



Valutazione della proposta


Valentina Fioroni

Gestione Progetti APRE

AGENDA

- PROCESSO
- ADMISSIBILITY/ELIGIBILITY CHECK
- ESPERTI
- CRITERI
- FASI
- COMUNICAZIONE DEI RISULTATI
 - INVITATION LETTER – TWO STAGES
 - INVITATION LETTER- SINGLE STAGE

VALUTAZIONE PROCESSO



PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

ADMISSIBILITY CHECK

PER ESSERE AMMISSIBILE, LA PROPOSTA DOVRA':

- essere SOTTOMESSA elettronicamente entro la scadenza del bando
- leggibile, accessibile e stampabile

N.B. Se la proposta è **INAMMISSIBILE**, il Coordinatore sarà informato attraverso il Participant Portal (sezione 'My Area')

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

ELIGIBILITY CHECK

CRITERI DI ELEGIBILITA':

- General Annexes A al Work programme (*List of countries, and applicable rules for funding*)
- General Annexes C al Work programme (*Standard eligibility criteria*)
- Criteri specifici previsti dal bando
- Regole di Partecipazione H2020

SOTTOMISSIONE A DUE STEP

La verifica di eleggibilità è effettuata al primo step. Al secondo step, la CE verifica soltanto che le condizioni di eleggibilità sussistano ancora.

N.B. Se la proposta è **INELEGIBILE**, il Coordinatore riceverà una PROPOSAL REJECTION LETTER con relative giustificazione

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE SELEZIONE ESPERTI

COME SONO SELEZIONATI GLI ESPERTI VALUTATORI?

Nominati per ciascun bando attingendo
al **DATABASE DEGLI ESPERTI**.

Criteri:

- competenza/esperienza nell'area specifica,
- bilanciamento in termini di
 - competenze
 - provenienza geografica
 - gender
 - settore pubblico/privato

European Commission Participant Portal

European Commission > Research & Innovation > Participant Portal > Home

HOME FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES HOW TO PARTICIPATE EXPERTS SUPPORT

LOGIN REGISTER

Horizon 2020 Funding

Starting from 1/1/2014

On this site you can find and secure **funding** for research & innovation projects under the following EU programmes:

- **2014-2020** Horizon 2020 - research and innovation framework programme
- **2007-2013** 7th research framework programme (FP7) and Competitiveness & Innovation Programme (CIP)

Non-registered users

- search for funding
- read the funding guide & download the legal documents
- check if an organisation is already registered
- contact our support service or check our FAQs

Registered users

- submit your proposal
- sign the grant
- manage your project throughout its lifecycle

WHAT'S NEW? FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES HOW TO PARTICIPATE **WORK AS AN EXPERT** MY PERSONAL AREA INFORMATION AND SUPPORT

HORIZON 2020 RESEARCH ON EUROPA CORDIS OLAF

© European Communities

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

VALUTAZIONE ESPERTI

- ALMENO TRE ESPERTI (DUE per la SOTTOMISSIONE A DUE STEP)
- ESPERTI AGGIUNTIVI PER **ETHICS REVIEW**
- IL PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE PUO' ESSERE SEGUITO DA **OSSERVATORI INDIPENDENTI**
- NO CONFLITTO D'INTERESSI

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE

Criterio 1

Eccellenza

Criterio 2

Impatto

Criterio 3

Qualità e
efficienza
dell'attuazione

- PROCEDURA DI PRESENTAZIONE A DUE STEP: SOLO ECCELLENZA E IMPATTO (4 SOGLIA MINIMA PER ENTRAMBI I CRITERI)

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE

1. Excellence

- Clarity of the objectives;
- Soundness of the concept, including transdisciplinary considerations;
- Credibility of the proposed approach;
- Progress beyond the state of the art.

2. Impact: [...] contribution to:

- The expected impacts listed in the work programme
- Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge;
- Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets;
- ...measures to, disseminate and exploit the project results,... communication.

3. Quality and efficiency of implementation

- Coherence and effectiveness of work plan, ... allocation of tasks, resources;
- Competences, experience and complementarity of the individual participants, as well as of the consortium as a whole;
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures....risk management.

CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE

SOGLIE e PESO

- ✓ Ciascun criterio è valutato da 0 a 5, con **soglia minima per criterio di 3/5** e **soglia complessiva di 10/15**
- ✓ A differenza di FP7, per Innovation Action e SME instrument, il **criterio dell'IMPATTO**
 - Ha un peso ponderato di 1.5
 - È considerato per primo nel caso di pari punteggio

CRITERI DI VALUTAZIONE PUNTEGGI

PUNTEGGIO DA 1 A 5 (POSSIBILITA' DI ½ PUNTO)

- 0 — The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 — **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2 — **Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3 — **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4 — **Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5 — **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion.

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE SELF EVALUATION

**DISPONIBILI PER TIPOLOGIA
DI AZIONE**

(RIA, IA, SME instrument, CSA)



PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE

FASI

FASE I — *INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION*

Ciascun esperto valuta individualmente la proposta e prepara un' **'INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)'** con commenti e punteggio per criterio

FASE II — *CONSENSUS GROUP*

Tutti gli esperti formano un 'consensus group' per raggiungere un'opinione condivisa sulla valutazione (**'CONSENSUS REPORT'**).

FASE III — *PANEL REVIEW*

Per concludere, un panel – generalmente guidato da un rappresentante CE - rivede tutte le proposte del bando (o di parte di un bando) per:

- accertare che le valutazioni dei consensus group siano consistenti
- se necessario, proporre valutazioni/comments diversi
- risolvere i casi in cui ci siano delle posizioni di minoranza nel consensus report
- convocare (tramite i cd. Hearing) i coordinator delle proposte per ulteriori spiegazioni

Il **'PANEL REPORT'** include l' **'EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT (ESR)'** di ciascuna proposta (sulla base del consensus report, inclusi i commenti e le eventuali revisioni del panel report), con punteggio e spiegazioni per criterio, insieme al punteggio complessivo finale (**'panel ranked list'**) e, se necessario, le raccomandazioni di priorità del panel.

PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE PROPOSTE CON STESSO PUNTEGGIO

NELL'ORDINE SI ATTRIBUISCE PRIORITA' A:

1. le proposte che riguardano topic altrimenti non coperti all'interno del WP
2. tra queste, si guarda prima al punteggio del criterio 'excellence', e poi ad 'impact'
 - *(al contrario per Innovation actions & SME instrument)*
3. se c'è ancora parità, al budget destinato alle PMI
4. se c'è ancora parità, al bilanciamento di genere del personale coinvolto
5. se c'è ancora parità, altri fattori (sinergie tra progetti, obiettivi H2020, etc...)


PROCESSO DI VALUTAZIONE COMUNICAZIONE RISULTATI

- PROPOSTE VALUTATE POSITIVAMENTE = *INVITATION LETTER + EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT* al coordinatore per informarlo dei risultati della valutazione e per invitarlo alla fase di preparazione del Grant
 - ECCEZIONE PER LA PRESENTAZIONE A DUE STEP:
 - 'GO' , il coordinatore viene semplicemente invitato a presentare la proposta completa per il II step, ma non riceve ESR
 - 'NO GO', il coordinator riceve ESR
- PROPOSTE BOCCIATE = *PROPOSAL REJECTION LETTER* al coordinatore con relative giustificazioni e possibilità di REDRESS
- RESERVE LIST = nel caso in cui la proposta non sia finanziabile per mancanza di fondi e finanziamenti extra diventino disponibili in futuro.




Brussels, 6 June 2014,
Ares(2014)1996560

Sent by e-mail only



**Subject: Initial information on the outcome of the evaluation of Stage 1 proposals
Horizon 2020 – Mobility for Growth call H2020-MG-2014_TwoStages**



Invitation to submit a full proposal for Stage 2

Dear coordinator,

I am pleased to inform you that the European Commission has now evaluated your Stage 1-proposal (with the help of independent experts).

Since your proposal passed the **minimum threshold scores** foreseen in the call conditions, you are **invited to submit a full proposal for Stage 2** of the evaluation.

The Stage 2-proposal must be submitted electronically through the 'Electronic Submission Service' of the Participant Portal by **28 August at 17:00** (Brussels time).

