



Erfahrungsbericht eines Evaluators der in PASR eingereichten Projekte

Univ.-Prof. Dr. Alexander Siedschlag

PASR = „Preparatory Action on the enhancement of the European industrial potential in the field of Security research“

„The evaluation criteria will be based on **quality**: activities selected for funding must demonstrate a high potential to contribute tangible and demonstrable improvements in security, a high technical and managerial quality, and the potential to stimulate innovation and to build sustainable partnership in the context of the objectives of the PASR.

Any proposal which contravenes fundamental **ethical principles** may be excluded from being evaluated or selected at any time.“

Handbook for Evaluation and Selection of Proposals, PASR-2006, S. 3.

5 Evaluierungskriterien

- Relevance of the proposal to the Programme of Work of the Preparatory Action and respect of the principles set out in the Programme of Work;
- Reinforcement of the competitiveness of European industry and potential for exploitation;
- Scientific and/or technological excellence and contribution to tangible and demonstrable improvements in security;
- Building of effective partnerships between (public) users, industry and research;
- Ability of the consortium to carry out the project successfully and to ensure its efficient management, including the ability to protect classified information if necessary, and clear plans for the management of intellectual property.

Punkteskala: 0 (fails to address the issue) bis 5 (excellent)

Schwellenwert für jedes Kriterium: 3 Punkte!

Handbook for Evaluation and Selection of Proposals, PASR-2006, S. 15.

Überblick über die Evaluierungskriterien (1/3)

1. Relevance of the proposal to the Programme of Work of the PASR and respect of the principles set out in the Programme of Work (*Threshold 3/5; Weight 1*)

The extent to which

- the proposed project is
 - mission-oriented and/or
 - pre-normative in areas relating to standards and internationally interoperable systems and/or
 - contributes to the understanding of human factors, social and ethical values.
- the proposed project addresses one or more of the priority missions
- the proposed project is instrumental in the preparation of the future ESRP and in particular one or more key activities
- the proposed project addresses multi-disciplinary, multi purpose (civil / defence applications) or multi-stakeholders RTD issues
- the European added value of funding this project by PASR is evident.
- the proposed project does not duplicate on-going projects

Handbook for Evaluation and Selection of Proposals, PASR-2006, S. 34-36.

Überblick über die Evaluierungskriterien (2/3)



2. Reinforcement of the competitiveness for European industry and potential for exploitation (*Threshold 3/5; Weight 1*)

The extent to which

- the proposed project has an impact on the European industry
- the effective usage of the results at the end of the project is convincing
- the European scientific and technological base is strengthened
- the proposed project enhances and complements other existing projects (national, European, international) in the field of security

3. Scientific and/or technological excellence and contribution to tangible and demonstrable improvements in security (*Threshold 3/5; Weight 1*)

The extent to which

- the proposed project delivers tangible results contributing to demonstrable improvements in security during the time frame of the project
- the proposed project has clearly defined objectives and addresses immediate security challenges of the European citizen and society
- the proposed project seeks the state of the art of research, application of research in non-explored areas, or in integrating existing results in innovative applications
- the proposed S&T approach is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives



Überblick über die Evaluierungskriterien (3/3)

4. Building of effective partnerships between (public) users, industry and research (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)

The extent to which

- the partners collectively constitute a consortium of high quality, with involvement of end users
- the partnership is sustainable and effective and establishes working methodologies between (public) users, industry and research organisations
- the range of capabilities and expertise covered by the project partners is convincing
- the partners are well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them
- there is good complementarity between partners
- there is adequate industrial involvement to ensure exploitation of results

5. Ability of the consortium to carry out the project successfully and to ensure its efficient management, including the ability to protect classified information if necessary, and clear plans for the management of intellectual property (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)

The extent to which

- the organisational structure is well matched to the level of complexity of the project
 - the project management approach is convincing and is demonstrably of high quality
 - there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property, of other innovation-related activities and of classified information if relevant (security clearance of staff?)
 - the project mobilises the required critical mass of resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) necessary for success
 - the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.
-

Vorgehensweise bei der Evaluierung



- Gesamt-Schwellenwert: 18 von 25 Punkten
- Erfolgsaussichten de facto von 25 bis 23 Punkte
- Jedenfalls zweistufiges Evaluierungsverfahren:
 1. Individuelle, unabhängige Evaluierung (keine Diskussionen) auf der Basis implizit vorgereichter Anträge
 2. Consensus Meeting (Kleingruppen-Setting, interdisziplinäre Perspektive, ergebnisorientierte Moderation durch einen DG official)

Persönliche Erfahrungen (1/3)



Eigene Erfahrungen aus der Evaluierung im Bereich der „Supporting Activities“

- Zu begutachtende Anträge von schwach bis stark vorgereicht, gute Hilfe
- Rasche interdisziplinäre Verständigungsgrundlage geschaffen
- Große gegenseitige Offenheit für jeweils „fremde“ fachliche Argumente
- In der Regel fließende Konvergenz der Einzelbewertungen
- Verbleibende Bewertungsdifferenzen werden durch den Austausch inhaltlicher Argumente am Schluss des Consensus Meeting gut gelöst
- Das „Bepunktungsverfahren“ wird erfahrungsbasiert kalibriert

Persönliche Erfahrungen (2/3)



- Greifbarkeit der Ergebnisse?
- Programmatischer Ansatz, entscheidendes Praxispotenzial?
- Klare Definition der Ziele?
- Ist die praktische Bewältigung einer relevanten Sicherheitsbedrohung zu erwarten?
- Internationalität des Konsortiums (>3?)
- Nachhaltigkeit des Konsortiums?
- Potenzial des Projektes, zum Wachstum der europäischen Industrie beizutragen?

Persönliche Erfahrungen (3/3)



- Managementkompetenz innerhalb des Konsortiums?
- Schlüssige Beschreibung der Organisationsstruktur und der Managementstruktur des Projektes?
- Passung der Kompetenzen der Konsortialpartner in den Gesamtzusammenhang des beantragten Projektes
- Ausreichende logistische Infrastruktur?
- Realistisches Budget? → Man kann auch zu wenig Mittel beantragen



Vielen Dank!

