

IMI2 JU responses to the Independent Observers' Report

Call ID: H2020-JTI-IMI2-2017-12-two-stage

IMI2 12th Call for Proposals

Stage 1 evaluation

Date of evaluation: 28 November - 1 December 2017

Name of the observers: Dr. Shosh Merchav and Prof. Ian Kitchen

Summary of Recommendations

- 1. We recommend consideration be given to devising a more efficient process to writing consensus reports as these are provided with a high level of detail for all applications regardless of quality. Word limits could be introduced for assessment comments of the expert panel members.*
- 2. We recommend that panels consisting of five or more experts, should always be constituted with at least two members of a single gender.*
- 3. We recommend that moderators discuss and share best practice in chairing panel sessions to harmonise the approach that is taken to this task.*

IMI2 JU responses to the recommendations

1. IMI2 JU is happy to take into consideration the recommendations regarding the process of writing consensus reports. The task of writing reports is always challenging, trying to provide detailed feedback to the applicants while completing the report writing in the time available. IMI2 JU continually looks at the role of the rapporteur, including their training and support, to try to ensure this process is as efficient and as fair as possible. Word limits already exist, but IMI2 JU will analyse the need to review the number of characters.
2. IMI2 JU acknowledges the benefits of having a balanced panel from gender point of view, but, unfortunately, it is not always possible at the level of each panel, due to the specific expertise and the availability of experts. At the level of the pool of experts involved in the evaluation session, the gender balance is well addressed, at least 40% are women.
3. The process of sharing good practice is used in IMI2 JU in order to ensure consistency and equal treatment between the topics. While IMI2 JU attempts to ensure consistency across panels (e.g. constantly exchange good practice, update guidelines, etc.), the specificities of the topics, the number of proposals received and the personality of the experts can all impact on how best to moderate an evaluation panel. While some variation can occur, IMI2 JU is pleased that the independent observers constantly find that the evaluations are run to a very high standard and praise the professionalism of all IMI2 JU staff.