To do so, please go to the 'My Proposals' tab in the '[My Area](#)' section of the Participant Portal. Access to the proposal template will be open as from 13 June.


Please note that:

- you *must* submit a Stage 2-proposal, if you would like to obtain funding
- funding will depend on a positive evaluation of your Stage 2-proposal; this letter cannot in any way be regarded as an offer to fund your project
- the Stage 2-proposal must be consistent with the Stage 1-proposal and may not differ substantially
- the topic descriptions remain those published in the call conditions
- the admissibility and eligibility conditions remain those published in the Work Programme/call conditions
- the evaluation of the Stage 2-proposal will be a completely independent evaluation exercise; the scores awarded to your Stage 1-proposal will not be taken into account
- you will receive the evaluation summary report (ESR) at the end of the Stage 2 evaluation.

Yours sincerely,

EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT

'NO GO' - TWO STAGES

Proposal Evaluation Form		
	EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Evaluation Summary Report
	Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme	

Call: H2020-MG-2014-TwoStages-First Stage
Funding scheme: Innovation action
Proposal number: 636264-1
Proposal acronym: DEECON B
Duration (months): 48
Proposal title: Innovative After-Treatment System For Marine Diesel Engine Emission Control (B)
Activity: MG-4.1-2014 + MG-4.2-2014 + MG-4.4-2014

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	BRUNEL UNIVERSITY	UK	0	-	13,689,000	100.00%
Total:			0		13,689,000	

Abstract:
 The exhaust gases from ships are a main source of pollutants causing a significant risk to people living close to coastal areas and inland waterways. The EU and the North American Countries, introduced regulations to reduce ships emissions, in addition to IMO guidelines. These require the use of high cost low sulphur fuel or retrofit modification to the existing fleet in order to comply. The goal of this project is to further develop the technology (Non Thermal Plasma Reactor and Wet Electrostatic Scrubber) that was successfully completed during FP7 funded DEECON project (284745) towards TRL 7/8, which will provide the pathway for commercial exploitation by the stakeholders. The new project will create a modular, innovative, advanced emission control system (IAECS) demonstrator that combines different sub-units, each of which is optimized to remove primary pollutants (SOx, NOx, soot - including BC, VOC, and CO) from 1-2 MW marine engine exhaust. This will incorporate three new add-on units (heat recovery, Carbon capture and storage and IFO/biofuels blends microemulifier) to reduce CO2 emissions and increase ship energy efficiency. The washwater treatment will employ microwave plasma and hydrodynamic cavitation to remove organic pollutants, photocatalytic denitrification for NO3- removal and electric field to dewater oil/water emulsion. A new process dynamics & control model and simulator will be developed to aid system scale up and for personnel training. To this end, the relevant information from the simulation models developed in FP7 RETROFIT and TEFLES will be used. The new IAECS will be designed to allow an easy and fast retrofit of existing ships but also can be fitted to new ships of the future. The innovative technologies that will be developed and implemented in the IAECS will be energy efficient as well as provide significant reduction in manufacturing, installation and maintenance costs compared to the existing exhaust gas cleaning systems.

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 7.00 (Threshold: 8.00)

Form information

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

Interpretation of the score:

- 0- The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1- Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2- Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4- Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: Yes

Not provided

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: 3.50 (Threshold: 4.00/- , Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring, and explained in the comments. Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

The objectives are clear and pertinent with the scope of the call, the proposal aims specifically at emission reduction in marine diesel engines, providing a close to the market affordable solution. In fact, the proposal is an improvement of the solution under development in FP7 DEECON project and it focused on two aspects: flexibility of the scrubber and integration with a waste heat recovery unit (HRU) and a unit for on-board

production of stable micro-emulsified fuel blends (SMEF).

Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant

Built on the results of FP7 project DEECON, the project is sound, being the logical continuation of the previous one. Technologies presented in the project have been, for most of them, already validated in previous research projects. The integration of the system in order to cover all diesel emissions (including diesel soot and volatile organic compounds) and minimize the wash water discharges, added to the HRU modul for saving energy requested for system operation, is well described and explained.

Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches)

The proposal is aiming to integrate the research on various pollutants filtering techniques. However many of these techniques have already been investigated in depth by the previous connected project DEECON, and others by various initiatives supported by independent and public entities. Consequently, the genuine opportunity for innovation beyond the state of art is not convincingly identified, making the innovation potential substantial, but not revolutionary.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: 3.50 (Threshold: 4.00/- , Weight: -)

Note: The extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level to the listed sub-criteria:

The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic

Since the project offers the possibility of near-zero emissions (except CO2, reduced by 15-30%), even using heavy and low-cost high-sulfur fuels, the impact on future requirements and world's fleet future emissions could be significant. A global effort for an effective and multilateral research strategy in emission treatment will produce opportunity for application, which could be applied by the shipbuilding industry. However the lack of a real cost benefit analysis and practical innovation topics make this outcome uncertain when compared with alternative approaches.

Remarks

There is a substantial potential to go a step further in after treatment systems for marine diesel engines, but the use of other fuels in the meanwhile could reduce the ambition and penetration of this solution. Moreover, there are many pilot projects underway, which make this proposal marginally attractive. No particular evidence is supplied on the obtained results by the running DEECON project.

INVITATION LETTER SINGLE STAGE

CARATTERISTICHE GA



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH & INNOVATION
Directorate B - Innovation Union and European Research Area
Science with and for society

Brussels,

Adalheidur JONSDOTTIR
THE ICELANDIC CENTRE FOR
RESEARCH
Laugavegur 13
101 REYKJAVIK
ICELAND

Subject: Result of Evaluation / Invitation to grant preparation
H2020 - H2020-GARRI-NCP-2014-1
635656 - SiS.net2

Dear **Adalheidur JONSDOTTIR**,

We are pleased to inform you that the above mentioned proposal has been **favourably evaluated** by the Commission. Consequently, we wish to proceed to the preparation of the Grant Agreement based on your proposal.

Please find enclosed the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) for your proposal. The ESR reflects the comments of the evaluators and their advice to the Commission on the proposal.

Invitation to grant preparation

With reference to the submitted proposal and its evaluation, the grant preparation shall be based on the following:

1. **Proposal No:** 635656 - SiS.net2 - CSA
2. **Strategic objective:** H2020 - H2020-GARRI-NCP-2014-1
3. **Project Officer:**

Mr. Jean-Francois DECHAMP
Jean-Francois.DECHAMP@ec.europa.eu
+32 22961462
Science for and in society

4. **Maximum Grant Amount:**

EU contribution requested in Proposal: 1,999,598.00 EUR

Maximum EU financial contribution attributed to Action following evaluation: 1,999,598.00 EUR

INVITATION LETTER SINGLE STAGE

TEMPISTICHE

5. Duration of the Action: 36 Months

6. **Technical content:** The 'Description of the Action' (**Annex 1** of the future Grant Agreement) and the 'Estimated budget for the action' (**Annex 2** of the future Grant Agreement) shall be based on the proposal submitted.

In the event that the ethics assessment and/or the security scrutiny identify substantive issues, these recommendations must be taken into account during grant preparation and reflected in the Description of the Action.

Please note that, in principle, no changes in the consortium composition (including linked third parties) are possible during the grant preparation phase. Please inform your Project Officer (3) as soon as possible if an organisation from the proposal is no longer in a position to participate in the grant agreement for duly-justified reasons (e.g. due to bankruptcy).

7. Timetable for grant preparation:

7.1 **7 weeks after the date of this letter** is the deadline for the submission of the grant agreement data, including annexes. Following the assessment of the submitted version of the grant agreement data, you will have a two-week deadline to submit the final version taking into consideration all requirements highlighted by the Project Officer,

7.2 **8 weeks after the date of this letter** is the deadline for the electronic signature of the participants' declarations of honour.

The Commission foresees proceeding with the signature of the grant agreement within **3 months** after the date of this letter.

Failure to respect the deadlines indicated above (7) will be considered as a wish not to enter into, or continue with, the grant preparation and, therefore, to withdraw your proposal. In such a case, the Commission reserves the right to initiate the procedures to reject your proposal, unless alternative arrangements have been accepted by the Commission.

The entire grant preparation process, including communication with the Commission and the subsequent signature of the Grant Agreement, shall be carried out through the Research **Participant Portal Grant Management Service** (PP GMS). By logging into the '*My Area*' section in the Participant Portal and selecting the project, each step of the grant preparation process can be followed, and all relevant documents consulted, at any time.

