



ERAC-CT-2005-026101

**MARTEC**

**ERA-Net Maritime Technologies**

Co-ordination Action

ERA-Net

**TASK 3.1**

**Action Plan towards a common program and joint calls, Ideas for future activities**

**D 3.1**

**Action plan for common programs and joint calls and ideas for future joint activities in Maritime Research**

**D 3.2**

**List of criteria for the measurement of the success of joint activities**

**22.06.2009**

Due date of deliverable: 15.07.2009 (to EC)

Actual submission date: 15.07.2009

Start date of project: 01.06.2006

Duration: 55 months

Research Center Jülich GmbH

<b>Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)</b>		
<b>Dissemination Level</b>		
<b>PU</b>	Public	X
<b>PP</b>	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
<b>RE</b>	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
<b>CO</b>	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

# Content

- 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3**
- 2 ACTION PLAN FOR COMMON PROGRAMS AND JOINT CALLS AND IDEAS FOR FUTURE JOINT ACTIVITIES IN MARITIME RESEARCH ..... 4**
  - 2.1 Definition of MARTEC priority areas..... 4
    - 2.1.1 *Priority areas in the various MARTEC partner countries..... 4*
  - 2.2 Collection of input from stakeholders ..... 5
  - 2.3 Action plan towards joint calls ..... 5
    - 2.3.1 *Pilot call..... 5*
      - 2.3.1.1 Pilot call areas and participating countries..... 6
      - 2.3.1.2 Pre-proposals ..... 6
      - 2.3.1.3 Full proposals ..... 6
      - 2.3.1.4 International evaluation ..... 7
      - 2.3.1.5 Decision for funding ..... 7
      - 2.3.1.6 Start-up of projects ..... 7
    - 2.3.2 *Recommendations for future joint calls ..... 8*
      - 2.3.2.1 Topics and participation..... 8
      - 2.3.2.2 Application procedure..... 8
      - 2.3.2.3 Evaluation and decision for funding ..... 9
      - 2.3.2.4 Start up of projects..... 9
      - 2.3.2.5 Summary of recommendations for future joint calls..... 9
  - 2.4 Action plan and ideas towards other joint activities ..... 10
    - 2.4.1 *Workshop/Brainstorming..... 10*
      - 2.4.1.1 Database for national projects (projects in partner countries)..... 10
      - 2.4.1.2 Mobility program (task 4.2)..... 10
      - 2.4.1.3 Monitoring (task 4.3)..... 10
      - 2.4.1.4 Transfer of knowledge- Communication of Martec projects (task 3.3 and 3.4)..... 11
      - 2.4.1.5 Completion of an overview in the research area ..... 11
      - 2.4.1.6 Database of evaluators ..... 11
      - 2.4.1.7 Other..... 11
    - 2.4.2 *Recommendation for future other joint activities ..... 12*
- 3 LIST OF CRITERIA FOR THE MEASUREMENT OF THE SUCCESS OF JOINT ACTIVITIES. 12**
  - 3.1 Definition of common criteria to measure success of joint activities and of opening-up of national programs on maritime research ..... 12
    - 3.1.1 *Development of a sustainable network and partnership of funding agencies and ministries..... 13*
    - 3.1.2 *Participation in calls ..... 13*
    - 3.1.3 *Sufficient number of relevant/good applications to calls..... 13*
    - 3.1.4 *Sufficient number of projects started..... 14*
    - 3.1.5 *Commitment of national authorities to cooperation in MARTEC ..... 14*
    - 3.1.6 *Increased cooperation between participants from different countries ..... 14*
    - 3.1.7 *Increased cooperation between TP Waterborne and MARTEC ..... 14*
    - 3.1.8 *Carrying out of joint activities other than calls..... 14*
    - 3.1.9 *Other suggestions for possible criteria, not assessed to be on the recommended list ..... 14*
  - 3.2 Recommendation of list of criteria for measuring the success of opening up of national programs on maritime research ..... 15
- ANNEX I. EVALUATION FORM - GUIDE FOR MARTEC EVALUATION..... 16**

# 1 Executive summary

The ERA-NET MARTEC (2006 – 2009) is an EU funded project in the 6<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme. The MARTEC partnership consists of 12 partners and 4 observers from 12 European countries.

