



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate L -Science, Economy and Society

The Director

Brussels, 28 February 2008
RTD/L.2/J-MB/PL D(2008)513693

Ms. Sally Scott
Centre for European Policy Studies - CEPS
Place du Congrès 1
BE - 1000 Brussels
Belgium

Email: sally.scott@ceps.eu
Subject: Initial information on the outcome of the evaluation of proposals
Programme: Cooperation Programme / Theme 8 / Socio-economic Sciences and Humanities (SSH)
Call Identifier: FP7-SSH-2007-1 / 29 November 2007 closure date
Proposal N°: 225289 - GLOBUSEUROPA

Dear Ms. Scott,

The Commission services with the help of independent experts have recently evaluated the proposals submitted in the context of the above-mentioned call. This includes the proposal entitled: 'GLOBALISATION, INTERNATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS, ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE AND LABOUR MARKET ADJUSTMENT – IMPACTS AND POLICY CHALLENGES FOR THE EUROPEAN ECONOMY' for which you are the coordinator.

Your proposal was evaluated against the criteria published for the call. The attached evaluation summary report (ESR) records the views of the expert evaluators and the scores that your proposal achieved.

Following this evaluation by independent experts, the Commission services will rank the proposals in priority order and will then take a decision on the lists of proposals for which negotiations of the grant agreement can proceed. For this particular call, it is estimated that funds will be available to support around 28 projects out of the 202 proposals that have passed all evaluation thresholds.

You will therefore understand that this letter cannot be regarded under any circumstances as prejudging the outcome of the project selection process and must not be construed as an offer of funding for your project. You will be informed in due course of the outcome of the Commission's decision on your project.

I would be grateful if you could inform the other participants in this proposal of the content of this letter. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Call coordinator, e-mail RTD-SSH-Q@ec.europa.eu.

If you have any questions of a more general nature, please contact the FP7 Enquiry Service <http://ec.europa.eu/research/index.cfm?pg=enquiries>.

Finally, please note that the redress procedure referred to in the Commission's rules for submission and evaluation¹ is described at the following website http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/fp7_redress_en.html.

Any such request must be received by 28 March 2008.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J.M. Baer', written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and cursive.

J.M. Baer,
Director

Encl.: Evaluation Summary Report (Annex I)

¹ Rules for the submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures, 30.3.2007, (C/2007/1390)

Annex 1.

Evaluation Summary Report for a Collaborative Project (Large-scale integrating project)

Proposal Number: **225289** Acronym : **GLOBUSEUROPA**

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) (Threshold 3/5)

This is a solid and very ambitious proposal fully relevant to the scope of the call (topic 1.2.1). Interesting and useful attention is paid to interdependencies of various dimensions of globalization (ranging from delocalization to financial integration). The strong emphasis on forecasting within a holistic and long-term approach is appreciated. The reference lists and proposed methodologies give indication of cutting-edge levels of competence within each work package, using a variety of modeling tools. The very broad scope of the project is welcome, but could also be an obstacle to in-depth integration of findings. Some of the topics are very wide (e.g. WP6) and could be a research project in themselves. As a consequence the research strategy is sometimes not planned as accurately as would be desirable.

Mark:	4.50
Weight	1.00

2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management (Threshold 3/5)

The consortium is strong, including many institutions that are experienced and recognized in their research field. The balance of competences is consistent with the scope of research, the geographical balance is also good and includes institutions from new member states. The work programme features a detailed and well-organized description of tasks and deliverables. Plans for more meetings would have been welcome, especially for the purpose of addressing contingent problems that may arise in the course of the project.

Mark:	4.50
Weight	1.00

3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results (Threshold 3/5)

The issues addressed are crucial and the proposal expects to offer new results and perspectives. The dissemination strategy based on communication to policy-makers of long-term projections is suitably described. Given the scope of the proposal, the dissemination could have been less concentrated in terms of geographical coverage and actors addressed. Discussion of potential policy options with stakeholders would have been an additional valuable element.

Mark:	4.00
Weight	1.00

Total (Threshold 10/15)	Mark: 13.00
--------------------------------	--------------------

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	Yes
--	------------

Does this proposal raise ethical issues?	No
--	-----------