The Grant Agreement preparation data provided through the Participant Portal (pre-filled with the information already available in the Beneficiary Register, and structured data from your proposal) are needed in order to prepare the grant agreement and provide programme-wide statistical information.

Please note that some information related to the legal and financial status of participants is read-only and may only be updated by the Legal Entity Appointed Representative (LEAR) of the concerned entity through the 'My Organisation(s)' page of the 'My Area' section in the Participant Portal. It is therefore important to ensure that all participants are aware of the need to appoint a LEAR.

Furthermore, please be aware that linked third parties mentioned in your proposal also need to be registered and validated as legal entities. If necessary, please urge them to start the registration / validation process as quickly as possible.

EVALUATION SUMMARY FOR SINGLE STAGE

In the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring, and explained in the comments.

- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- Credibility of the proposed approach
- Soundness of the concept
- Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures

The proposal very well resonates with the objectives of the call and sets the project objectives accordingly. It aims to provide training for the network of NCPs and to give feedback to the Commission. The project will solely address cross-cutting issues, as requested by the call. The proposed general approach, based on four different dimensions (vision, action, culture and systems and logistics) is very promising, and take into consideration the different national cultural, social, legal aspects in the different addressed countries. The concept includes giving all NCPs the chance to convene and to engage in a dialogue focusing on a particular subset of issues the NCP is deemed to handle in their day to day business. It therefore follows a grassroots approach, giving the NCPs the floor to learn from each other. The novel concept introduced (NCP Academy) is not elaborated in a nuanced way, so it remains unclear as to how exactly the proposed objectives will be achieved. There are references in the first part of the proposal focused on its relationship with the work programme that remain under-qualified, such as the one referring to the project's ambition to respond to the heterogeneity of NCP services which are provided at the national level, or its aim to provide quality training to the NCP community. The proposal's references to the need for integral training are under-elaborated e.g. how exactly a harmonised training approach and a cross-fertilisation will be materialised and become operational. Another shortcoming is that the proposal does not take into account the results and main conclusions from previous similar projects on the role and activities of NCPs in detail.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or international level.

the relevant topic disseminate the project results (Including management of IPR), to be relevant. It will have a good impact on the NCP quality level. The effectiveness of the proposed shortcoming: explained e.g. at the description of implementation risks "lack of demand" is criticised widely" (p.39), but this activity is not described in the relevant WP4 advertisement or awareness raising activities either. Outreach to NCPs with fewer capacities and outside the consortium and to the means that the enabling of NCPs will be less effective than expected. Presenting many collaborative tools (e.g. collaborative platform). The training materials are in general well-structured and well-planned. However, as training materials are in the expiry of the project, the proposal lacks detail and reference to or to relevant intellectual property rights. The project life will be sustained on the European level.

appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources (when relevant) procedures, including risk and innovation management

and are adequate to the nature and extent of the proposal. The main tasks to fulfill the objectives. The description of the tasks is rather brief in resulting in loss of coherence. - There are inconsistencies in the planning e.g. the staff effort Table 3.1b (p.34) indicates the number of person months for the different WPs. According to this table, the total number of person months regarding the five WPs is 168.8 (and not 169.4 as indicated in the sum at the end of the table itself). However, Table 3.4a (page 40) indicates a summary of staff effort of 174.4 person months. Another example: The KPIs will be defined in M12 D3.2 (p.28), so it must be a typo mistake that in Table 3.1c its delivery date is M1 (p.35) - The allocation of tasks and resources is explained very vaguely in the proposal (pp.41-43); and in particular the budget lines are not clearly justified nor linked to tasks in the WP descriptions. In particular, the allocation of PM to consortium members is not sufficiently justified. - The support of an Advisory Board meeting once a year is envisaged. However, the selection criteria regarding the future members, and their professional backgrounds, skills and requirements are not adequately described. In particular, the role of NCPs outside the project is not offered. - The management structure is suitable; the applicants, in particular the lead applicant, are very experienced in the management of such projects. The consortium consists of NCPs and is therefore familiar with the issues NCPs have faced in FP7 and before. The consortium partners' experience is complementing, and the consortium is excellent and collectively very well capable to perform the tasks. - The proposal does not elaborate widely to identify neither NCPs that chose not to participate in the consortium, nor their reasons, as the Call expects. Moreover, the proposal does not explain how the "currently undefined NCP Coordinators" (p.19) will be identified, and involved. -In WP 1 the WP leader DASTI will develop the NCP Academy concept in detail, set the quality check mechanisms and provide support mechanisms for NCPs. The mechanisms include a mailing list and a blog, but there is no detailed description on who will facilitate them or who will answer the questions on the list. The mentor's role and affiliation is not elaborated either. (p.21) There are no further, more innovative and interactive tools planned.

