



MINISTÈRE  
DE L'ENSEIGNEMENT  
SUPÉRIEUR  
ET DE LA RECHERCHE

*Liberté  
Égalité  
Fraternité*



# Analyses des ESR (Evaluation Summary Report) Cluster Santé – Appels 2022 1 étape

PCN Santé – MESR





# Netiquette

- ✓ **Coupez votre caméra et microphone**
- ✓ **Posez vos questions sur le chat**





**Virginie Sivan, MESRI**  
Coordination PCN et représentation au comité de  
programme Santé



**Vania Rosas-Magallanes**



**Sophie Decamps**



**Catherine Tostain-Desmares**

<https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/contactez-les-pcn>


# Vous allez trouver dans cette présentation:

- Le cluster santé dans Horizon Europe
- La procédure d'évaluation
- Méthodologie d'analyse des ESR
- Résultats d'analyses des ESRs par Destination
- Ressources utiles
- Recommandations



# La Santé dans Horizon Europe

## THREE PILLARS FOR IMPLEMENTATION



# Le programme de travail dans Horizon Europe

- Horizon Europe is implemented through **work programmes** which set out funding opportunities mainly through **calls for proposals**.
- A call for proposal will normally contain one or more **topics** with a common deadline. The budget of the call is distributed among topics. Where topics share a budget envelope, proposals for these topics will be competing against each other and will result in a single ranking list.
- Applicants **apply to a specific call and topic**.
- Each topic to which applicants can apply will include:
  - The topic **scope**
  - The topic **expected outcome**
  - The **expected impact** of the destination to which the topic belongs
  - The **type of action**
  - The topic **budget** (or budget shared by group of topics)

# Procédure d'évaluation

---

## ✔ Critères d'évaluation

3 critères principaux sont évalués : excellence, impact, qualité et efficience de la mise en œuvre

## ✔ Évaluation par les pairs

Comités d'experts indépendants, les « experts-évaluateurs »

Chaque projet est évalué par minimum 3 experts

Les projets sont classés et financés par rapport au budget disponible

## ✔ Duré de l'évaluation

5 mois maximum (+3 contractualisation) = 8 mois de la date limite au début du projet « *time to grant* »

---

# Procédure d'évaluation

## Excellence

Clarté et pertinence **des objectifs du projet**; et dans quelle mesure ils sont ambitieux et vont au-delà de l'état de l'art

Crédibilité de la méthodologie proposée, notamment les concepts sous-jacents, les modèles, hypothèses, approches interdisciplinaires

Considération appropriée du **genre dans le contenu de la recherche**

Qualité **des pratiques de science ouverte**, notamment l'engagement des citoyens, de la société civile et des utilisateurs finaux et gestion et partage des résultats de la recherche

5

## Impact

**Crédibilité de la voie choisie** (*pathway*) pour atteindre les « outcomes » et « impacts » attendus listés dans l'appel et le programme de travail et dans quelle mesure le projet va y contribuer

Adéquation et qualité des mesures pour maximiser les impacts et résultats attendus, tels que décrit dans **le plan d'exploitation et de dissémination**, notamment les activités de **communication**

5

## Mise en œuvre

**Qualité et efficacité du plan de travail**, évaluation des risques et adéquation des efforts assignés à chaque « work packages » et les ressources

**Capacité et rôle de chaque participant**, et dans quelles mesures le consortium dans son ensemble apporte l'expertise nécessaire

5



# Les notes des évaluations

---

0 : La proposition **ne répond pas** au critère ou ne peut être évaluée en raison d'informations manquantes ou incomplètes.

1 : **Médiocre**. Le critère est insuffisamment pris en compte ou présente de graves faiblesses intrinsèques.

2 : **Passable** : la proposition répond globalement au critère, mais présente des faiblesses importantes.

3 : **Bon** : la proposition répond bien au critère, mais présente un certain nombre de lacunes.

4 : **Très bien**. La proposition répond très bien au critère, mais présente un petit nombre d'insuffisances.

5 : **Excellent**. La proposition aborde avec succès tous les aspects pertinents du critère. Les éventuelles lacunes sont mineures.

