


Proposal Evaluation Form		
	<b>EUROPEAN COMMISSION</b>	<b>Evaluation Summary Report - Research and innovation actions</b>
	Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme	

**Call:** H2020-SC1-PHE-CORONAVIRUS-2020-2-RTD  
**Type of action:** RIA  
**Proposal number:** 101016033  
**Proposal acronym:** EQUIP  
**Duration (months):** 30  
**Proposal title:** EQUItable outbreak response Planning for resilient, sustainable, and cohesive societies  
**Activity:** SC1-PHE-CORONAVIRUS-2020-2C

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1		BE	623,211.25	9.78%	623,211.25	9.78%
2		NL	453,027.5	7.11%	453,027.5	7.11%
3		NL	488,762.5	7.67%	488,762.5	7.67%
4		NL	309,081.25	4.85%	309,081.25	4.85%
5		UK	461,995	7.25%	461,995	7.25%
6		DE	495,368.75	7.77%	495,368.75	7.77%
7		IT	425,075	6.67%	425,075	6.67%
8		FR	170,926.25	2.68%	170,926.25	2.68%
9		FR	226,300	3.55%	226,300	3.55%
10		AT	254,850	4.00%	254,850	4.00%
11	5.1.2e	AT	223,262.5	3.50%	223,262.5	3.50%
12		NO	263,372.5	4.13%	263,372.5	4.13%
13		DE	253,292.5	3.97%	253,292.5	3.97%
14		EL	140,930	2.21%	140,930	2.21%
15		SE	244,887.5	3.84%	244,887.5	3.84%
16		SE	160,128.75	2.51%	160,128.75	2.51%
17		BE	273,180	4.29%	273,180	4.29%
18		NO	160,213.75	2.51%	160,213.75	2.51%
19		HU	172,387.5	2.70%	172,387.5	2.70%
20		IE	202,722.5	3.18%	202,722.5	3.18%
21		DK	227,500	3.57%	227,500	3.57%
22		BG	142,762.5	2.24%	142,762.5	2.24%
Total:			6,373,237.5		6,373,237.5	

**Abstract:**

The COVID-19 crisis hit like a tidal wave in the midst of other ongoing global challenges like climate change and rising socio-economic inequalities. The impacts of the crisis are affecting the (mental) health of many, often already vulnerable. EQUIP will rapidly and robustly investigate these impacts, as well as effective, evidence based measures being implemented across Europe to keep the pandemic from exacerbating existing inequalities and fueling new ones. It will also investigate effective approaches to build trust and adherence to behavioural advice to contain the spread of the virus. The focus will be on measures that address social, economic and environmental determinants (SEEDS) of (mental) health, and that address immediate needs whilst contributing to long term health, well-being and resilience. EQUIP's results will be delivered in four phases (1) analysis (2) piloting (3) foresight and (4) impacting. EQUIP will implement and test new 'next' practices where feasible, and use forecasting and future scenarios to encourage engagement. A key outcome will be an Alert Level Guidance System on practical measures to safeguard the health, wellbeing and resilience of vulnerable communities. EQUIP's multi-disciplinary consortium of national health institutes, academics and civil society will provide actionable results for end users at scale and have tangible impacts on understanding, policy at EU and national/regional levels and future preparedness. The ambition is to make vital, evidence-based information rapidly accessible and actionable, for those seeking to respond in real time to the crisis in ways that also contribute to strengthening the future fabric of society.

**Evaluation Summary Report****Evaluation Result**

**Total score: 12.50 (Threshold: 12)**

**Form Information****SCORING**

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

**Interpretation of the score:**

- 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.