As a contribution to the development of the European Research Area, the objective of MARTEC is to form a sustainable network and partnership of key funding agencies and ministries aiming at deepening the understanding of conditions for management of maritime technologies research between the key European countries actively funding RTD in this sector. In co-operation with the European industrial maritime cluster and other stakeholders this network intends to work out a strategy for future maritime technological research funding through trans-national programs and calls which are coherent with the European research policy and the strengthening of the European Research Area.

Due to the nature of maritime industry RTD, MARTEC will put particular emphasis on the co-ordination of national R&D programs which are strategically planned to provide funding for projects which contribute to improving the international competitiveness of the European shipping and marine technology industry. The typical projects funded are technologically oriented with industrial partners involved.

In order to achieve these objectives, it is of importance for MARTEC to interact with representatives from the industry and the research communities. It is of particular interest to keep a close cooperation with the Technology Platform WATERBORNE.

This report presents the results of Task 3.1 Action Plan towards a common programme and joint calls. The outcome of the previously performed Task 2, D 2.4 Workshop in Oslo October 2007, has formed the basis for the work performed in this task.

Based on previous work, a pilot call was announced and carried out in 2008. Recommendation for future calls that are presented in chapter 2.3.2 are based on experience gained from this pilot call.

Based on previous work and workshops/input from stakeholders, recommendations for future other joint activities are presented in chapter 2.3.3

The criteria for measuring the success of joint activities are presented in chapter 3, and recommendation for measuring the success of opening up of national programs on maritime research is presented in chapter 3.2.

## 2 Action Plan for common programs and joint calls and ideas for future joint activities in maritime Research

### 2.1 Definition of MARTEC priority areas

Basic priority areas were defined in work package 1. It was decided to distinguish between thematic priority areas and horizontal priority areas during the workshop at London on 20 June 2007.

Eight thematic and three horizontal priority areas are structured in MARTEC at the moment:

Thematic priority areas	Horizontal priority areas
shipbuilding	safety and security
maritime equipment and services	Environmental and climate impact
ship and port operations	human elements
Inland water and intermodal transport	
offshore industry/offshore technology	
offshore structures for renewable energy	
polar technology	
fishing/aquaculture	

The thematic and horizontal priority areas were further discussed in the workshop in Oslo in October 2007 and are described in the D 2.4 Recommendations of areas of future co-operation in maritime research.

#### 2.1.1 Priority areas in the various MARTEC partner countries

The priority areas vary in each partner countries. Some areas are only covered by a minor number of partners, while others are covered by the majority of partners. The different priority areas and coverage are shown in the table below (coloured means covered, open means not covered):

## Overview table: partner countries – priority areas

	DE	SP	PL	F	FI	DK	UK	NL	NO	S	RO
shipbuilding- new ship types, structures, ship design and construction											
shipbuilding- production process and technology											
maritime equipment and services											
ship and port operation services											
inland water and intermodal transport											
offshore industry/ offshore technology											
offshore structures for renewable energy											
polar technology											
fishing/ aquaculture											
safety											
Security											
environmental and climate impact											
human elements											

## 2.2 Collection of input from stakeholders

The outcome of Task 2, presented in the report D 2.4 has been used as the basis for priority. The objective has been to get the view from stakeholders on the content and the conclusions made in the report D2.2. Input has been collected during meetings and by the use of questionnaires.

In order to achieve its overall objectives, it is of importance for MARTEC to interact with representatives from the industry and the research communities. A particular important stakeholder is the Technology Platform WATERBORNE. TP WATERBORNE consists of all major stakeholders in the maritime sector in Europe. As a preparation for the European Commissions 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme, TP WATERBORNE has developed a Strategic Research Agenda and the WATERBORNE Implementation Route Map (WIRM) 2007 to implement the WATERBORNE Strategic Research Agenda and achieve the long term Vision 2020 targets.

