

Lessons learnt from 2022-2024 calls

Dieter BRIGITTA

Call Coordinator

3 April 2025



slido

Ask your question:

slido.com

#CBEJU



Table of contents

- **Proposal creation timing vs. success rate**
- **Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) analysis**
 - Evaluation process
 - Most common shortcomings and weaknesses

2024 call – 559 proposals *created* in portal

- **125** remained in draft ('test' proposals...or missed submission deadline?)
- **136** deleted by project coordinators
- **298** proposals submitted
 - **30** proposals were invited for Grant Agreement Preparation ('main list')
 - **35** proposals were placed on the 'reserve list'
 - **119** proposals were above thresholds, but did not make the 'main' or 'reserve' lists
 - **105** proposals were below threshold(s) (did not pass one or more of the evaluation threshold(s))
 - **9** proposals did not meet the Horizon eligibility and admissibility criteria

2024 call submission analysis (1/2)

	Created between...	Median creation date	Created in September
30 x Main list	24/04 - 03/09	18/06/2024	1 (3%)
35 x Reserve list	24/04 - 29/08	08/07/2024	0 (0%)
74 x above threshold(s), non-reserve	24/04 - 18/09	16/07/2024	17 (14,3%)
105 x below threshold(s)	25/04 - 18/09	07/08/2024	22 (20,1%)
9 x ineligible/withdrawn	22/05 - 15/09	26/08/2024	4 (44,4%)

Would there be correlation (or even causation) between the creation time of a proposal and its success rate? Like there was in the 2023 call?

2024 call submission analysis (2/2)

	Created between...	Median creation date	Created in September
30 x Main list	24/04 - 03/09	18/06/2024	1 (3%)
35 x Reserve list	24/04 - 29/08	08/07/2024	0 (0%)
74 x above threshold(s), non-reserve	24/04 - 18/09	16/07/2024	17 (14,3%)
105 x below threshold(s)	25/04 - 18/09	07/08/2024	22 (20,1%)
9 x ineligible/withdrawn	22/05 - 15/09	26/08/2024	4 (44,4%)

- Positive **correlation** between early proposal creation and success rate
- Also **causality?** more time to build a solid consortium + cover all requirements

Early creation = earlier awareness about elements blocking submission (IT tool provides warnings) = more time to solve them => **starting to work in the Portal asap adds value!**

2024 call evaluation analysis (1/2)

- **2024 call : 289 evaluated proposals**
 - Using the 3 main Horizon Europe evaluation criteria: excellence, impact and implementation
 - Each main criterion is further split into different evaluation **sub**criteria
 - Horizon Europe scoring principles are used
 - Max. score: 5 points per criterion, so max. 15/15 for whole proposal
 - Score per criterion is defined by how many (minor) shortcomings and/or weaknesses are identified by expert-evaluators
- **Analysis of evaluation outcomes**
 - For each of the 'bullet point' in the proposal templates...
 - ...check which are the most common shortcomings and weaknesses...
 - ...for all proposals, for RIAs, and for IAs (to check if there is a difference or not)

Horizon Europe scoring principles

0 The proposal **fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1 **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are **serious inherent weaknesses**.

2 **Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are **significant weaknesses**.

3 **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of **shortcomings** are present.

4 **Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a **small number** of **shortcomings** are present.

5 **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any **shortcomings** are **minor**.

**CBE JU
evaluation
thresholds: 3/5
or 4/5 (impact)**

2024 call evaluation analysis (1/2)

- **2024 call : 289 evaluated proposals**
 - Using the 3 main Horizon Europe evaluation criteria: excellence, impact and implementation
 - Each main criterion is further split into different evaluation **sub**criteria
 - Horizon Europe scoring principles are used
 - Max. score: 5 points per criterion, so max. 15/15 for whole proposal
 - Score per criterion is defined by how many (minor) shortcomings and/or weaknesses are identified by expert-evaluators
- **Analysis of evaluation outcomes**
 - For each 'bullet point' in the proposal templates...
 - ...check which are the most common shortcomings and weaknesses...
 - ...for all proposals, for RIAs, and for IAs (to check if there is a difference or not)

All proposals

Rank	Most common weaknesses	Most common shortcomings
1	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text
2	Exc – Methodology	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)
3	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs	Impl – Risk table incl. mitigation measures
4	Exc – is the proposal (fully or partially) in scope	Exc – Methodology
5	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs

IAs incl. Flagships

Rank	Most common weaknesses	Most common shortcomings
1	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text
2	Exc – Methodology	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)
3	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs
4	Impa – Business case	Impl – Risk table incl. mitigation measures
5	Impa – Business model	Exc – Methodology

RIAs

Rank	Most common weaknesses	Most common shortcomings
1	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text	Impa – Expected outcomes in topic text
2	Exc – Methodology	Exc – Methodology
3	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)
4	Exc – is the proposal (fully or partially) in scope	Impl – Risk table incl. mitigation measures
5	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs

Call 2024 evaluation analysis (1/2)

- **‘Expected outcomes in the topic text’** is the source of the most common shortcomings and weaknesses in all proposals, as well as IAs and RIAs (!)
- **2-3/5 most common weaknesses** are linked to **Excellence** (Methodology, ambition, in scope) => ***you can’t hide a bad idea...***
- **5 most common shortcomings** are the same for all types proposals, only in a different order
- In particular, **Risk & mitigation measures** are top 3-4/5 in shortcomings in all types of actions
- Mostly similar analysis outcomes as **2022-2023 calls**

2024 call evaluation analysis (2/2)

Shortcomings in proposals scoring between 13.5 and 14.5/15?

- In the 2024 call : 85 such proposals (so statistically relevant)
- Often on the threshold of (not) getting funding
- By definition: no weaknesses, only shortcomings

What would be the most common shortcomings for these - often very well-written - proposals?

2024 call evaluation analysis (2/2)

Rank	Most common shortcomings
1	Impa – Business model (only in IAs incl. Flagships)
2	Impa – Economic viability check (only in RIAs)
3	Impl – Work plan (overall structure, tasks, milestones, deliverables,...)
4	Impa – Communication measures
5	Exc – ambition (going beyond the state of the art) + appropriate TRLs

2024 call evaluation analysis (2/2)

Shortcomings in proposals scoring between 13.5 and 14.5/15?

- 3/5 most common shortcomings are linked to impact...
- ...although NOT to 'expected outcomes in the topic text', where the most shortcomings and weaknesses are found in all proposals (!)
- The top 2 most common shortcomings are i) economic in nature (business model and economic viability check), and ii) CBE JU-specific evaluation criteria

CBE JU is an **impact-driven programme**, and therefore has some very specific impact-related evaluation subcriteria: **business case, business model, business plan**



**Circular
Bio-based
Europe**
Joint Undertaking

Contact us

info@cbe.europa.eu
www.cbe.europa.eu

Follow us



Subscribe



 Bio-based Industries
Consortium

 Co-funded by
the European Union

slido

Ask your question:

slido.com

#CBEJU



10:45 – 12:45

Session 3 | Information on CBE JU 2025 call

Chair: Dieter Brigitta, Call Coordinator, CBE JU

10:45 – 11:00 Call submission & evaluation of proposals

Dieter Brigitta, Call Coordinator, CBE JU

11:00 – 11:20 Call management rules & conditions

Marta Campos Iturralde, Legal Manager, CBE JU

11:20 – 11:40 CBE JU 2025 call specific requirements

Pilar Llorente Ruiz de Azua, Programme Officer, CBE JU

11:40 – 12:00 How to write a good proposal

Oliver Zobell, Project Officer, CBE JU

12:00 – 12:15 Lessons learnt from the 2022-24 calls

Dieter Brigitta, Call Coordinator, CBE JU

12:15 – 12:45 Q&A session