

Successful proposal

Brussels, 23rd Sept 2015– **Geothermal Panel meeting**
Philippe DUMAS, EGEC



Criterion 1 - Excellence

- **Clarity and pertinence of the objectives**
 - how the *objectives* are *interconnected* is not discussed *adequately*.
 - The proposal lacks a *clear identification of TRLs*, which is a significant weakness.
 - The largest part of the activities relate to *data collection*.
 - The involvement of policy makers is not *secured*.
 - The pertinence is limited by the fact that the proposal addresses only *partially* the geothermal industry market uptake.
 - The objectives do not *sufficiently* address the market uptake *challenges at the level outlined in the Call*.



- **Credibility of the proposed approach**

- *Little information is given on the **accessibility of data** of previous EGS projects.*
- *The proposed approach is not sufficiently credible, because its description is not **clear**, and its architecture is not **fully defined** nor comprehensive.*
- *The approach is **limited to collection of data** and analysis, rather than on recommendations and concrete implementation actions.*
- *It is not adequately demonstrated that the project's approach could **contribute** either to capacity building nor to post-2020 debate on policy, legislation and regulation.*

- **Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant**
 - *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 proposed work is not ambitious. It **focuses only on one site** and does not contain ground-breaking concepts or particularly novel approaches for the geothermal industry.*
 - *the **concept** is not sound.*
 - *It is **not feasible** ...with the level ...that is proposed.*
 - *The concept of providing **unbiased information** without properly involving independent stakeholders is not realistic.*

-
- **Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures**
 - *The proposed coordination and support measures are **not convincing**.*
 - *There are significant weaknesses in the **general description** of the measures.*
 - *there is insufficient explanation of how the **collaboration** with international bodies will practically support the project outcomes.*
 - The quality of the proposed coordination and support measures is fair. The consortium has identified other projects with which this project will develop **synergies**.

Criterion 2 - Impact

- **The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic**
 - *The expected impacts are not **adequately described** in the proposal. For example, it is not sufficiently described how drilling costs will be reduced.*
 - *The proposal fails to **justify how the impacts** described in the call will be achieved.*
 - *The contribution to the expected impacts of the Call (e.g. financial framework, public acceptance, increased share of RES) is **not convincingly** demonstrated.*
 - *the **key performance indicators** are not well addressed.*
 - *The project proposal identified five impact areas, but the **description** of how the project will contribute to them is weak.*
 - *There are no appropriate **performance indicators**.*

Criterion 2 - Impact

- **Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge**
 - *The project is unlikely to enhance the innovation capacity and the integration of new knowledge, and it does not sufficiently **describe** how it could be achieved.*
- **Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets and where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets**
 - *The potential strengthening of companies is not adequately **described**.*
- **Any other environmental and socially important impacts**
 - *the proposal **underestimates** the social impact of induced seismicity.*

Criterion 2 - Impact

- Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant
 - *Standard* ways of exploitation and dissemination are described.
 - *Intellectual property* rights are not discussed adequately.
 - Although the proposal includes a completed set of dissemination activities, they have not been *sufficiently targeted* to the groups of interest.
 - the effectiveness of some measures such as social media is *not convincing*.
 - The dissemination activities and exploitation plan are broadly presented but *insufficiently discussed*.
 - The proposed measures *do not address the appropriate stakeholders*.
 - IPR and data management are addressed *very briefly*.
 - Dissemination and exploitation of results are *briefly and inadequately described*, with dissemination activities limited to a few media. The same applies for the communication activities.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

- **Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources**
 - *the work plan is **not well described**.*
 - *The proposal fails to **sufficiently demonstrate** how the work packages would be **connected** to each other.*
 - *A specific work package on the business case is **missing**, which is required by the call.*
 - *The structure of the work plan is **coherent and effective** to implement the task leading to the achievement of the proposal.*
 - *The resource allocation is **logical and balanced**.*
 - *The description of the work packages **lacks sufficient detail** on the implementation.*
 - *The **allocation of resources** is not fully **justified** due to insufficient descriptions in the implementation plan.*
 - *The work plan is **not coherent**, because the sequence and interaction of activities are not convincingly **described**.*
 - *The roles and responsibilities allocated to each partner are adequately based on their knowledge, capabilities and experiences.*
- *The overall project budget is appropriate.*

-
- **Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)**
 - *The partners in the consortium are **complementary**.*
 - *It is not adequately justified why XXX is **sub-contracted** and not part of the consortium, considering their substantial part of the work and the importance of their task.*

- **Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management**
 - *The potential risks and their management are not adequately **discussed**.*
 - *Innovation management is also not adequately **described** in the proposal.*
 - *The intended management structure and procedures are only **briefly described**.*
 - *It **lacks** decision making procedures.*
 - *some **risks**, such as "interest of external stakeholders" are not properly treated.*
 - *The **management plan** is poor, as the role and engagement of the Advisory board is not fully defined and no information is provided on how the partnership will be structured and how the decision making process is designed.*
 - *the **risks** related to limited participation of targeted stakeholders are **not discussed**.*
 - *The management structures and procedures are **briefly described**, and do not foresee an appropriate participation of the project partners in decision making.*
 - *The risk-mitigation measures are partially **inadequate**.*

Conclusions

- There is a lot of competition so you need not only a right concept but also a really good written proposal with clear presentation and defined objectives (not only on TRL)
- For that you need both an experienced coordinator and minimum 4-5 months to prepare your proposal
- Assess impacts and provide key performance indicators
- Have the right consortium and resource allocation, management plan
- Engage with target groups



Thank you
for your kind attention