## 2.3 Action plan towards joint calls

### 2.3.1 Pilot call

To prepare for future joint activities, and to gain experience, it was decided that MARTEC should open a pilot call in 2008. The Pilot call was decided to be performed as a 2 step call, the first step (pre-proposals) had submission deadline 31 January 2008 and the second step (full proposals) had deadline on 31 may 2008. The pilot call was published on the Martec web-site and an electronic submission system was developed for submission of proposals.

It was recognised that a number of tasks had to be conducted by the Martec partners during the submission period; in particular the evaluators' database and the evaluators' form and guidance had to be prepared.

### **2.3.1.1 Pilot call areas and participating countries**

Based on the outcome of Task 2.4 the pilot-call opened up for proposals within the following priority areas and integrated activities:

- Shipbuilding
- Maritime equipment and services
- Ship and port operation
- Inland and intermodal transport
- Offshore industry/technology
- Offshore structures for renewable energy
- Polar technology
- Fishing/aquaculture
- Safety and security
- Environmental impact
- Human elements

Partners from Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Spain and Poland took part in the pilot call.

### **2.3.1.2 Pre-proposals**

Within the time-limit of 31 January 16 proposals with participants from 7 countries were received. The participants were from all the participating countries Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Norway, Poland and Spain.

The pre-proposals were evaluated at national level before it was decided which projects that would be invited to submit full-proposals. Out of the 16 pre-proposals, 10 proposals were invited to submit full proposals.

### **2.3.1.3 Full proposals**

Within the time limit of 31 may 2008, 9 full-proposals were received. A table showing the participation and requested funding is shown below:

<b>Country</b>	<b>No of proposals</b>	<b>Founding requested (€)</b>
Denmark	0	0
Finland	1	606 570
France	1	772 668
Germany	5	4 287 216
Norway	4	1 080 925
Poland	4	1 975 110
Spain	3	1 940 687

None of the proposals had participants from more that two countries.

### 2.3.1.4 International evaluation

A database of international evaluators was created (D 3.5) and the full proposal was evaluated by evaluators registered in this database. Each proposal was evaluated by at least three evaluators, none of them being from the same countries participating in the proposal being evaluated. A total of 21 evaluators were involved in the evaluation of 9 proposals. The distribution of proposals between origin countries for evaluators is described as follows:

Country (Evaluator)	No of proposals
Denmark	2
Finland	5
France	1
Germany	2
Norway	1
Romania	6
Spain	5
Sweden	5
Total no of evaluations	27

The evaluators were provided with an evaluation form, including a guidance section, see Annex I. All the evaluators were requested to use this form. It was possible to give scores from 0 to 5 on the areas Scientific and Technological excellence (35%), Potential impact (35%) and Consortium (30%).

It was not required that the three evaluators that had evaluated the same project should deliver a consensus report. It was noted that in a few cases the evaluation reports on the same project differed substantially.

### 2.3.1.5 Decision for funding

A discussion between all partners took place in the Steering committee meeting concerning which proposals should and could be funded. The discussion based on the international evaluation results, on national decisions as well as the availability of national budgets. The result was that 5 projects in principle was fundable, but with limitations.

	Without restrictions fundable	In principle fundable, pending partner decisions <sup>1</sup>	Restriction concerning available funding, clarification necessary
Number of projects	3	1	1
Participating countries	Germany-Norway (2) Finland-Germany	France - Spain	Germany-Poland

### 2.3.1.6 Start-up of projects

In the call announcement, it was stated that earliest possible start up of projects would be 1 January 2009. Although the Martec Steering Committee had made its

<sup>1</sup> The project could not be funded in this Pilot Call, due to Spain's decision not to have a call announcement for international projects the corresponding year.

decision of selecting the fundable projects already in late September 2008, it was noted that not all projects would be able to start up at 1 January. Some work remained concerning the finalisation of the contract negotiations in each country.