In WP2 there are few details on the concept of the training as a whole, so it remains unclear e.g. if there would be training for different levels. The streamlining, structuring of the trainings is not clearly presented, especially, there are no details on how the external experts will be selected. While the content of the trainings is presented, the methodology of teaching lacks details.

The description of the deliverables and milestones suggest that there will be only two training course series (4 modules each) during the project duration: the first in M16 and the second in M34. It is not explained why, if the course content is ready at M8 the first training starts 10 months later. Efficiency is doubted with so few trainings. As the proposal well observed, with the launch of H2020, the NCPs need to update their knowledge and acquire new skills. The delay in starting the trainings would delay this process.

In WP 3 the objective to have a standardised quality across the NCP network is described, but it remains unclear how it will have a sustainable effect be tested and used later, e.g. discussed among the NCP coordinators and further refined. In WP4 description there is no sufficient detail on meetings and task force reports e.g. the content, methodology, and the expected number of participants in activities of task 4.1 M&E workshops.

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

Not provided

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: **Yes**

Not provided

Remarks

Not provided

ation Report

ed	%
700	23.21%
878	10.31%
000	8.08%
236	7.18%
600	16.47%
844	8.90%
826	5.01%
000	1.02%
176	6.51%
600	7.29%
370	9.01%
828	

ients and project and the European national contact id ways of working. together NCP and implement mmunication for base already 20 programme rium will work mpacts include calls.

pic description



RESEARCH & INNOVATION

Participant Portal

European Commission > Research & Innovation > Participant Portal > My Proposals

MY AREA

HOME

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES

HOW TO PARTICIPATE

EXPERTS

SUPPORT

Search PP



DIASSINA DI MAGGIO

My Organisation(s)

My Proposal(s)

My Project(s)

My Notification(s)

My Expert Area

My Proposals

H2020 ONLINE MANUAL

This page provides a list of all proposals relating to you as a participant, as follows:

- proposals you have initiated or submitted as a Coordinator/Principal Investigator, or
- proposals you have contributed to as a project participant

You can view, edit or download your draft or submitted proposals, depending on the proposal status and the deadline of the relevant call.

To start preparing a new proposal, go to [Funding Opportunities](#), to the page of the call or topic that you want to apply for, and enter the **electronic submission system**.

LEGEND



Edit Draft



View Draft



View Submitted



Delete Proposal



Follow-up

Show 10 entries

EXCEL

Search: green dial

PROGRAM	CALL	FUNDING SCHEME	PROPOSAL ID	ACRONYM	STATUS	REMAINING TIME	ACTIONS
H2020	H2020-SC5-2014-one-stage	CSA	SEP-210145597	Green Dialogue	Final	0	VS FO

Showing 1 to 1 of 1 entries. (filtered from 58 total entries)

← PREVIOUS 1 NEXT →





European Commission

RESEARCH & INNOVATION

Participant Portal - Grant Management Services

Diassina DI MAGGIO

MY PROPOSAL



Call: H2020-SC5-2014-one-stage
 Type of Action: CSA
 Acronym: Green Dialogue
 Current Phase: Evaluation
 Number: 642333
 Duration: 36 months
 Start Date:
 Estimated Project Cost:
 €2,145,746.00
 Requested EU Contribution:
 €1,671,923.00
 Contact:

See all data ...




H2020 ONLINE MANUAL



Proposal Management & Grant Preparation
642333 - Green Dialogue

08/04/2014



Documents



642333-G...logue-ESR



Evaluati... Dialogue



Messages