

What can we learn from the Evaluation Summary Reports?

**WG1 meeting
5-6 March 2015
Ljubljana, Slovenia**

**Ellen Schenk
Erasmus MC, Rotterdam, The Netherlands**

GSC1 single stage call 2014

Call topic	# full proposals	# projects likely to be funded	Estimated overall success rate
PHC-07	11	1	9%
PHC-08	5	1-2	30%
PHC-15	30	6-9	25%
PHC-19	79	4-6	6%
PHC-20	56	3-5	7%
PHC-26	254	12-20	6%
PHC-31	9	2-3	28%
PHC-34	7	4	57%

GSC1 two-stage call 2014 and 2015

Call topic	# stage 1 proposals	Overall success rate	Passed to stage 2	Success rate stage 2
PHC-01	359	3%	173 (48%)	7%
PHC-05	120	4%	37 (31%)	14%
PHC-06	84	7%	32 (38%)	19%
PHC-10	462	2%	138 (30%)	7%
PHC-13	296	4%	128 (43%)	10%
PHC-17	136	7%	55 (40%)	18%
PHC-23	108	5%	33 (31%)	18%
PHC-32	116	8%	31 (27%)	32%
PHC-02	205	4%	44 (22%)	17.0%
PHC-03	355	2%	108 (30%)	6.0%
PHC-04	78	5%	13 (17%)	30.8%
PHC-11	349	3%	97 (28%)	10.3%
PHC-14	421	3%	130 (31%)	9.6%
PHC-16	312	2%	33 (11%)	22.7%
PHC-18	134	4%	36 (27%)	15.3%
PHC-22	183	2%	34 (19%)	10.3%
PHC-24	59	4%	11 (19%)	22.7%

Experiences from Grand Societal Challenge 1

2014 and 2015 two-stage calls

- Stage 1 selection limited effect -> success rate stage 2 << 20%
- Stage 1-2014: if Excellence score < threshold, Expected Impact **not** evaluated
- Stage 2-2014: if Excellence score < threshold, Impact and Implementation **not** evaluated
- Stage 1-2015: Standard evaluation text for specific scores
- Limited timeframe for stage 2: 12 weeks

Critics on non-granted stage 1 applications

Excellence & Impact standard text

- < 3 = Fair to good. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses.
- $3 - 3.5$ = Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but with some shortcomings.
- 4 = Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well but with a small number of shortcomings.

Critics on non-granted single stage & stage 2 applications

Excellence

- Proof of concept not sufficiently strong
- Poor trans-European strategy
- Prior art not sufficiently described

Impact

- Communication, IPR and data management not well addressed
- Exploitation plan not sufficiently described
- Lack of companies

Critics on non-granted single stage & stage 2 applications

Implementation

- WP distribution not balanced
- Poor risk management
- Budget not balanced
- Innovation management not sufficiently described

Critics on granted applications (1x single stage and 1x stage 2)

Excellence

- Clear & ambitious objectives, excellent presentation methodology
- Good innovation potential

Impact

- Clear IPR strategy & exploitation plan & dissemination strategies
- WP for Exploitation, IPR and Ethics well appreciated

Implementation

- Balanced consortium, including key patient representative body
- Scientific and Ethic advisory boards well appreciated

Conclusions

- Applicants of non-granted proposals do not always get valuable feedback
- Crucial elements that seem to make the difference:
 - Contribution to innovation capacity
 - Innovation management
 - IPR strategy and exploitation measures
 - Dissemination and communication plan
 - Ethics management
 - Risk mitigation

