

## IMI2 JU responses to the Independent Observers' Report

**Call ID: H2020-JTI-IMI2-2018-15-two-stage**

**IMI2 15<sup>th</sup> Call for Proposals**

**Stage 1 evaluation**

**Date of evaluation: 12-15 November 2018**

**Name of the observers: Joy Davidson and Pieter de Pauw**

### **Summary of Recommendations**

*The evaluations were very well administered and there are just a few minor modifications that we can suggest to optimise the process. These are outlined below.*

- *To provide a visual reminder of the co-creation call process in each evaluation room that experts can refer to if needed. In addition, it would also be helpful to optimise its visibility via the IMI website in full screen mode rather than as a scrollable image.*
- *Despite the independent observers being introduced during both briefing sessions, some experts were still unclear as to the relationship between the independent observers and IMI. In future it might be helpful to emphasise that independent observers are not IMI staff during the briefing(s).*
- *Investigate new functionality in SEP that will facilitate the sending and amending of CR text between moderators and the IMI actors on site to improve the security of the information contained within the CRs. However, the observers recognise that this will not be a quick fix.*
- *Wherever feasible, avoid remote participation by experts which depend upon technology working well. However, the observers realise that due to the very niche expertise required to evaluate the call proposals, this will not always be possible.*
- *Consider extending the amount of time that experts have to carry out remote evaluation of proposals for calls receiving very high submission rates.*
- *Consider making clearer how experts can provide remarks to be sent to the Ethics Panel for consideration.*

### **IMI2 JU responses to the recommendations**

IMI2 JU is happy to have the Independent Observers' confirmation that the evaluations were very well administrated and will take into considerations the recommendations made.

- IMI2 JU will investigate the technical options to increase the visibility of the infographic explaining the development of the topics on the IMI2 JU website. Also, IMI2 JU will analyse the benefits of making this infographic available in the evaluation rooms.

- At the briefings before and during the evaluation meetings, IMI staff emphasize that the independent observers are external independent experts present at the evaluation to monitor the functioning and running of the overall IMI process and to suggest possible improvements. It is also emphasized that they are not IMI2 JU staff members.
- As the independent observers recognise, changing the configuration of a corporate tool is not easily accomplished, particularly in the latter stages of a Framework Programme but, following the recommendation, IMI2 JU already took measures to ensure a secure exchange of documents between the actors involved in the evaluations.
- In IMI2 JU calls the remote participation of experts in the in-house evaluation is allowed only in exceptional circumstances (an expert has limited availability, important expertise, they are not able to travel), but IMI2 JU will continue to endeavour to try to avoid these cases.
- The period dedicated to the remote evaluation is the same for all topics, calculated according to the H2020 rules in order to allow the same amount of time to be dedicated to each proposal. IMI2 JU will investigate the available options to increase the time dedicated to remote evaluation for topics with high submission rates.
- Proposals recommended for funding are undergoing a separate ethics evaluation. Experts involved in the ethics evaluation can always make remarks that the Scientific Officer responsible of the topic will communicate to the ethics panel of experts.