

IMI2 JU responses to the Independent Observers' Report

Call ID: H2020-JTI-IMI2-2018-15-two-stage

IMI2 15th Call for Proposals

Stage 2 evaluation

Date of evaluation: 5-6 June 2019

Name of the observers: Joy Davidson and Pieter de Pauw

Summary of Recommendations

The evaluations were very well administered and there are just a few minor modifications that we can suggest to optimise the process. These are outlined below.

- *The prepared hearing questions should be short and simply worded, but unambiguous. While the hearings are an opportunity offered by IMI, IMI may still consider whether they should allow the consortium the possibility to request clarifications about the hearing questions during the one hour provided to prepare their responses.*
- *While in rare cases it can be impossible to avoid the need for consortium members to participate in the hearings remotely, IMI may wish to reinforce the message that this is not the preferred approach. Consortia are given ample notice of the evaluation and hearing dates and every effort should be made to ensure that those participating are able to attend in person. More specifically, the consortium representative who does the PowerPoint presentation should be physically present.*
- *Check all technical material before starting sessions. We propose that a moment of double-check by the moderator together with the speaker is scheduled, just before the 90 minutes hearing starts.*
- *Consider an alternative way to estimate the amount of time that experts need for remote evaluation of full proposals, for example as a function of the complexity of the FP, the estimated budget, or its number of pages instead of a fixed number of days that is equal for all topics.*
- *Consider if observation of the Ethics Panel would have an added value to the overall effectiveness and transparency of the evaluation process.*

IMI2 JU responses to the recommendations

IMI 2 JU is pleased to have the confirmation of the independent observers that the evaluations were very well administered and thanks the independent observers for the suggestions proposed in order to optimise the process.

- The aim of the hearing questions is to provide clarifications regarding the submitted proposals. IMI2 JU will investigate the possibility of allowing the consortia to request clarifications during the preparatory meetings before the hearings.

- As the independent observers mention, the consortia members are notified well in advance about the hearing date, in order to ensure that the relevant consortia members can attend the hearings in person. IMI 2 JU will continue to underline the need to have the relevant consortia representatives in the room, but, in the end, it is the applicant consortium partners who decide how best to represent the consortium in front of the evaluation panel.
- The technical materials are checked before the start of the sessions. During the hearings, topics where consortia members join the hearing by teleconference are an exception, in most of the cases all the consortia representatives are present in the room. In order to avoid unnecessary delays, a double-check of the technical aspects between the moderator and the speaker does not take place. In case of technical problems for a specific topic, additional time is given at the end, allowing all consortia the same amount of time for the hearings.
- According to the H2020 rules, the payment for the remote evaluation is calculated based on the complexity of the proposal and the length of the compulsory technical annex. IMI2 JU will investigate the available options in case the additional technical annexes (not limited in terms of number of pages) are unduly burdensome and require more attention from the experts.
- The ethics evaluation is a specific type of evaluation. It is a very formal and strict evaluation, fully aligned with H2020 process, offering limited room for changes/developments. IMI2 JU will look into the possibilities of having this process observed by independent observers.