---

# Un ESR : Evaluation Summary Report

Proposal Evaluation Form		
	<b>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</b> Horizon Europe Framework Programme (HORIZON)	<b>Evaluation Summary Report - Research and innovation actions</b>

Call: HORIZON-HLTH-2021-STAYHLTH-01  
Type of action: HORIZON-RIA  
Proposal number:  
Proposal acronym:  
Duration (months):  
Proposal title:  
Activity:

## Evaluation Summary Report

### Evaluation Result

Total score: 14.00 (Threshold: 10)

#### Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art.
- Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end users where appropriate.

#### Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from the project.
- Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

#### Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **5.00** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.
- Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

### Excellence:

1. Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
2. Ambition beyond the state of the art
3. Soundness of the concept and methodology
4. Artificial intelligence
5. Clinical trials/regulatory aspects
6. Gender dimension
7. Open science

### Impact :

1. Pathways leading to the expected outcomes and impact
2. Dissemination, communication
3. IPR exploitation
4. Regulatory aspects

### Mise en œuvre:

1. Work plan and resources
2. Assessment of risks
3. Regulatory aspects
4. Consortium

Les commentaires sont très généraux avec un même style d'écriture

## Critères de sélection des ESR

- Uniquement les topics de type RIA
- Même nombre de projets financés/non financés (pour comparaison du nombre de commentaires)
- Projets avec une note supérieure ou égale à 11 (sauf destination 4)
- Répartition des notes et des pays coordinateurs

## Analyse de 100 ESR de projets soumis aux appels 2022, tous topics confondus :

- 16 Destination 1 (1 topic)
- 10 Destination 2 (1 topic)
- 20 Destination 3 (2 topics)
- 8 Destination 4 (1 topics)
- 22 Destination 5 (2 topics)
- 24 Destination 6 (3 topics)

**Nombre de commentaires positifs et négatifs (comparables, car généraux) par critère:** excellence, impact et mise en œuvre pour l'identification des différences entre projets financés et no

---


# Résultats de l'appel 2022 – Topics RIA

10 topics

267 propositions

95 sous le seuil (>10) : 36% des propositions

Répartition des notes RIA




# Résultats de l'appel 2022 – Topics RIA – Projets avec au moins un partenaire FR

10 topics

110 propositions (37% des propositions EU)


37 sous le seuil (>10) : 34% des propositions FR



10 topics


100 ESRs analysés (37% des dépôts)

Répartition des notes  
ESRs analysés




# Analyse des ESRs 2022 – Topics RIA

Moyenne des notes par critère et par Destination




Projets financés - moyenne des notes par critères






## Commentaires par critère




# Analyse des ESRs 2022 – Critère Excellence

## Financés




## Non financés




# Analyse des ESRs 2022 – Critère Impact

## Financés




## Non financés




# Analyse des ESRs 2022 – Critère Mise en œuvre

## Financés



## Non financés



## **Critères les plus commentés en général**

- Soundness of the concept
- Pathway to impact
- Quality and efficacy of the work plan

## **Critère les plus commentés de manière positive**

Genre et open science : faire attention à ce critère

## **Critères les plus commentés de manière négative**

- Intelligence Artificielle
- Analyse de risque
- Etude clinique

→ En général, peu de différence entre les projets financés et non-financés sur le nombre de commentaires négatifs sur ces critères

## Soundness of the concept

### Méthodologie

Exemple de critiques négatives sur la méthodologie des projets

- *There is a concern about the large number of instruments and items and it is not clear how many they will be used in practice*
- *the collection of samples, as described in the methods, is challenging especially for the proposed sample size*
- *the proposed methodology has a shortcoming related to the experimental models, which are insufficiently described and difficult to translate to human health.*
- *some concepts and the integration of different methods and expertise are inadequately demonstrated*
- *Aspects such as the establishment of the biobanks or the modelling aspects are insufficiently elaborated*
- *convincing data are not presented supporting the assumption*
- *characteristics of the study population are not clearly described including if and how the project will target high-risk groups for the interventions*
- *The proposal lacks details regarding the validation of the new diagnostic test.*
- *Although the scientific methodology is clear and sound, it is not always sufficiently detailed.*

## Soundness of the concept

### Interdisciplinarité :

Dans la plupart des cas, les remarques négatives sur l'interdisciplinarité soulignent le manque d'expertise ou d'intégration des Sciences Humaines et Sociales

→ *Problème en particulier pour la Destination 4, destination avec les plus nombreuses critiques sur cet aspect*

