resource allocation needs further clarification	
68	the methodology and the work plan are not sufficiently described		
69	the WP lacks important information regarding methodology		
70	it does not convincingly meet the requirements of the call	the identification of actual risks, their impact and the approach to mitigation them are not addressed	the impact is limited
71	the working hypothesis for the proposed development is not adequately supported	the leader of some WP is not adequately explained	it is not clear how the impact is delivered
72	the methodology does not fully consider behavioural monitoring	the person month allocation need to be revised	cost effectiveness is not properly considered
73	cost effectiveness is not well addressed	there are some discrepancies	the dissemination and exploitation activities need more detail
74	use cases are not well described		
75	the review of sensor technology, workflows and integration aspects is brief	the management structure is basic	target market may be compromised by the need for in vivo human studies

76		decision making and conflict resolution are not clearly set out	the dissemination plan is brief
77		the consortium lacks competency in health informatics standards	
78		a bottom up calculation of WP costs was not provided	
79	it does not address well the closed loop concept	the role of the advisory board is not fully developed	the exploitation plan is insufficient
80	some developments are recycled from former FP projects	risk analysis should have been better addressed	the potential impact is weakened by the fact that the objectives are not supported by adequate exploitation effort
81	the overall system architecture is not described in sufficient detail	there is no leader for clinical validation activities	
82	the success of the project is insufficient visible	the project cost is high and not justified	
83		some WP are overestimated	
84		indirect costs are high	
85	not all objectives are represented in the work plan	there is no evidence that the consortium has experience in closed-loop systems	the exploitation strategy is not adequately detailed
86	it lack important details in the work plan	there is an imbalance in the allocation of resources	
87	insufficient info is provided to quantify progress beyond the state of the art	contingency plan missing	
88	study designs are missing	risk and mitigation plan missing	
89	the work plan is weak on the technological aspects	expertise in some technical areas is not fully demonstrated	- more information could be provided concerning the cost effectiveness of Persona System
90		the proposed budget is high	
91		resource allocation should be revised	
92	there is overlap with existing technologies	the track records of SMEs are not convincingly described in relation to the tasks assigned to them	the limitation of the testing and validation phases cast doubts on the eventual extent of the impact
93	it does not show in convincing detail how progress beyond the current state of the art will be achieved	there is a lack of explanation regarding subcontracting	
94	it is questionable that the scope of work is feasible and realistic		
95	the project scope is not well developed	technical risks should have been more detailed	it is unlikely to have a significant impact in the field and market
96	the objective does not appear to be achieved	the consortium seems weak in the area	exploitation plan is not detailed
97	there is little innovation in the project	experience is not uniformly established	

98	the methodologies and work plan are not well described		
99	it does not fit to all requirements of the call	the risk management raise dome discussions	quantification of targeted results is missing
100	the implant should be changed annually	it does not credibly explain the partner's expertise in diabetes research	dissemination and IPR management are not properly covered
101	there is insufficient info about the functioning of the sensor and implant	subcontracting is not justified	
102	the interdependencies and linkages between the WP are not sufficiently addressed		

On each evaluation criteria, the frequent errors are:

a) First criterion (Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call))

1	some areas of the work plan need further description
2	there are some unclear issues that must be detailed
3	risk analysis is too general
4	there are some unclear issues that must be detailed
5	some WP have some weaknesses
6	the prototypes come too late in the proposed schedule
7	some strategies are beyond the state of the art
8	data analysis should be more detailed
9	the way of mapping the WP is not clear
10	there is no clear description of which data will be collected and how it will be analysed
11	there is no evident justification as to whether the validation can proceed with clinical tests without going first through animal tests.
12	some methods cannot be quantified
13	some WP do not involve some key partners
14	the objectives are insufficiently described
15	the S/T methodology has some weaknesses
16	the clinical evaluation is not convincingly presented

b) 2nd criterion (Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management)

1	the allocation to the RTD WP is underestimated
2	contribution to a partner is high relative to the others (consortium is not balanced)
3	conflict resolution procedures should be more detailed
4	quality and risk management should be more detailed
5	the budget is not sufficiently detailed
6	involvement of clinical end-users is inadequate
7	some resources cannot be justified
8	risk handling and conflict resolution are not so well defined in the proposal
9	some of the proposed contingency plans could be more concrete
10	justification of resources besides personnel costs need more detail\
11	project management procedures do not provide detail

12	effort for project management is underestimated
13	it is not clear how the contributions from some stakeholders will be covered
14	the allocation of some resources is not sufficiently justified

c) 3rd criterion (Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results)

1	IPR management issues are generic and lack details specific to this proposed project
2	it is not clear how the impacts will be delivered
3	exploitable results are not identified
4	quantified impacts for exploitation plans are not included
5	partner exploitation plan is not available
6	market analysis is missing
7	preliminary market info on closed-loop systems for diabetes is not included in the proposal
8	the education aspect in dissemination is not sufficiently addressed

Categories WEAK and GARBAGE were not taken into consideration as failed to pass at least 1 threshold (mark to at least 1 criterion was less than 3 out of 5). If the proposal fall at least 1 threshold the proposal will not be listed as being possible to be funded by the EC.

4. Conclusions

As presented in the above analysis, in both themes of FP 7 the most frequent errors are the same, irrespective of scientific domain, or topic addressed (not taking into consideration those errors strictly related to the scientific issue as such). For the **first criterion** the frequent errors are: quality of R&D activities to be performed during the life time of the project, presentation of state-of-the in that particular scientific field, correlation between project objectives and those presented in the topic for which the project was submitted, the proposed strategies to be followed within the project are not those needed for such an important undertake, workpackages are not well structured, scientific level is not the one needed for such an important project. Regarding the second criterion, the frequent errors relates to: how the proposed activities are organised, the allocation of resources is not appropriate for a successful implementation, management procedures are not detailed and cannot be evaluated, the human resources are under-evaluated, consortium is unbalanced, partner's responsibilities are not justified. Concerning the third criterion, it can be mentioned that the most common error are: the link between R&D and education and innovation is not presented, exploitation plans are not (well) presented or are not according to requests from the topic, the exploitation plan does not fit with the outcomes of the project and are not in line with project objectives.

Final conclusion: By these analysis (on the two FP 7 themes) it has been showed that the errors made by project proposers are similar irrespective the scientific domain in response to which the project proposal was submitted (environment and information and communication technologies) and organisations which are members of consortia

Acknowledgements

The work presented in this papers was possible with support from the project „Environmental NCP cooperating to improve their effectiveness”, acronym ENV-NCP-TOGETHER, www.env-ncp-together.eu, funded by Directorate General Research, Grant Agreement-ul 212494, coordinated by Viorel Vulturescu from National Authority for Scientific Research.