BCD application to ITN-EJD

1. The results

2. Interpretation / Changes

3. Are the same players shooting again?

4. Timeline.

Ref. Ares(2019)3202471 - 15/05/2019

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Research Executive Agency

REA/A/01 – Marie Sklodowska-Curie Innovative Training Networks
Head of Unit

Stephane MONTEIL
UNIVERSITE CLERMONT AUVERGNE
49 BOULEVARD FRANCOIS MITTERRAND
63000 CLERMONT-FERRAND
FRANCE

Subject: Horizon 2020 Framework Programme
Call: H2020-MSCA-ITN-2019
Proposal: 861403 — FLAME
Proposal rejection letter

Dear Madam/Sir,

I am writing in connection with your proposal for the above-mentioned call.

Having evaluated your proposal, we regret to inform you that, despite its merits, it can unfortunately not be funded because the score obtained does not suffice, given the budgetary resources available for the call.

Please find enclosed the evaluation summary report (ESR).

General information about the relative position of your proposal in the ranking is published in a topic update.

I would be grateful if you could inform the other members of your consortium (if any) of this letter.

We thank you for your interest and hope that you will not be discouraged from applying to our calls in the future.

Yours faithfully,

Klaus-Guenther BARTHEL
Head of Unit

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 72.20% (Threshold: 70/100.00)

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 50.00%)

Quality, innovative aspects and credibility of the research programme (including inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)
Quality and innovative aspects of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and, where appropriate, gender aspects)
Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for EID and EJD projects)
Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations

Strengths
- The proposal addresses an interesting research field. It is well structured with compelling science goals and clear work packages.
- The presence of a strong industrial network in a program of High Energy Physics (HEP) is very positive.
- The research programme combines well theoretical and experimental modules in the HEP field.
- The proposal envisages industrial training by world leading businesses, while summer schools and secondments are planned in a timely manner.
- Overall, the proposed supervision scheme is appropriate.
- Most supervisors are recognized world-class experts in HEP.

Weaknesses
- The research program is not sufficiently multidisciplinary and innovative, and the needs of the market are not effectively connected to the programme.
- Gender aspects are not addressed appropriately in the proposal.
- The transferable skills training programme is not convincingly planned for the benefit of all ESRs.
- Several supervisors' experience in directing PhDs is not strong.
- The interaction plan between the participating organizations is not described clearly and sufficiently.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **3.40** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 30.00%)

Enhancing the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development
Contribution to structuring doctoral / early-stage research training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity, including the potential for:
a) meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the doctoral/research training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field
b) developing sustainable joint doctoral degree structures (for EJD projects only)
Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results
Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences

Strengths
- The programme has the potential to enhance the career perspectives of the ESRs in academia, within the HEP field.
- Most of the non-academic partners have strong R&D activities and can contribute substantially to the scientific and training programme.
- The dissemination plan for the project results is appropriate, including publications and conference participations.
- Two of the partners will be organizing a major conference in the field (ICHEP 2022), which will be an excellent opportunity for the ESRs to be heavily involved and present their findings.
- The proposed communication measures of the project activities to different target audiences are appropriate, including summer schools and public events in different countries.

Weaknesses
- The programme being narrowly focused on the HEP field limits the career perspectives and employability of the ESRs' outside the specific field and outside academia.
- The contribution to strengthening European innovation capacity is not clearly described.
- The programme's exploitation plan is generic, with not enough precision, like for instance in the anticipated gains in IT, finance and telecoms.

Criterion 3 - Quality and Efficiency of the Implementation

Score: **4.20** (Threshold: 0/5.00 , Weight: 20.00%)

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources (including awarding of the doctoral degrees for EID and EJD projects)
Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management (with a mandatory joint governing structure for EID and EJD projects)
Appropriateness of the infrastructure of the participating organisations
Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the programme

Strengths
- The overall work plan is clear and coherent and describes in details all the work packages and ESRs' projects.
- The management structure of the programme is clear and appropriate, consisting of a Steering Board and an International Advisory Committee, with clear roles for governing, recruitment, admission and supervision.
- The risk management is properly discussed and evaluated, while appropriate mitigation measures are proposed.
- The participating organizations are world class leaders and provide appropriate infrastructure and expertise to cover the programme's needs.
- The consortium of the program consists of world class academic institutes and start-up companies with high profile track record and experience in HEP.

Weaknesses
- The appropriateness of some task allocations is insufficiently justified.
- The complementarity of know-how and the commitment in the programme of the involved partners are not detailed enough.

2. Highlight: weaknesses & discussion

- Multidisciplinarity deficit.

- Not enough innovative.

- Implication for the economical market is noted bad: the project does not do anything for IT (?), finance and telecoms…

- Gender balance is not satisfactory.

- Deficit of supervision records noted.

- Obvious actions to complete :

  - Multi-disciplinarity is to be addressed.
  - Have only high credentials supervisors.
  - Need to simultaneously narrow the scope.
  - Provide the economical virtue in terms of European Innovation.

- One might reach 90% with refinement of the writings but we want > 95 %.

3. Are the same players shooting again?

- I will send this week an e-mail to check interest in our consortium.

- Round table ? (I'll update the slides after the meeting).

- Here is the addition. The result of the round table indicates that all the present members of the consortium are willing to go ahead with the re-application.

4. Timeline (if we go ahead)

- If quorum is attained, a proposal for narrowing (a bit) the scope will be issued in end of September.

- Work to be performed with administrative / project engineering staffs to comply to the EU implicit requirements: end of October.

- Collaborative writing, refinements, edits, cosmetology end of November.

- Collect all partnerships: end of December.

- Submission: mid of of January 2020 .