### **2.3.2 Recommendations for future joint calls**

The discussion for recommendations for future joint calls, have taken into considerations the experience gained from carrying out the Pilot call. Details about the main issues for considerations are further discussed in this part.

#### **2.3.2.1 Topics and participation**

Experience from the pilot call indicates that the proposals will cover topics from several of the priority areas described in 2.3.1.1. By mutual understanding it has been decided to recommend continuing to keep the next ERA-Net Martec call open for all MARTEC thematic and horizontal priority areas as described in 2.1.1., although some countries may have specific priorities within their national programs, i.e. Denmark will focus on reducing emission from transport at sea.

Seven countries took part in the Pilot call. Projects with participants from six countries were decided to be fundable. There are no indications that only a specific country/group of countries will have success in a future call. It is recommended that all Martec partners and observers should participate in future calls.

In the Pilot-call, each consortium had a limited number of participants. Application and execution of projects based on MARTEC calls should be as simple as possible. In particular they should be simpler than projects in FP7. The discussions have concluded that it would be regarded beneficial to keep the number of participants in each consortium below 10; however a larger number of participants in a consortium would not lead to exclusion of a project (not ground for ineligibility).

The participation in Martec-projects of participants from third countries has also been discussed. It has been stated that this should be allowed, but the institutions from third countries that are involved in the submitted project, are responsible for their own funding.

#### **2.3.2.2 Application procedure**

The advantages/disadvantages between one stage and two stage call procedure have been a topic for discussion between the ERA-Net Martec partners. The majority of the partners have expressed the view that a one stage procedure would be beneficial. The reactions and feed-back from applicants and possible applicants in future calls, emphasised that the main obstacle for applying for funding in Martec had been the lengthy procedure for decision of funding of project, i.e. typically one year or more from the first time limit for pre-proposal to start up date of projects. A one stage procedure would shorten this time with at least 3 months and a one stage procedure is therefore recommended for future calls.

An electronic submission system was used in the pilot-call, and it proved to be efficient and reliable. The system was developed and administrated by the Martec secretariat. All partners can find proposal documents in the internal MARTEC web page. In addition some applicants have to submit national documents (see national regulations in call). There have been no requests or suggestions to alter this process



and therefore it is recommended to continue with submission of full proposals to the Martec system and in addition submission to national funding agencies.

### **2.3.2.3 Evaluation and decision for funding**

The experience gained from the pilot call, lead to a discussion on how to improve the evaluation for future calls. The procedure with international evaluators and use of the evaluator's form has shown to be beneficial. However, in some cases, it was noted that the evaluation of the same project could vary between the evaluators. Therefore, the discussions have emphasised that the evaluators should be able to discuss the projects and evaluation results among themselves. The evaluators should deliver a consensus report on each project.

At the time of the steering committees decision meeting in September 2008, not all countries had decided on how much funding that would be available for funding their national participants. It is agreed that it would be beneficial to have had this clarified prior to the decision meeting, and if possible also when the call is announced.

### **2.3.2.4 Start up of projects**

The pilot call showed that the process of contract negotiation varied in each country, and the process would take considerable time. It is therefore recommended that each partner should emphasise on getting the contract negotiations started as early as possible. The process of contract negotiations also showed that a certain degree of coordination was needed between the funding agencies in countries that were founding parts of the same total project. To a certain degree, the Martec secretariat facilitated such coordination and this proved to be useful.

### **2.3.2.5 Summary of recommendations for future joint calls**

Common calls from MARTEC should be open for all MARTEC thematic and horizontal priority areas with respect to thematic priorities. Since Calls in FP7 are specified to a certain degree, the stakeholders want MARTEC calls to be open for all MARTEC thematic and horizontal priority areas. This will make MARTEC complimentary as a funding opportunity for international co-operation. MARTEC can accommodate this by including all its priority areas in their calls. However participants from each country are limited by the priorities made in the funding programmes of their own country.

