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Vision for Compared (as submitted)

Provide an online platform for semantic comparison of research proposals with a corpus of R&I grants from EU and MS funding agencies, and other documents.

Expected benefits

- Give evaluators of R&I proposals the means to compare incoming proposals to a corpus of grants and other relevant documents
  - Decrease duplication and scientific overlap
  - Support the selection of scientific evaluators
  - More evidence for decision-making

- Give grant applicants the possibility to retrieve similar funded grants
  - Increase quality of incoming applications
  - Decrease duplication and scientific overlap

- Give non-public funding entities means to better assess the quality of submitted projects
**Stakeholders of Compared**

Core group
- Commission DGs "Research family"
- EU R&I funding agencies
- Science Europe and national funding agencies of R&I

Second tier
- Applicants to R&I funding schemes
- Private R&I funding agencies
- Elsevier

**Synergies**

With DG RTD and ERC

With other TM initiatives in EU institutions

With Science Europe working group
Process

Application

EMM or DGT

Translation

Indexing

Grants data from funding agencies

Semantic comparison Module + Entity matching module

Index of grants data + other relevant data

English text in user interface

Translation

Semantically similar grants, publications...
Flagging above threshold

Flagging of application/grant pair with similar applying entities

Expert evaluation

...
1. Collect user requirements

User requirements meeting at Science Europe. September?

Attendance: national funding agencies (via Science Europe), steering group, EU executive agencies.

Goal: collect user requirements to orient development.
2. Define data format and content

To be discussed during the user requirements meeting.

Goal: discuss data collection and use with data providers and list technical and legal constraints.
3. **Build and populate database for pilot**

For the pilot phase: grant data from Cordis (FP5 – today); grant data from NKFIH and FECYT; scientific publications, patents.

Database at JRC.

Goal: populate database for first testing
4. **Develop pilot semantic platform**

By JRC

Prioritisation of user requirements is needed (at user meeting).

Goal: develop pilot platform with key functionalities for testing
5. Test pilot platform

By users. NKFIH, FECYT, ERC, others?

What testing model?
- Test of iterative developments?
- Full functionality test at the end?

A real test case could be defined.

Goal: Validate the concept before launching a scale-up, report to the closing user meeting group.
6. Closing meeting and report

Report containing recommendations is prepared by JRC with the testers of the pilot platform.

A review meeting is organised at the end of pilot phase to envisage possible scaling up. (steering group only or larger stakeholder audience).

Goal: Validate the concept before launching a scale-up
What is next?

- **Now**: recruitment of project manager.

- **User meeting**: early September?

Discussion / Decisions

Scope/goals/planning of the project

Governance
- reporting mechanism to steering group
- frequency of meetings

Stakeholders interaction: Pending assessment of pilot system?

**User meeting**: September? Scope?