Recommendations for European Project Proposals

Collection of recommendations according to past submissions received by the European Commission. Reproduced as presented by Olivier da Costa in November 2012 at BICA in Palermo.

What Works	**What Fails**
Target *the Call*	• Deliberately using *keywords* from the (broad) call, rather than more specific terminology in line with the specific intent. • Re-submission from other challenges *artificially re-shaped* for this challenge.
Follow-up: explain clearly the new added-value.	Mere continuation of an existing project
Partial or full *resubmission* of the previously rejected proposals are allowed, and treated like all other (new) proposals.	Not taking into account comments from previous Evaluation Summary Report.
Ambitious yet realistic objectives	Describing numerous diverse goals without clarifying how they tie together.
Precise position with respect to the *State-of-the-Art (SoA)* (literature/funded projects). • Where it stands • How it will be advanced	• Lack of discussion of SoA • Promising something too far beyond SoA, or already done. • Proposing a large effort on literature survey within the project.

What Works	**What Fails**
Justify the specificity / contribution in the "FP7 landscape". • Situate the proposal in reference to ongoing projects • Build on them • Identify potential synergies and/or possible cooperation. • Identify gaps.	Apparent "double funding"
Convincing description of *methodology*: make clear *what* you want to do and *HOW*.	Insufficient description of methodology, proposals tell *WHAT* they want to do but not *HOW*.
Be honest when the way forward is not clear, don't deny or underestimate difficulties.	Believing that the evaluators are not that bright and that they won't notice that you don't know how to proceed.
Challange 2 is a *scientific* challenge, NOT an application challenge.	Pure application / product development
Validation in *real-world scenarios* • Testing/validation • Illustrate capabilities of system • Open to any application area	Pure theoretical projects or with only simulation/lab tests
Clearly specified *success criteria* • Mielstones/expected functionalities / benchmarks / metrics.	Vague promises to solve all the open issues.
Need for *integration* well taken into account.	Underestimated integration.
• Spell out the *management risks* and the *specific technological risks* in a realistic and concrete way. • Provide a credible *contingency plan.*	Claiming that a research project is almost risk free.

What Works	**What Fails**
Bring the right *partners* on board from the start. One single rule: *three* mutually independent partners from *three* different Member States or participating countries. • IPs don't have to be huge • STREPs don't have to be small	Artificial Add-on: • Attempt a "good geographical coverage". • Un-manageable / inefficient IPs with large number of partners. • Consultant for administration / finance (unless proven cost efficient).
• Three Possible motives for industrial participation: – Involvement of R&D departments – Providing platforms – Enabling validation scenarios. • Demonstrate commitment to the project. • Genuine interest in the project outcome.	Industry artificially-added with no clear role / added value or no clear commitment to the project.
CVs of key PIs and references to most relevant publications.	• Missing CVs of key PIs or references to most relevant publications. • "Big names" without any real involvement.
Match the *human resources* and *management* to the proposal.	• Over or under-estimation of the budget. • Management too complex or too generic

What Works	**What Fails**
Creative *dissemination* of results: • Potential impact for the EC • Use of modern media, social networks, summer schools...	Dissemination too restrictive or generic.
Explain the *expected concrete impact*: • On S&T • On business & society...	