Application and execution of projects based on MARTEC calls should be as simple as possible. In particular they should be simpler than projects in FP7.

Further, as elaborated on in the paragraphs above, the recommendations for future calls can be listed as follows:

- a) All partner countries as well as observers should participate in future calls
- b) Call to be announced early, but the call could be open shorter than in the Pilot-call.
- c) The future calls should have a "one stage" procedure.
- d) There should be a common call with priority areas as before and topics as described in 2.1.1
- e) Participations from third countries should be allowed, but the institutions from third countries that are involved in the submitted project, are responsible for their own funding.

- f) It is recommended that the maximum partnership not exceeds 10 partners; however a larger number of participants in a consortium should not lead to exclusion of a project (not ground for ineligibility).
- g) The electronic submission system to Martec secretariat should be kept, and in addition one should have submission to national funding agencies.
- h) The evaluation process should be improved so that evaluators should deliver a consensus report.
- i) Martec secretariat should facilitate coordination between the funding agencies in the different countries that fund the same projects
- j) Amount of available funding in each call should be decided and made ready in advance of the publication of the calls
- k) To attract applicants, it is necessary to show what the benefits for participation are, i.e. inform about the available funding

## ***2.4 Action plan and ideas towards other joint activities***

### **2.4.1 Workshop/Brainstorming**

Input from stakeholders was collected during several meetings and through the use of questionnaires.

All ideas and suggestions that came up during these sessions have been discussed between the partners and observes. Some ideas were decided not to be included in the action plan, and are only shortly commented upon. The ideas that the partners have decided to keep or develop further are more thoroughly described.

#### **2.4.1.1 Database for national projects (projects in partner countries)**

In addition to co-operating on common calls, it is recommended that MARTEC establish an overview of maritime research in Europe. This can be done by creating a database for projects funded by the partners and by the EU Commission. However, consideration should be made to similar initiatives to avoid duplication and overlap.

All partners agreed to have this in the action plan and national project should be uploaded to the MARTEC project database.

#### **2.4.1.2 Mobility program (task 4.2)**

The topic "Managers mobility program" is also listed as task 4.2 in the MARTEC project. The outcome of task 4.2 will show if this will be a topic in the action plan for other joint activities, and should therefore not be excluded from the action plan at this stage.

#### **2.4.1.3 Monitoring (task 4.3)**

Monitoring should be seen in connection with call procedures. At the moment technical and scientific monitoring of projects are on national level, but must be discussed further.

The topic "Monitoring" is also listed as task 4.3 in the project. Monitoring is recommended to be kept as an area of future cooperation, and the ideas will be extended in task 4.3.

#### **2.4.1.4 Transfer of knowledge- Communication of Martec projects (task 3.3 and 3.4)**

Several ideas for “Transfer of knowledge” were given by the partners and observers. The following is a listing of the ideas:

- a) Dissemination of Martec projects
- b) Dissemination of National projects with international cooperation
- c) Dissemination of National projects of international relevance
- d) Conferences organised by MARTEC or presentation of projects in conferences.
- e) Visits to national important research centres in combination with the above
- f) Cooperation and coordination with TP Waterborne
- g) Cooperation with TPs (other than TP Waterborne) and other ERA Nets, i.e. TP-ICT, ERA Nets for Transport and POLAR.
- h) Coordination with networks other than TPs and ERA-nets, i.e. Europe INNOVA ([www.europe-innova.org](http://www.europe-innova.org)) Enterprise Europe ([www.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu](http://www.enterprise-europe-network.ec.europa.eu))

Some of these activities could also serve the purpose as project incubators. In addition, knowledge of other activities is generally seen as beneficial.

#### **2.4.1.5 Completion of an overview in the research area**

In the area of maritime research, there are many initiatives and ongoing projects (i.e. ENT5 SURSHIP) and an overview is needed. Martec should therefore carry out a joint activity to complete an overview in the maritime research area.