## Open sciences practices

Engagement of citizens, civil society, and end-users where appropriate : 17% des commentaires positifs

Exemple cités : highly developed co-creation design, consultations with adolescents, parents and staff and development of advisory committees, involvement of patient advocacy group, engagement of end-users in usability tests



## Artificial Intelligence

### Commentaires positifs

*Solid AI methodology, robustness sufficiently discussed/ well-described / well demonstrated*

### Commentaires négatifs

*AI solution is not sufficiently described*

*the robustness of the AI tools to be used is not clarified in sufficient details / not adequately addressed*

*The proposal indicates that AI and Machine Learning will be used without sufficient information about the models, techniques and the approaches that are proposed*

*insufficient details on the justification of the use of AI*

## Clinical Trial/Studies

### Commentaires positifs

- *The retrospective and prospective cohorts to be used for validation are well described including sample availability, while possible regulatory obstacles are realistically identified*
- *All studies are designed to the specificities of the settings, regions and target groups, with adequate detail provided*
- *clinical study is professionally described, designed extremely well, scientifically sound, structurally excellent, planned robustly and operationally highly feasible*

### Commentaires négatifs

- *is not clear whether the number of subjects in the clinical study will allow prediction of the health-to-disease transition and whether the study is of sufficient complexity*
- *there are concerns that the number of participants of the study to understand youth perceptions of exposures relevant to mental health conditions does not adequately cover the diversity of target group*
- *the clinical study document does not provide sufficient information on power calculation.*
- *the study design, variables and sample size estimations lack specification*
- *Some part of the protocol is unclear, how and why the timing for treatment has been chosen*

## Pathway to impact

Beaucoup de commentaires sur cet aspect

### Exemple de commentaires négatifs

- *the proposal fails to convincingly elaborate the path to get to the expected outcomes and impacts considering policy recommendations, treatment guidelines related to regulatory principles and involvement of patient groups.*
- *details on the specific pathways (on how the expected contributions will be achieved) are lacking, for example, on stakeholder engagement, citizen science.*
- *the deployment of the proposal outputs at a broader European level among member states and decision-makers at various member state levels are not convincingly presented*
- *the proposal does not clearly define the targets/validation for some KPIs and how they will be monitored and assessed*
- *the obstacles related to social risks are not sufficiently covered*
- *there is insufficient evidence how mental health outcomes will lead to potential impact*

## Pathway to impact

Beaucoup de commentaires sur cet aspect

### Exemple de commentaires négatifs

- *given the complexity of the proposed action, the proposal has devoted insufficient attention to some further possible barriers*
- *barriers in achieving impacts are insufficiently detailed beyond research activities*
- *the potential lack of acceptance or adoption of the outcomes by Regulatory or HTA agencies is an important barrier that is not sufficiently considered.*

## Plan de dissémination, communication et exploitation

Près de 30% des commentaires positifs sur les plans de dissémination et communication soulignent l'identification de **groupes cibles différents** et l'adaptation du plan à chacun d'entre eux

- Exemple de groupes cibles cités : healthcare professionals, patients, researchers, clinicians, citizens, decision makers, different level (local, regional, global), industrial stakeholders, networks of excellence
- Exemple de voie de dissémination communication citées : newsletter, events, social media, seminars, policy papers, training and education materials, workshops, open data sources,

## Work plan

25% des commentaires négatifs concernent l'allocation des ressources

- *Resources distribution per partner, task leaders and work packages are not well balanced*
- *the high level of person months allocated to the coordinator is not convincingly justified*
- *the overall effort of the project is underestimated*
- *the resource allocation does not correspond to the planned work, is insufficiently justified*
- *some major direct cost items are insufficiently detailed*

17% des commentaires négatifs concernent le timing du projet :

- *the timing of the tasks is not specified*
  - *all WPs start in month 1 and end in month 48.*
  - *the timeline is likely too ambitious to complete the proposed tasks*
  - *the planning in terms of timing and sequencing of WPs and tasks may not contribute to the effective execution and evaluation of the project.*
  - *the timing that has been allocated to the tasks is not well aligned with the objectives / underestimated / not specified*
  - *the proposed duration of the project has not been sufficiently justified.*
-