**Criterion 1 - Excellence**

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:

**Clarity and pertinence of the objectives**

**Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology**

**Extent that proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models)**

**Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge and gender dimension in research and innovation content**

*The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but with some shortcomings. The proposal clearly frames pre-existing social and structural problems that the COVID-19 crisis has revealed and worsened. The objectives are clearly linked to the topic description, focusing on the impacts of the crisis on the mental health of vulnerable groups and to support the implementation of effective, evidence-based measures being implemented across Europe.*

*The proposed methodology is reliable, however, some relevant details are lacking or insufficient. Indeed, the valuable outcome of a web-based 'Rapid Alert Guidance System' would be instrumental in providing practical guidelines to safeguard the health, wellbeing and resilience of vulnerable communities. However, it remains unclear how this innovation would benefit those who do not need real-time information or how information that cannot be real-time would be covered.*

*The methods could have been clearer in terms of the gathering technique and integrated use of new data on top of those that allied research activities will generate. The cross-national comparison of policy analysis and the qualitative part of the analysis could have been better described.*

*Gender dimensions are convincingly considered throughout the proposal.*

**Criterion 2 - Impact**

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

**The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic**

**Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society**

**Quality of the proposed measures to:**

- exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant
- communicate the project activities to different target audiences

*The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but with some shortcomings. The expected impacts correspond closely to the expression of interest, with a broader EU-wide dimension. The digital Guidance System is consistently presented and it addresses, among others, the required contribution to holistic preparedness.*

*The inclusion of the project outcomes and the Guidance system in the EuroHealthNet's Health Inequalities portal beyond the end of the project and its promotion within EHN's post-2021 5-year strategy appropriately contribute to the sustainability to the project. The proposal also congruously justifies the usefulness of its outcomes and Guidance (and continuous updating) in structural interventions required to prevent exacerbation of social derangement. The coordinated use of substantial data sources and real-time access to data appears realistic and shows as a strength of the project.*

*The proposal is only marginally explicit about how the policy-relevant results can reach the government level and what the nature of the measures for adoption would be like. Even though the proposal has potential for exploitation of investment and market opportunities, these are not substantiated.*

*The proposal is strong in its consideration for social justice, environment and sustainability. However, it covers insufficiently a contextual consideration of differences in family-support systems between European nations as it concerns mental health and resilience.*

*Dissemination tools rank from a project's website to conferences, to publications, from traditional media to social media. This implies different levels of language and data presentation to raise awareness in the two main different target audiences identified. There is adequate quality of proposed measures to exploit project results.*

**Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation**

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

**Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables**

**Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management**

**Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise**

**Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role**

*The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but with some minor shortcomings.*

*Deliverables are clear, achievable and explicitly presented. The consortium consists of multiple partners with a strong footing in the relevant fields, demonstrated successful collaborations on related projects and are well-positioned to implement this project. Their direct involvement at decision-making bodies or access to societal stakeholders is reliably demonstrated to be strong. The multifaceted integration required is confirmed by the profiles of consortium members and profiles of the professionals involved in the proposal.*

*The resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables. The investigators show adequate complementarity and have presented plans for mutual engagement. One minor shortcoming is the lack of justification for the two countries not participating in direct research. Besides, the strategies for the collection of data from minority groups (migrant and refugee populations etc.) could have been detailed.*

*In general, the management structure is clear and extensively described, and seems adequate to counter the large challenges such an extensive, and the multiparty collaborative project would be facing. The shape of the innovation management and dissemination and exploitation board could have been elaborated more clearly. Many of the potential pitfalls and risks are described and effective ways to counteract potential setbacks are realistically described.*

*One issue which seems to have received too little attention relates especially to the extent on how the project will be able to gather quantitative data from vulnerable subgroups (migrant and refugee workers in particular). These groups have proven to be key in understanding the pandemic dynamics and might be both at highest risk for adverse effects as well as driving outbreaks in many EU regions.*

**Scope of the proposal**

Status: **Yes**

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

*Not provided*

**Operational Capacity**

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

If No, please list the concerned partner(s), the reasons for the rejection, and the requested amount.

*Not provided*

**Exceptional funding of third country participants/international organisations**

*A third country participant/international organisation not listed in [General Annex A to the Main Work Programme](#) may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the [Online Manual](#))*

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should exceptionally be funded:  
(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

*Not provided*

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should NOT be funded:  
(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

*Not provided*

**Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)**

Status: **No**

If yes, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not because of a lack of information.

*Not provided*



This document is digitally sealed. The digital sealing mechanism uniquely binds the document to the modules of the Funding & Tenders Portal of the European Commission, to the transaction for which it was generated and ensures its integrity and authenticity.

Any attempt to modify the content will lead to a breach of the electronic seal, which can be verified at any time by clicking on the digital seal validation symbol.