#### **2.4.1.6 Database of evaluators**

In connection with the pilot call, a “database” of evaluators was created. Most partner and observer countries had evaluators in this database. It is agreed that this should be developed further so that these experts also would be available for Martec countries for evaluating projects on national level.

#### **2.4.1.7 Other**

As described in the introduction to chapter 2.4, a number of ideas was put forward and discussed among the partners and observers.

Examples of some ideas that were mentioned, but decided to be redundant or unnecessary are:

- a) Database of research teams as partner search tool.  
*Not recommended to be developed further as there already exists tools in MARTEC web-site and CORDIS*
- b) Database of projects and information about the capacities and technological centres, etc. as a useful tool for companies. – Creation of a market place.

*Not recommended to be developed further, see item a).*

- c) Junior researchers mobility program  
*Majority not in favour of this, and also with reference to ERASMUS.*
- d) Activities for developing student research  
*The majority was not in favour of this*

## **2.4.2 Recommendation for future other joint activities**

The recommended areas for future other joint activities are identified and described in paragraphs 2.4.1.1 to 2.4.1.6. In addition, the work in connection with the related tasks and deliveries, will contribute to the identification of more areas or clarification of the already identified areas. The areas are:

- The development and maintenance of databases for national projects (projects in partner countries) and evaluators , see 2.4.1.1 and 2.4.1.6
- Transfer of knowledge- Communication of Martec projects (dissemination, coordination and cooperation), see 2.4.1.4
- Completion of an overview in the maritime research area, see 2.4.1.5
- Mobility program, see 2.4.1.2
- Monitoring, see 2.4.1.3

The ideas for future joint activities identified in this chapter should be developed further through Work Package 4.

## **3 List of criteria for the measurement of the success of joint activities**

To identify the criteria for the measurement of the success of joint activities, input from stakeholders was collected through the use of questionnaires and discussion during meetings.

Several ideas have been discussed, but not all were deemed to be right for measuring the success of MARTEC. This is elaborated in 3.1. The criteria recommended to measure the success of MARTEC are listed in 3.2.

### ***3.1 Definition of common criteria to measure success of joint activities and of opening-up of national programs on maritime research***

In the paragraphs below, details about the various ideas for common criteria are given.

### **3.1.1 Development of a sustainable network and partnership of funding agencies and ministries**

The objective of MARTEC is to form a sustainable network and partnership of key funding agencies and ministries aiming at deepening the understanding of conditions for management of maritime technology research between the key European countries. Some success criteria to be set are:

- a) Attendance and active participation in MARTEC meetings
- b) Activities between the meetings, such as
  - i) cooperation in preparing deliveries
  - ii) distributing comments and chairing views on ongoing work
  - iii) information exchange and informal contacts and sharing views (phone, e-mail etc.)
- c) Commitment of partners and observers to continue cooperation after the end of MARTEC project period, by
  - i) participation in a future ERA-net MARTEC II or,
  - ii) continuance in non funded MARTEC-follow up activities, i.e. meetings, conferences, managers' mobility program etc.

### **3.1.2 Participation in calls**

The success of calls can be measured in both the number of participation of *who* and *how many* from;

- a) companies and research organisation and
- b) sufficient numbers of participating MARTEC partners and observers

Ideally, all Martec partners and observers would participate in calls. At present there are 12 countries in MARTEC, and 8 of them are participating in the calls.

Further, the calls should have applicants from companies and research organisations from all participating countries.

Participation from companies and research organisations can be divided into first time applicants and "experienced" applicants that applies for second or third time.

To promote MARTEC and to attract participants to apply more than once, MARTEC must be and appear to be attractive to applicants. In particular, the experience of previous participants should be taken into account, specially regarding the;

- a) application procedure,
- b) the evaluation process and procedure
- c) the time needed for decision of funding
- d) cooperation with international companies/institutes

### **3.1.3 Sufficient number of relevant/good applications to calls**

The majority of MARTEC partners suggest keeping the calls open for all MARTEC thematic and horizontal priority areas, meaning that there should not be more specific thematic areas. One criterion to be set is if the received proposals are covering the broad scope of thematic areas that MARTEC offers.

