

**Global Service Facility of the EC - Proposal Writing Camp
Hands-on work in group(s)**

Evaluation Session – Hand-out ESR

- **Read an extract from an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), Horizon Europe call 2021 on Wind energy – Challenge 5; ESR report received in May 2022**
- **We take Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation (criterion 1 excellence and criterion 2 impact not discussed in this example)**
- **Review of implementation (work-packages, tasks, management, budget items)**
- **When you read the comments of evaluators, how would you score the project on implementation, on a scoring range 0-5?**
- **At the end of exercise the original will be displayed with score for this criterion: are the score and comments justified/ok, or too high, or too low?**

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall
- Capacity and role of each participant, and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

ESR text: Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Overall, the proposal addresses the criterion well. In particular:

- * In general, the work plan is effective and of acceptable quality. For example, the breakdown of the project into appropriate work packages and their tasks is convincing, and proportionate to the scale and complexity of the proposed project.
- * Milestones are sufficient in number, and timing, and their means of verification. They are appropriate to enable effective monitoring of project progress.
- * The content of the deliverables is appropriate to document the outputs of the project.
- * The resources assigned to work packages are credibly in line with their objectives and deliverables.
- * Each participant has a specific and valid role, and the capacity to carry it out.
- * The consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise, including valuable previous experience with Local Water Forums, and previous involvement in a range of H2020 projects.

Nevertheless, a number of shortcomings are present, namely:

- * Some of the initial deliverables are not scheduled early enough for effective project progress. For example, deliverables on quality control and risk management, and data management, are not scheduled until month 6, and the launch of the website is not scheduled until month 4, which is not sufficiently justified.
- * The proposal does not sufficiently identify critical risks concerning the access and availability of testing grounds; and does not credibly mitigate potential difficulties in setting up the local sustainable energy assemblies (e.g. lack of trust and acceptance in the local communities) beyond one-way communication.
- * The proposal does not provide sufficient justification for the purchase costs allocated to partner 11 (€53,100, which is 27.7% of Personnel costs) or to partner 13 (€85,500, which is 48.8% of Personnel Costs).