

EMPIR Call Process
Guide 3: Prioritising Potential Research Topics

Document: P-CLL-GUI-103
Approved: EMRP Programme Manager

Version: 1.2
2016-01-05



Guide 3: Prioritising Potential Research Topics



CONTENTS

1	Background.....	3
2	Practicalities	3
3	Pre-review	4
4	Collation of pre-grading.....	4
5	Prioritisation meetings.....	5

If you require further help or guidance after reading this document, please contact the helpdesk

Email: msu@npl.co.uk

Telephone: +44 20 8943 6666

1 Background

This document outlines the process for the prioritisation of Potential Research Topics (PRTs) submitted to EURAMET in response to a Stage 1 Call.

The EMPIR Committee has the overall responsibility to decide on the priority of the ideas included in the various PRTs received, and has chosen to rely primarily on the recommendations of two Sub-Committees of the EMPIR Committee (Research (SC-R) and Capacity Building (SC-CB)) charged with that responsibility.

Prioritisation must be conducted in a fair and transparent way, irrespective of the number of PRTs received or their origin. Sub-Committee members must act on behalf of the EMPIR Committee and not their own national organisation(s) or country.

Following receipt, the PRTs will be checked by the [EURAMET Management Support Unit \(MSU\)](#) and those that have been withdrawn or superseded by the submitter and that are spurious or ineligible will be separated and not included in the prioritisation (but will be made available to the EMPIR Committee for completeness).

The requirements for PRT submissions are defined in [Guide 2: Submitting a Potential Research Topic](#) and form the basis of the prioritisation of ideas. A submitted PRT has to fulfil two requirements:

1. To provide sufficient information to enable EURAMET to evaluate it, in particular;
 - Has a clearly specified scientific, metrological or technological challenge/problem/ opportunity been identified? Is this justified? Why does it need to be addressed by a collaborative European approach rather than a national one? What is the scale of this need?
 - What is the likelihood of the European metrology research community effectively addressing the challenge/problem/opportunity taking account of the progress required beyond the current state of the art?
 - How significant will the impact be for stakeholders if the proposed topic was successfully addressed?
2. To be suitable for incorporation into supporting documentation for Stage 2 of the Call, i.e.:
 - Sections B to D must remain anonymous (i.e. no references to the submitter, submitter's organisation, co-authors and/or affiliations),
 - Text should be clear and concise.

Please note that the details of the individual and their organisation, submitting the PRT are included in the prioritisation spreadsheets for the EMPIR Sub-Committees during the prioritisation process. EMPIR Committee Members should be aware that external stakeholders have been encouraged to submit PRTs.

2 Practicalities

All information associated with the relevant PRTs is available to the EMPIR Sub-Committees from password protected workspaces at msu.euramet.org however if EMPIR Sub-Committee members prefer the information can be emailed. PRTs and their associated information for the two sub-committees will be dealt with completely separately i.e. separate spreadsheets, collated documents and zipped files.

Information available for each Sub-Committee:

- Spreadsheet of data including basic statistics, and worksheets for all relevant PRTs and for each grouping.
- Zipped folders including Word files of all relevant PRTs, with those withdrawn or superseded by the submitter and those that are spurious or ineligible submissions filed separately. Those PRTs that are suitable for prioritisation will be in their preliminary groupings by classification, which align with the groupings in the spreadsheet.
- Information on which groupings are allocated to which EMPIR Sub-Committee members for pre-meeting review - the EMPIR Chair is responsible for the allocation.
- A single pdf of all the relevant PRTs considered suitable for prioritisation in numerical order, rather than grouped by classification.

PRTs are grouped by defined "classifications" - the submitters initially identify the most appropriate classification from a menu. Depending on the PRTs received additional separation of groupings or

reclassification may be done at the initial checking stage if the MSU judge that it will simplify or aid the relevant EMPIR Sub-Committee's prioritisation process.

The relevant EMPIR Sub-Committee will "mark" each grouping, and may suggest additional or split groupings if appropriate. The spreadsheet includes:

- A. A worksheet with basic statistics regarding the PRTs received
- B. A worksheet identifying all of the PRTs received
- C. Individual worksheets per grouping including only those PRTs that fall within that grouping and that are suitable for consideration in the prioritisation of ideas. Any initial comments from the MSU will also be included on these worksheets.

3 Pre-review

Individual EMPIR Sub-Committee members are free to pre-review all of the groupings within their Sub-Committee's PRTs, however to ensure that all groupings are pre-reviewed adequately ahead of the relevant prioritisation meeting at least two members of the Sub-Committee will be allocated to each grouping. Prior to the relevant prioritisation meeting each EMPIR Sub-Committee member will need to complete, as a minimum for their allocated groupings:

- Worksheets C (specific to the groupings) which include:
 - identifying any potential "showstoppers" (a specific reason why this topic should not go ahead irrespective of other marks e.g. the subject of a funded EC/EMRP/EMPIR project)
 - indicating whether ideas contained in a given PRT are considered out of scope of the call.
 - marking each grouping collectively (or by sub grouping if more appropriate)
 - identifying potential title(s) for publication at Stage 2
 - capturing which PRTs contribute to the idea to be taken forward
 - identifying the most suitable PRT to serve as the basis for developing the supporting documentation for Stage 2
 - providing comments on each PRT where appropriate
 - identifying the main reason, selected from a menu, why a PRT should not be taken forward,.

On Worksheets C, for each PRT considered suitable for prioritisation, against each of the three criteria:

- Has a clearly specified and justified scientific or technological challenge / problem / opportunity been identified and of what scale, and does it need to be addressed by a collaborative European approach rather than a national one?
- What is the likelihood of the European metrology research community effectively addressing the challenge / problem / opportunity, taking due account of the progress required beyond the current state of the art?
- How significant would the impact be for stakeholders if the proposed topic were successfully addressed?

A mark of either: 0 = poor, 1 = low merit, 2 = medium merit or 3 = high merit, should be assigned.

4 Collation of pre-grading

Sub-Committee members should e-mail their workbooks to the [EURAMET MSU](#) by the deadline given. The MSU will assemble the marks into separate workbooks for each TP and distribute the data to the relevant EMPIR Sub-Committee members prior to each prioritisation meeting so that all members are aware of the initial thoughts of the other members.

Please note the pre-grading exercise is only intended to provide a starting point for the EMPIR Sub-Committees' discussions. The EMPIR Sub-Committees are entirely free to (and are likely) to come to different consensus conclusions following the collective discussions when facts known to one member are discussed more widely, e.g. issues such as balance across the technological areas or available capability within the metrology community may be a factor etc.

5 Prioritisation meetings

At each prioritisation meeting a consensus position should be reached by the relevant EMPIR Sub-Committee and the information captured on a spreadsheet. Subsequently, the titles and objectives of individual SRTs are refined by email and then taken to a meeting of the full EMPIR Committee for review and approval. This review should have particular emphasis on checking for any additional “showstoppers”. Information on the PRTs will also be made available to the EMPIR Committee members together with the main reason why a PRT was not taken forward to the SRT stage. The information will be in form of a single pre-defined reason per PRT eg poor fit with scope, lack of critical mass, limited metrology, limited research, lack of European dimension, primarily training/KT, limited progress beyond the state of the art, limited rationale, limited or unclear objectives, limited stakeholder support, limited SDO support, poor standardisation links, insufficient budget.