### **3.1.4 Sufficient number of projects started**

The number of projects started should be proportionate with the quality of the received proposals. The goal is to have high standard proposals, and one factor that is crucial to be able to start up as many good proposals as possible is the allocation of funds in the participating countries. Experience from the pilot-call showed that the lack of allocation of funds, prevented good proposals from being started.

### **3.1.5 Commitment of national authorities to cooperation in MARTEC**

As mentioned in the paragraphs above, one of the success criteria of MARTEC, is the success of calls, both participation and projects started. To attract good applicants, it is important that the national authorities are committing themselves to Martec. Such commitment can be shown by

- Increasing their budget for Martec projects, and/or
- Making the financing of ERA-Net projects competitive to financing of national projects

### **3.1.6 Increased cooperation between participants from different countries**

The cooperation between participants from different countries means both cooperation between participants in calls and cooperation between the different MARTEC partners and observers. One way to measure increased cooperation is the development in participation in calls. In the pilot-call, Germany was participating in most projects, and with most other countries. If the coming calls shows cooperation between more countries, this would be a success.

### **3.1.7 Increased cooperation between TP Waterborne and MARTEC**

Martec partners mainly consist of funding agencies/authorities from the participating countries. More cooperation with TP Waterborne would be beneficial, especially since this will contribute to input from industrial stakeholders. It is a goal that TP Waterborne will see MARTEC as one way to implement their strategic agenda and will give its benefits back to MARTEC.

### **3.1.8 Carrying out of joint activities other than calls**

In chapter 2.4, paragraph 2.4.2, possible future joint activities, other than joint calls, are identified and recommended to be carried out. One success criterion to be set is therefore the completion of these activities.

### **3.1.9 Other suggestions for possible criteria, not assessed to be on the recommended list**

The topics listed below, were all discussed, but decided not to be suitable for measuring the success of MARTEC. These were:

- a) Future possible cooperation in ERA-Net plus
- b) Common pot for projects and/or cross financing

- c) Specific maritime programmes will be started in countries that have more generic programs

The main reason for not adding them to the recommended list was that these were factors that the MARTEC partners regarded that they had little or no influence over, and such were not suitable for measuring the success of MARTEC.

### ***3.2 Recommendation of list of criteria for measuring the success of opening up of national programs on maritime research***

From the topics above, the following “short-list” of criteria is given:

- a) Development of a sustainable network and partnership of funding agencies and ministries
- b) Participation in calls.
- c) Sufficient number of relevant/good applications to calls.
- d) Sufficient number of projects started and allocation of funds.
- e) Commitment of national authorities by the means of funding.
- f) Increased cooperation between participants from different countries.
- g) TP Waterborne will see MARTEC as one way to implement their strategic agenda and will give its benefits back to MARTEC.
- h) Carrying out of recommended joint activities other than calls.

For elaboration of the topics on the list, see paragraphs 3.1.1 to 3.1.8

## **Annex I. Evaluation form - Guide for MARTEC Evaluation**

This form is to be filled only by the evaluator assigned for MARTEC ERA-NET. The MARTEC proposals should be judged in base of the criteria established for the call.

First some questions are introduced you might like to ask yourself about the proposal are given in each criterion/sub criterion box. The score that you give to each of the criterion/sub criterion will weight the given the percentage in the brackets. The final evaluation given, once the weights are applied, will be used as a base for the MARTEC ranking of the proposals.

