



PRESENTATION OF THE SUMFOREST PROJECT

THE SUMFOREST CALL – WP 5

BY

VERA STEINBERG, BLE, GERMANY

CALL SECRETARIAT





OUTLINE

- Scope of Proposals
- Timeline
- Funding Organisations
- Available Budget
- Number of Proposals
- Evaluation Criteria
- Expert Panel
- Chosen Projects
- Call Statistics



SCOPE OF PROPOSALS

Topic	Description
1	Comparative assessment of the sustainability performance of forest-based, other renewable and non-renewable raw material-based value chains to inform policy decisions
2	Risk resilient forest management – Adapting forest management regimes which incorporate risk assessment related to potential climate change impacts to inform policy decisions
3	Investigation, appraisal and evaluation of trade-offs related to the provision of forest ecosystem services to inform policy decisions



TIMELINE

International Day of Forests

Action	Deadlines
Launch of the Call	21 st April 2016
Optional pre-registration for proposal	20 th May 2016 5PM CET
Pre-eligibility check by Call Secretariat and national Funding Contact Points	23 rd – 25 th May 2016
Closing date for proposals	17 th June 2016 3PM CET
Eligibility check by Call Secretariat and national Funding Contact Points	20 th June – 01 st July 2016
Scientific evaluation (online)	04 th July – 09 th September 2016
Scientific evaluation (meeting)	15 th /16 th September 2016
Funding decision (meeting)	26 th /27 th September 2016
Latest date the funding decision is communicated to applicants	14 th October 2016
Start of national negotiation between selected project partners and funding organisations	14 th October 2016
Start of projects	From January 2017 on



TIMELINE

Action	Scheduled/Deadlines
Launch of the Call	21 st March 2016
Optional pre-registration for proposal	20 th May 2016 3PM CET
Pre-eligibility check by Call Secretariat and national Funding Contact Points	23 rd – 25 th May 2016
Closing date for proposals	17 th June 2016 3PM CET
Eligibility check by Call Secretariat and national Funding Contact Points	20 th June – 01 st July 2016
Scientific evaluation (online)	04 th July – 09 th September 2016
Scientific evaluation (meeting)	15 th /16 th September 2016
Funding decision (meeting)	26 th /27 th September 2016
Latest date the funding decision is communicated to applicants	14 th October 2016
Start of national negotiation between selected project partners and funding organisations	14 th October 2016
Start of projects	From January 2017 on



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS

- 24 Organisations from 20 countries (originally)



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS – ORIGINALLY

Country, Organization

Austria, BMLFUW

Belarus, National
Academy of Science

Belgium FNRS

Belgium, FWO

Canada, NRCan/RNCan

Croatia, CRFI

Finland, MMM

France, ADEME

France, ANR

Germany, BMEL

Ireland, DAFM

Italy, MIPAAF

Country, Organization

Latvia, Ministry of
Agriculture

Lithuania, MERL

Lithuania, RCL

Norway, RCN

Russia, MON

Slovak Republic, MPRV SR

Slovenia, MAFF

Spain, INIA

Spain, MINECO

Sweden, FORMAS

Switzerland, FOEN

Tunisia, IRESA



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS

- 24 Organisations from 20 countries (originally)
- Unfortunately, no proposal with a Tunisian partner applied
- For three partners, no proposal was chosen (NRCan/RNCan, Canada, CRFI Croatia and MPRF SR, Slovak Republic)
- Russia dropped out last minute
 - Two projects are running with Russian **in kind** participation (still negotiating)



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS – FINAL CALL

Country, Organization

Austria, BMLFUW

Belarus, National Academy of Science

Belgium FNRS

Belgium, FWO

~~Canada, NRCan/RNCan~~

~~Croatia, CRFI~~

Finland, MMM

France, ADEME

France, ANR

Germany, BMEL

Ireland, DAFM

Italy, MIPAAF

Country, Organization

Latvia, Ministry of Agriculture

Lithuania, MERL

Lithuania, RCL

Norway, RCN

~~Russia, MON~~

~~Slovak Republic, MPRV SR~~

Slovenia, MAFF

~~Spain, INIA~~

Spain, MINECO

Sweden, FORMAS

Switzerland, FOEN

~~Tunisia, IRESA~~

No
proposal
No
proposal
chosen



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS – FINAL CALL

Country, Organization
Austria, BMLFUW
Belarus, National Academy of Science
Belgium FNRS
Belgium, FWO
Canada, NRCan/RNCan
Croatia, CRFI
Finland, MMM
France, ADEME
France, ANR
Germany, BMEL
Ireland, DAFM
Italy, MIPAAF

Country, Organization
Latvia, Ministry of Agriculture
Lithuania, MERL
Lithuania, RCL
Norway, RCN
Russia, MON
Slovak Republic, MPRV SR
Slovenia, MAFF
Spain, INIA
Spain, MINECO
Sweden, FORMAS
Switzerland, FOEN
Tunisia, IRESA

No proposal
No proposal chosen

In Kind
proposal chosen
Funded by MINECO (ongoing)

No proposal applied



FUNDING ORGANISATIONS – FINAL CALL

Country, Organization

Austria, BMLFUW

Belarus, National
Academy of Science

Belgium FNRS

Belgium, FWO

Finland, MMM

France, ADEME

France, ANR

Germany, BMEL

Ireland, DAFM

Country, Organization

Italy, MIPAAF

Latvia, Ministry of
Agriculture

Lithuania, MERL

Lithuania, RCL

Norway, RCN

Slovenia, MAFF

Spain, MINECO

Sweden, FORMAS

Switzerland, FOEN

18 Organisations from 15 Countries



AVAILABLE BUDGET

Country, Organization	Max. Budget Available [€]
Austria, BMLFUW	900.000
Belarus, National Academy of Science	90.000
Belgium FNRS	200.000
Belgium, FWO	200.000
Canada, NRCan/RNCan	125.000
Croatia, CRFI	60.000
Finland, MMM	600.000
France, ADEME/ANR	1.000.000
Germany, BMEL	800.000
Ireland, DAFM	350.000
Italy, MIPAAF	150.000

AVAILABLE BUDGET

Country, Organization	Max. Budget Available [€]
Latvia, Ministry of Agriculture	100.000
Lithuania, MERL	100.000
Lithuania, RCL	100.000
Norway, RCN	1.100.000
Slovak Republic, MPRV SR	30.000
Slovenia, MAFF	180.000
Spain, MINECO	700.000
Sweden, FORMAS	1.900.000
Switzerland, FOEN	280.000
Total	8.965.000



NUMBER OF PROPOSALS

- Overall: 27 proposals
- Eligible: 26 proposals

Topic	No. of Proposals	Percentage
1	7	27
2	15	58
3	2	8
1+2	1	4
2+3	1	4
Total	26	100

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- The evaluators were requested to assess proposals against a set of criteria
- Maximum of 5 points per criterion according to the following scale (incl. half points):

Score	Description
5	Outstanding
4	Very good
3	Good
2	Fair
1	Poor
0	Not considered for funding



EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Proposals were evaluated regarding
 - Scientific Excellence
 - Quality and Efficiency of the implementation
 - Impact

EXPERT PANEL

- 16 international experts: 8 women, 8 men
- Countries: Canada, Croatia (2x), Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Macedonia, Russia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands, United Kingdom



TASK OF THE EXPERTS (JULY – SEPT 2016)

- Perform the evaluation of 4 – 5 project proposals
- Three experts per proposal
- Provide the evaluation results including relevant comments online
- Join the evaluation meeting (15/16 Sept 2016)
- Act as rapporteur for a proposal if required; one rapporteur per proposal
- Coordinate the reviewers feedbacks on the proposal and formulate the feedback on the proposal to be sent to the applicants



EXPLANATION OF RANKING PROCEDURE

- Rapporteur summarized 3 evaluations per proposal
- At the expert meeting: presented proposal to other experts (Sept 2016)
- Discussion of evaluation
- Consensus on score
- Creation of ranking list (not binding)

SELECTION OF PROPOSALS

- During CSC2: Sept 2016
- Ranking List: highest score was 13,67 out of 15
- Following the ranking list, but projects could be skipped (FP7 Programme)



AVAILABLE BUDGET

Country, Organization	Max. Budget Available [€]	Max. Budget Spent [€]
Austria, BMLFUW	900.000	805.843
Belarus, National Academy of Science	90.000	49.200
Belgium FNRS	200.000	166.880
Belgium, FWO	200.000	200.000
Canada, NRCan/RNCan	125.000	0
Croatia, CRFI	60.000	0
Finland, MMM	600.000	599.881
France, ADEME/ANR	1.000.000	808.366
Germany, BMEL	800.000	799.359
Ireland, DAFM	350.000	222.394
Italy, MIPAAF	150.000	115.000



AVAILABLE BUDGET

Country, Organization	Max. Budget Available [€]	Max. Budget Spent [€]
Latvia, Ministry of Agriculture	100.000	100.000
Lithuania, MERL	100.000	100.000
Lithuania, RCL	100.000	100.000
Norway, RCN	1.100.000	729.110
Slovak Republic, MPRV SR	30.000	0
Slovenia, MAFF	180.000	173.037
Spain, MINECO	700.000	499.960
Sweden, FORMAS	1.900.000	1.931.484
Switzerland, FOEN	280.000	280.000
Total	8.965.000	7.680.514



CHOSEN PROJECTS

Acronym	Project Duration	Topic	Coordinator
BenchValue	35 Months	1	EFI, Finland
Forexclim	36 Months	2	Technical University of Munich, Germany
ForRISK	36 Months	2	Swiss Federal Research Institute, Switzerland
FutureBioEcon	36 Months	1	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
POLYFORES	28 Months	3	Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Sweden
REFORCE	36 Months	2	National Research Institute of Science and Technology for Environment and Agriculture, France
REFORM	36 Months	2	The National Institute for Agricultural and Food Research and Technology, Spain

CALL STATISTICS

- Max. 7.680.514 € out of 8.965.000 € are distributed
→ 86%
- 7 out of 26 proposals were funded
→ 27 %
- 18 out of 24 organisations participated
→ 75 %



DO YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?

???

???

???

???

???

???

???

???

???

Thank you for your attention



VERA STEINBERG
FEDERAL OFFICE FOR
AGRICULTURE AND FOOD
VERA.STEINBERG@BLE.DE



Federal Office for
Agriculture and Food



EVALUATION CRITERIA

- The evaluators are requested to assess Proposals against a set of criteria. Maximum of 5 points per criterion according to the following scale:
- **5: outstanding:** the proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.
- **4: very good:** the proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
- **3: good:** the proposal addresses the criterion well; however, it contains a number of elements that could be improved.



EVALUATION CRITERIA

- **2: fair:** the proposal broadly addresses the criterion; however, it contains some weaknesses and elements that can be improved.
- **1: poor:** the proposal addresses the criterion unsatisfactorily or in an inadequate manner. It shows serious inherent weaknesses resulting in the need of substantial modification or improvement.
- **0: not considered for funding:** the proposal shows severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project. The criterion under examination is not addressed or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- **Half points can be given**



1. SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE

- Excellence aspects will be assessed by means of the following criteria:
 - a) Scientific quality of the proposed research
 - b) Novelty / originality and innovation including methodology
 - c) Clarity of the hypothesis, theories and/or research questions
 - d) Level of inter/multi/trans-disciplinarity
 - f) Relation to other projects relevant to the topic

Interdisciplinary approaches are strongly encouraged, but mono- or multi-disciplinary studies are not excluded a priori; the approach must be adequate to address the question posed.



2. QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

- a) Quality and efficiency of the management structure and procedures, its organisation and coordination, including the management and sharing of data
- b) Quality and suitability of the consortium members including international reputation of participants in the field(s) of the proposal (previous work in the field, expertise of the participants)
- c) Quality of the consortium and collaboration (well balanced partnership; integrated partnership in work packages; broadness of consortium compared with geographical relevance; previous level of collaborative interaction between the participants)



2. QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION

- d) Feasibility of the proposal – human, technical and financial resources: adequate work package structure and work plan (tasks, milestones, deliverables, matching events, calendar); adequate equipment and manpower resources and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)
- e) Feasibility and probability of success of the proposal based on description of risks and the contingency plan



3. IMPACT

- a) Approach to stakeholder engagement
 - » Reasons for undertaking or not undertaking stakeholder engagement
 - » Identification of appropriate stakeholders and why they are relevant to the proposal (what role they could play), and the desired outcomes of engaging with specific stakeholders
 - » Evidence of support from appropriate stakeholders towards the research, and commitment to engage
 - » Methods/activities proposed for engagement and collaborative learning, planning and resources
 - » Inclusion of relevant societal, ethical and gender aspects



3. IMPACT

- b) Policy relevance and importance of the research for solving pressing issues
 - » Clear statement of the policy application. Any proposal must contain details which cite the relevance of the research to policy instruments and current legislation. It should also highlight the importance of this work for solving pressing societal issues related to the details of the joint call.
 - » Clearly identified policy makers who are end users of the research results and ways to engage them. The proposal will be expected to identify specific end-user organisations, and, if possible, to name individuals within these organisations.
 - » Arrangements for knowledge transfer, dissemination and communication.



3. IMPACT

- c) International added value
 - » resulting from the transnational research proposal, which is additional to the value that would have resulted from research proposals funded at national level. The added value may be at a European and/or international level; however.
- may include: relevance to EU and/or international policy statements, legislative framework or management plans; clear added value to national research proposals across Europe and the international partners that joined the Sumforest call by linking expertise and efforts across national teams; standardization of methods, general increase of common knowledge relative to the themes of the call, etc.