## Work plan

15% des commentaires négatifs concernent le suivi du projet :

- *the work packages (WPs) do not provide enough quantified information to monitor progress*
- *the number of milestones is insufficient to allow adequate monitoring of the project's progress*
- *milestones are not related to deliverables. This makes the monitoring of the project difficult*
- *the number of deliverables is too limited to enable an adequate progress tracking*
- *the proposal is expected to include many deliverables that are not publicly available, which is a concern*
- *the breakdown in work packages (WP) is not fully appropriate to monitor the progress of this project*
- *not all milestones have a due date specified / insufficient milestones to enable appropriate monitoring of implementation progress.*
- *most deliverables and milestones are scheduled for the final months of the project and intermediate control points are not obvious in the plans*

## Work plan

25% des commentaires négatif concernent la description technique des WP:

- *dissemination is split between WP0 and WP6*
- *the logistics and delivery approach that will be used for the transport of specimen is not convincingly described*
- *There is lack of details concerning the implementation of WP1*
- *the proposal does not sufficiently define how the primary data of the three pilot will be collected*
- *Some implementation aspects are insufficiently detailed. For example, the process to define and agree on a minimum viable product and aspects of trustworthiness*
- *there is limited information about the standardisation/harmonisation status of existing data and about any measures to address potential lack of standardised data among the data providers*
- *The description of the work packages is insufficient*
- *the proposal provides insufficient implementation details on each of the envisaged pilot studies*



## Risk Analysis

### **Commentaires positifs**

Critical/potential risks are well identified and appropriate mitigation measures proposed  
Risk assessment is well presented / very good

### **Commentaires négatifs**

The risks are inadequately addressed / not sufficiently elaborated  
The list of risk is not exhaustive, too general

Mitigation measures are not sufficiently explained / not fully convincing

## Consortium

### Exemple de commentaires négatifs


- *The availability and the access to the necessary infrastructure is not clearly described*
- *The roles of the partners are not always balanced across the execution of this project / is not sufficiently clear or justified*
- *Lack of expertise in specific fields (health economics, psychology, HTA bodies, clinical, Social Science and Humanities, etc.)*
- *the project does not provide a significant industrial/commercial involvement to ensure exploitation of the results*



# Analyse par destination


# Destination 1- Staying Healthy in a rapidly changing society

HORIZON-HLTH-2022-STAYHLTH-02-01 -Personalised blueprint of chronic inflammation in health-to-disease transition




# Destination 1- Excellence

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Objective/Ambition : do not address the health-to-disease transition

Soundness of the concept : not detailed enough, inadequately demonstrated



AI : not sufficiently explained, no information on the techniques and approaches

→ Genre et Sciences ouvertes toujours très bien évalués !

Gender dimension satisfactorily/well/effectively addressed, integrated into the approach, taken into account

Open science : engagement of citizens, sharing and management of research data, FAIR principle

# Destination 1- Impact



## Commentaires non-financés :


Pathway to impact :

Contribution to expected outcomes of the topic not sufficient, scale and significance not clear or overestimated


Exploitation plan : not clear, lack detail, not correlated to the TRL of the project

# Destination 1- Mise en œuvre

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Complementarity of the consortium

Lack of a specific expertise (clinical/industry)

Role not clear

Access to critical infrastructure not demonstrated

## Destination 1 - zoom sur les projets financés

Excellence score	Impact score	Implementation score	Status
4,00	5,00	5,00	Main list
4,00	5,00	5,00	Main list
4,00	4,50	5,00	Below available budget
4,00	5,00	4,50	Below available budget
4,5	4,5	4,5	Below available budget
4,5	4,5	4,5	Below available budget

**Tous les critères sont importants!!!!**



# Destination 2 - Living and working in a health promoting environment


HORIZON-HLTH-2022-ENVHLTH-04-01:  
Methods for assessing health-related costs of  
environmental stressors

Notes moyennes




# Destination 2 : Excellence

## Financés



## Non-financés




### Commentaires non-financés :


**Objective/Ambition** : the project is not innovative, the proposal do not go beyond the state of the art  
 Soundness of the concept : not detailed enough, inadequately demonstrated, not clear and lacking of robustness  
 AI : not sufficiently explained, not robust (financés aussi)

# Destination 2 : Impact

## Financés



## Non-financés




### Commentaires non-finances:

**Pathways to impact:** The scale and significance of the project's contribution to the expected outcomes and impacts are only partially estimated.