### **Scoring**

For each criterion/subcriterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments:

*0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*

*1 - Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.*

*2 - Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.*

*3 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.*

*4 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.*

*5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor and weighting*

The following table shows how the final evaluation is got:



CRITERIA	SUBCRITERIA	Partial evaluation	CRITERIA EVALUATION	WEIGHTING	Final evaluation (FE)
<b>A</b> <b>Scientific and Technological excellence</b>	<b>A1.</b> Innovation level (progress beyond the state of the art) <b>A2.</b> Quality of the approach, work plan and methodology <b>A3.</b> The extent to which the proposed S&T approach is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation		$CEA=(A1+A2+A3)/3=$	35%	$FE = (A*0.35+B*0.35+C*0.3) =$
<b>B</b> <b>Potential impact</b>	<b>B1.</b> The extent to which the proposed project is suitably ambitious in terms of its strategic impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal or environmental problems at a European level. <b>B2.</b> The extent to which the innovation-related activities and exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results. <b>B3.</b> Is the proposal compatible with norms, standards and regulations?		$CEB=(B1+B2+B3)/3=$	35%	
<b>C</b> <b>Consortium</b>	NONE		$CEC=C=$	30%	

<b>CRITERIA:</b> <b>A. Scientific and Technological excellence (35%)</b>	<b>CEA=(A1+A2+A3)/3=</b>
<p><b>1. Innovation level (progress beyond the state of the art)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the proposal contributing and or increasing the advance of the S&amp;T knowledge?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal take scientific and technological risk? Is the proposal possibly reaching transcendent research advances in knowledge, in case of investigations with a risky character?</li> <li>▪ Is the proposal contributing to advances in knowledge and innovation of the research group, the scientific community and economical and societal agents?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>2. Quality of the approach, work plan and methodology</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the proposal objectives clear, feasible and focused?</li> <li>▪ Is the methodology, research design and work plan adequate to the proposed objectives?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>3. The extent to which the proposed S&amp;T approach is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do the objectives of the proposal have a scientific relevance based on the theoretical knowledge and empirical background?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>

<b>CRITERIA:</b> <b>B. Potential impact (35%)</b>	<b>CEB=(B1+B2+B3)/3=</b>
<p><b>1. The extent to which the proposed project is suitably ambitious in terms of its strategic impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal or environmental problems at a European level.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the proposal have a trans-national added value?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal have previewed a short and mid term effect of the support on the R&amp;D&amp;I of the research group (i.e. creation, consolidation, expansion or integration of the equipments or R&amp;D&amp;I lines)?</li> <li>▪ Does the project have the capacity to form high level researchers and technologists?</li> <li>▪ Is the proposed project likely to have an impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal or environmental problems?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposed project demonstrate clear added value in carrying out the work at trans national level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka); ?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal have the possibility to transfer the results in the short and mid term?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>2. The extent to which the innovation-related activities and exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the proposal have a feasible exploitation plan and diffusion of the scientific project results?</li> <li>▪ Are the expected results or the knowledge acquired of importance for the economical sectors and the economical development?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>
<p><b>3. Is the proposal compatible with norms, standards and regulations?</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b></p>

\* Total Score: Each average result form the three criteria will be weighted by their percentage,

<b>CRITERIA</b>	<b>CEC=C=</b>
<b>C. Consortium (30%)</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do the participants in the proposal constitute a consortium of high quality?</li> <li>▪ Are the participants in the proposal well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them?</li> <li>▪ Do the participants compliment correctly between each other?</li> <li>▪ Is the management of the consortium of enough quality?</li> <li>▪ Is there a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation related activities?</li> <li>▪ Financial capacity of the participants.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Do the project foresee the necessary resources for success (personnel, equipment, financial...)?</li> <li>- Are the resources convincingly integrated to form a coherent project?</li> <li>- Is the overall financial plan of the project adequate?</li> <li>- Is there a necessity or an adequacy of human or technical resources in relation to the work plan?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<b>Score:</b>
<b>TOTAL SCORE*</b>	

Total Score = Scientific and Technological excellence \* 0,35 + Potential impact \*0,35 + Consortium \*0,3 =

Total Score (Please, indicate decimals):

Name:

Signature: