



The assessment of maturity of new proposals

Strategy Report on Research Infrastructures
ROADMAP 2018

Odd Ivar Eriksen
Chair of ESFRI IG
Norwegian delegate

Info Day – 17th January 2017

Málaga
Spain



The Assessment of maturity of new proposals

ToR for ESFRI Implementation Group (IG) from ESFRI Forum June 2nd in Geneva

The role of the IG is to:

- **assess the maturity of proposals for an ESFRI roadmap update;**
- assess the implementation of ESFRI Projects;
- contribute to the monitoring of ESFRI Landmarks;
- propose conclusions, recommendations and decisions on the status for new proposals, ESFRI Projects and ESFRI Landmarks to the Executive Board and the Plenary Forum;
- offer targeted and specific support to ESFRI Projects to move towards implementation and to ESFRI Landmarks;
- contribute to the further development of the methodology for ESFRI roadmap updates.

Composed of nine delegates + representative from EC + representative from eIRG



The IG assesses maturity along eight dimensions

- Stakeholder commitment
- User strategy and access policy
- Preparatory work
- Planning
- Governance and management
- Human resources policy
- Finances
- Risks



Minimal key requirements

- ESFRI applies minimal key requirements on all eight dimensions along the RI life cycle.
- These minimal key requirements serve as the basis for the scoring in the assessment.
- Meeting minimal requirements is mandatory, but not necessarily sufficient to be listed in the Roadmap.
- The minimal key requirements are described in detail in the Public Roadmap 2018 Guide



Key requirements

New Projects must demonstrate an adequate maturity level, i.e. a proposal must:

- have successfully completed a **design/feasibility study**;
- have planned its **business case/delivery strategy**;
- provide proof of political support, i.e. **Expression of political Support (EoS)** by the lead country and at least two additional MS and AC signed by the national ministries responsible for RI (in case of an EIROforum member commitment a Council resolution);
- provide proof of financial commitment, i.e. **Expression of Commitment (EoC)** to financially contribute to the preparation and implementation phases by an authority from the lead country (in case of an EIROforum member the financial commitment should be explained in the Council resolution);
- provide proof of an **inter-institutional and multi-lateral agreement**, e.g. a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed by the core partners - being research institutions - formally involved in the consortium.



Key requirements

- qualified **project management** and clear reporting structure for preparation approved
- **governance for operation** with clearly defined responsibilities and reporting lines
- top-level breakdown of **cost** elements with overall order of magnitude estimates (including for Central Hub, National Nodes and main upgrades)
- **funding opportunities** identified
- identification of **major risks** involved and **mitigation strategies** described



SCORING

Scoring values are attributed to each dimension following the minimal key requirements described for new proposals (preparation phase in the 2018 Roadmap Guide):

- **Very high**, i.e. the key requirements are **outstandingly met**.
- **High**, i.e. the key requirements are **comprehensively met**.
- **Medium**, i.e. the key requirements are partly met, but the proposal/Project/Landmark shows **weaknesses with regard to specific requirements**. Enhancing the RI's future success requires (significant) changes to (specific parts of) the proposal/plans.
- **Low**, i.e. the key requirements are **insufficiently met** and the evidence for future success of the RI is not convincing.
- In order to be considered as a Project, **a proposal must meet the key requirements for `preparation` and score at least `high` for both the scientific case and the maturity.**



PRINCIPLES, CONFLICT OF INTEREST (COI) AND CONFIDENTIALITY

All evaluations and assessments must comply with the following four principles:

1. **Independence**, i.e. involved persons carry out the evaluations and assessments in a personal capacity and they represent neither their employer nor their country.
2. **Impartiality**, i.e. persons must treat all proposals, Projects and Landmarks equally and evaluate and assess them impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants and coordinators.
3. **Objectivity**, i.e. involved persons evaluate and assess each proposal or questionnaire as submitted; meaning on its own merit, not its potential if certain changes were to be made.
4. **Accuracy**, i.e. involved persons make their judgment solely against the formal evaluation and assessment criteria and the relevant ESFRI documentation.

ESFRI checks any CoI with all SWG and IG Members and with all **external Reviewers**, which must **declare non-conflict of interest and confidentiality** on the proposals, Projects or Landmarks they are evaluating and assessing. Strict rules for confidentiality apply.



Process

- The IG assesses maturity of each proposal and present their conclusions and recommendations to the EB.
- The Plenary Forum will discuss the status, the conclusions and the recommendations per proposal and will decide upon new Projects taking the Landscape Analysis and recommendation of the EB into account.
- Projects are RI in their preparation phase, which have been selected for the **excellence of their scientific case** and for their **maturity**, according to a sound expectation that the Project will reach **implementation** phase **within the ten-year term**.
- Projects are included in the Roadmap in order to underline their strategic importance for the ERA and to support their timely implementation.



Thank you for your attention!

Strategy Report on Research Infrastructures
ROADMAP 2018

Odd Ivar Eriksen
Chair of ESFRI IG
Norwegian delegate

Info Day – 17th January 2017

Málaga
Spain