The proposal does not convincingly elaborate the pathways in delivering the expected outcomes

## Destination 2 : Mise en œuvre

### Financés



### Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés:

**Mise en œuvre:** the allocation of resources is not entirely justified, lack of clarity on how the workpackages are interlinked, the description of the WP is insufficient

## Destination 2 - zoom sur les projets financés

Excellence score	Impact score	Implementation score	Status
4.0	4.5	4.5	Main List
3.5	4.5	5.0	Main List
4.0	4.0	4.5	Main List
4.0	4.0	4.0	Main List
3.0	4.0	4.0	Main List
4.0	3.0	3.5	Reserve List
2.5	3.5	3.0	Below threshold

**Tous les critères sont importants!!!!**


**Attention, pour les appels 2023/2024 le seuil pour les critères excellence et impact sera de 4/5**

# Destination 3-Tackling diseases and reducing disease burden

HORIZON-HLTH-2022-DISEASE-07-02: Pandemic preparedness


HORIZON-HLTH-2022-DISEASE-07-03: Non-communicable diseases risk reduction in adolescence and youth (Global Alliance for Chronic Diseases - GACD)

Notes moyennes




# Destination 3 : Excellence

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Objective/Ambition : objectives claimed with no reference, not sufficient description on how they are measurable, achievable and realistic / Innovation limited or not sufficiently demonstrated, no sufficient information on the technology


Soundness of the concept : lack of detail on the methodology, not clearly described, not convincing

AI : insufficient detail to evaluate the robustness or to justify the use of AI


→ Genre et Sciences ouvertes toujours très bien évalués !

# Destination 3 : Impact

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Pathway to impact : only broadly described, not convincingly described

Contribution to expected outcomes : not fully justified how it will contribute to them, indicators not addressed, not quantified


Potential barriers : insufficiently outlined, presented in generic terms, only briefly assessed, partially identified

IPR consideration : Strategy for IPR management insufficient




## Destination 3 : Mise en œuvre

### Financés



### Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Quality of the workplan :

lot of comments on timing : deliverables due in M60 too late, Gantt charts not sufficiently clear on timing, time dedicated to a task not justified, duration of project not justified, timing of WP and tasks not fully aligned

Assessment of risks : very generic or limited


## Destination 3 - zoom sur les projets financés

Excellence score	Impact score	Implementation score	Status
4,5	4	4,5	Main List
4	5	4	Main List
4	4,5	4,5	Reserve List
4	4	4,5	Reserve List
4,5	3	4,5	Below budget

**Tous les critères sont importants!!!!**


# Destination 4-Ensuring access to innovative, sustainable and high-quality health-care

HORIZON-HLTH-2022-CARE-08-04: Better financing models for health systems




# Destination 4 : Excellence

## Financés



## Non-financés




### Commentaires non-financés :

**Clarity of the objectives** : the lack of clear KPIs questions their measurability. The maturity of the proposal is discussed referring to the TRL scale, but the evidence to justify the claimed level is not presented coherently.


**Soundness of the concept**: There is a lack of clarity in terms of innovative research input. The proposal does not show clearly enough how social sciences and humanities aspects are considered in the proposed action

## Destination 4 : Impact

### Financés



### Non-financés




### Commentaires non-financés :


**Pathways to impact:** it does not sufficiently address the policy, socioeconomic, and cross-country applicability aspects. Although the pathways to the topic specific outcomes are ambitious, they are not convincingly explained.

## Destination 4 : Mise en œuvre

### Financés



### Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Insufficient milestones to enable appropriate monitoring of implementation progress.

The resource allocation is unbalanced for some specific work packages, e.g. project management, dissemination/communication activities

Insufficient detail on possible methodology, data analysis, privacy, data protection and policy risks, is not presented clearly.

## Destination 4 - zoom sur les projets financés


Excellence score	Impact score	Implementation score	Status
5.0	4.0	4.0	Main list
4.0	3.0	4.5	Main list
3.5	4	4	Main list
4.0	3	3.5	Main list
2.5	3	3.5	Below Threshold

## HORIZON-HLTH-2022-TOOL-11-01:

Optimising effectiveness in patients of existing prescription drugs for major diseases (except cancer) with the use of biomarkers


HORIZON-HLTH-2022-TOOL-11-02: **New** methods for the effective use of real-world data and/or synthetic data in regulatory decision-making and/or in health technology assessment

Notes moyennes






## Financés



## Non-financés




### Commentaires non-financés :

**Clarity of the objectives** : some relevant KPIs are difficult to verify


**Soundness of the concept**: the validation of the methodology is not fully convincing, some aspects of the methodology are not fully clear

# Destination 5 - Impact

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :


**Pathways to impact:** It is not fully clear how the professional network in the consortium will assist in the successful EU-wide exploitation of the tool once it has been developed.

The pathway to one of the expected outcome from the topic description is insufficiently addressed


Concerns about the long-term cost-effectiveness of the approach

## Destination 5 – Mise en œuvre

### Financés



### Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

The allocation of resources is insufficiently justified

Only two consortium members contribute to the central WP

The exact synchronization of some tasks in work packages lacks clarity.


The timing of the planned deliverables and milestones does not allow to appropriately monitor the progress of the project.

HORIZON-HLTH-2022-IND-13-01: Enhancing cybersecurity of connected medical devices

HORIZON-HLTH-2022-IND-13-02: Scaling up multi-party computation, data anonymisation techniques, and synthetic data generation


HORIZON-HLTH-2022-IND-13-03: New pricing and payment models for cost-effective and affordable health innovations

Notes moyennes




# Destination 6 : Excellence

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Objective/Ambition : choices made not sufficiently elaborated or clarified, KPI not specific or not relevant / no sufficient detail on advance of the state-of-the art, or not convincing

Soundness of the concept : lack of detail and clarity on the methodology used, too generic


AI : insufficient details to evaluate the robustness

Clinical trials/studies : study design lack specification, case studies not sufficiently described


→ Genre et Sciences ouvertes toujours bien évalués !

# Destination 6 : Impact

## Financés



## Non-financés



### Commentaires non-financés :

Pathway to impact : too generic, not enough detailed, lack further justification, fail in demonstrating the impact, not quite convincing


KPI not sufficiently described or not convincing

Likely scale and significance : not sufficiently evidenced


Exploitation Strategy : not clear, not sufficiently explained, lack specific details

## Destination 6 : Mise en œuvre

### Financés



### Non-financés



Peu de différences sur les projets financés/non-financés

### Commentaires négatifs

Quality of the workplan : Lack of clarity in description and organisation of the WPs, overall efforts underestimated

Assessment of risks : very generic or limited, not identified

# Les ressources utiles

- **Briefing des experts-évaluateurs** : [https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/experts/standard-briefing-slides-for-experts\\_he\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/experts/standard-briefing-slides-for-experts_he_en.pdf)
- **Standard evaluation form** : [https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/temp-form/ef/ef\\_he-ria-ia\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/funding-tenders/opportunities/docs/2021-2027/horizon/temp-form/ef/ef_he-ria-ia_en.pdf)
- **Devenir expert-évaluateur** : [https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/devenez-expert-evaluateur-horizon-europe-aupres-de-la-commission-europeenne-24364\\*](https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/devenez-expert-evaluateur-horizon-europe-aupres-de-la-commission-europeenne-24364*)
- **French portal on horizon Europe**: <https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr>
- **Health in the portal** : <https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/cluster-1-sante>
- **National contact points on legal and financial aspects**: <https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/le-point-de-contact-national-affaires-juridiques-et-financieres-24391>
- <https://www.horizon-europe.gouv.fr/webinaire-de-conseil-sur-la-prise-en-compte-des-evaluation-summary-report-esr-29960>



# Takehome messages

---

- Lisez attentivement l'appel
- Prenez en compte les aspects politiques qui ont donné lieu à l'appel
- Regardez ce qui a été financé dans le passé dans la même thématique dans CORDIS
- Prenez en compte TOUS les aspects demandés, tout est important
- Faites vous accompagner et surtout sur des aspects comme la mise en œuvre, cela doit être excellent
- Ne forcez pas votre projet sur un appel
- Ayez un bon anglais, utilisez des figures et graphes
- Inscrivez vous au webinaire du PCN JurFin sur l'évaluation à l'aveugle le **4 avril 2023**

