

THE SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Sixth Framework Programme covers Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2002 to 2006

EVALUATION RESULTS

for proposals responding to the competitive call for additional contractors in the EU 6th Framework programme project

**Integrated Project
HyWays Phase II**

**Facilitated by:
Dr. Ulrich Bünger / LBST**

07. December 2005

Table of Contents

Introduction

Conclusions for member states selected

Conclusions for member states not selected

Final conclusions

Introduction

In total 17 proposals were received on the due deadline. The proposals received by the HyWays evaluation panel were thoroughly assessed by the external evaluators; they were generally of high quality. Apparently, the call for proposals for adding the new member states to HyWays in Phase II had been very well understood and accepted. This made the decision of the evaluators very difficult, as well prepared, well-written proposals had to be turned down. The fact that the call text required exactly the same scope of work from all applicants also reduced the possibilities to separate proposals for their innovation.

Evaluation Procedure

Following the above call for proposals, launched on 5 August 2005 to extend the partnership of the HyWays Integrated Project to include representation from additional European member states or associated states, the project Steering Committee implemented an evaluation procedure conforming to the provisions set down in the European Commission document “GUIDANCE NOTE for project co-ordinators planning a competitive call for additional contractors in an EU 6th Framework programme project - Integrated projects or Networks of excellence”. An evaluation panel comprising the co-ordinator’s nominated representatives and independent evaluators was established with the approval of the HyWays project Steering Committee.

The proposals were evaluated against the criteria published in the call. The results of the evaluation were referred to the HyWays project Steering Committee which considered the panel’s recommendations and endorsed the results of the evaluation which are summarised below.

Whilst the Description of Work for the HyWays project provides for the addition of up to six additional partners, the Steering Committee, in consultation with the project General Assembly, have taken the decision to add only four additional partners. This decision was necessary because insufficient resources are available for a comparable analysis to that undertaken for the Phase I partners. The Commission, including its legal services was informed throughout the process.

The criteria C1 to C4 are listed underneath.

C1: Quality of proposed programme and added value to the European Hydrogen Energy Roadmap process e.g. climate or geographic issues, complementarity with the 6 Phase I member state partners, (specifically renewable) energy potentials for hydrogen production, availability of member state specific statistic data

C2: Competence of the member state expert organisation (to carry out the tasks listed in the task description of the call text) and impartiality (with respect to stakeholder groups, specific energy chains, etc.)

C3: Funding capability of the member state expert organisation (at least 50% of the maximum amount of the EC funding rate, own funds or co-funding from other e.g. member state sources)

C4: Commitment of organised stakeholder groupings (e.g. from ministries, industry, institutes or other organisations)

The following table shows the evaluation results in detail. On the basis of this information the evaluators have carefully come to the conclusions underneath, not showing the below threshold scores.

No	Inst.	MS	C1(Th: 4/5)		C2(Th: 3/5)		C3(Th: 3/5)		C4(Th: 3/5)		Total (Th: 16/20)		Avg. grand total	Selection
			1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2		
1	INETI	Portugal	4	x	4	3	3	x	3	3	x	x	x	
2	ICETEC	Iceland	x	4	5	4	5	4	4	5	17	17	17	
3	VTT	Finland	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	3	19	17	18	2
4	Risø	Denmark	4	x	3	4	3	3	4	4	x	x	x	
5	Ovidius Univ.	Romania	4	x	3	4	3	3	x	3	x	x	x	
6	CIDAUT/INTA	Spain	5	5	5	4	4	4	5	4	19	17	18	1
7	VITO	Belgium	x	x	3	4	4	3	4	3	x	x	x	
8	IDMEC-IST	Portugal	4	x	3	3	x	x	3	4	x	x	x	
9	Central Mining Inst.	Poland	5	5	4	4	5	4	4	4	18	17	17,5	3
10	INASMET	Spain	4	4	3	3	x	x	3	x	x	x	x	
11	DTI	UK	4	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	17	18	17,5	4
12	CEA	Czech Republic	4	x	3	3	5	3	3	x	x	x	x	
13	AEA	Austria	5	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	16	x	x	6
14	ETC	Sweden	x	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	17	18	x	5
15	H&M Transf. Inst.	Belarus		x		x		x		x	x	x	x	
16	Budapest Univ.	Hungary									x	x	x	

Yellow – accepted (top 4), grey – not accepted (top 6), red – not accepted, blue – special status

Preliminary conclusions for member states selected

Position 1: CIDAUT/INTA (Spain)

Proposal exceeds thresholds for all criteria. The stakeholder group reached through the Spanish Hydrogen Association is the group which needs to be addressed by HyWays and is representative of this Southern European region by population, geography, role of renewables and industrial character. By explaining its task precisely in the proposal INTA has proven they have understood the HyWays process. INTA is believed to have the capacity and the standing, to provide the input and commitment. INTA has also proven that it is capable to provide its own funding.

Position 2: VTT (Finland)

Proposal exceeds thresholds for all criteria. The current political decision process in Finland and the relevance of the Finnish industry and outstanding situation (i.e. its biomass resources and expertise) make it a relevant candidate to add to the value of the HyWays' roadmap process. VTT is believed to be a central, accepted, unbiased and reliable expert partner to pull together relevant experts from politics, industry and research and carry out the necessary facilitation tasks requested by HyWays which they have well proven in the past. They have presented both an outstanding proposal by contents as well as a sound work programme to contribute to HyWays.

Position 3: Central Mining Institute (Poland)

Proposal exceeds thresholds for all criteria. Poland by means of a sound primary energy mix of domestic lignite and biomass resources to produce hydrogen will be an important member state to add a new perspective to the HyWays evaluation. As it is an Eastern European member state Poland plays an important role to also bring forward the visions and represent the specific interests of this region. In a European context the Institute of Mining has in the past proven that it has been accepted by Polish stakeholders to play a key role in the formulation of a specific national Polish hydrogen energy strategy. The proposal is of high quality addressing the major energy and policy related issues and concerns. It also is developing an own work programme to contribute to HyWays and devise a process to invite further Polish stakeholders to engage in the European viewpoints of the strategy.

Position 4: DTI (UK)

Proposal exceeds thresholds for all criteria. The UK can become an important stakeholder in the European hydrogen strategy. It has announced with increasing intensity to develop an own national strategy for the introduction of hydrogen energy. DTI, being a national and government owned institution has the power to access the policymakers and has been accepted for its role as hydrogen facilitator for HyWays - also by industry. DTI is believed to have the power to carry out the requested moderation and facilitation work to carry out the necessary tasks for HyWays and convey the information generated by HyWays to a wider UK stakeholder group due to its central role. Whilst the proposal lacked some detail, DTI was positively evaluated. Any such concerns were considered to be more than compensated for because of the specific and central role DTI plays in UK policy, its hydrogen expertise from past activities, and its acceptance by the UK industry partners.

Position 5: ETC (Sweden)

Proposal exceeds thresholds for all criteria. Sweden was ranked to be one of the top candidates as Sweden's strong (automobile) industry, its experience with introducing biomass as a new form of (renewable) energy and its influence in the Scandinavian system was ranked high. The proposal was not ranked among the top 4 partners as ETC has until recently not played an important role in the field of hydrogen. Thus, the experts could not judge on the appropriateness of ETC to become the central Swedish hydrogen policy facilitator which had been defined as key criterion. In general, the proposal was very convincing, with the exception that a clear work plan was not presented. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained. Nevertheless every effort will be made to associate the Swedish stakeholders with HyWays to the extent possible.

Position 6: AEA (Austria)

All criteria but the first have been evaluated to meet the thresholds. Austria is one of the few European member states with a concise strategy on hydrogen energy which has emerged from joint discussions between industry and the government. Furthermore, its obviously increasing commitment to introduce renewable energy in stationary energy supply, and also in the transport sector makes it an important candidate for the HyWays roadmap process. Also, the stakeholder group and AEA as facilitator earned high scores. The evaluators however came to the conclusion that Austria will not contribute to HyWays with an outstanding profile as many of its relevant assets are already represented by other member states participating in HyWays Phase I. The proposal of AEA was ranked high, showing both high systems analysis quality and a good understanding of the goals of HyWays. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained. Nevertheless every effort will be made to associate the Austrian stakeholders with HyWays to the extent possible.

Special status: ICETEC (Iceland)

Based on an excellent and convincing proposal and the role that Iceland plays as a showcase for renewable hydrogen energy, the evaluators have expressed their support to accord Iceland a special status in HyWays.

It was suggested to let Iceland gain access to detailed data and participate in HyWays project meetings. The objective is twofold: An exchange on common interests and learning effects for both sides, such that Iceland can directly profit from the European learning process without having to become part of the modelling exercise, and secondly to incorporate the issue of possible imports of hydrogen from renewable energy in Iceland to central Europe. A final decision on precisely how to associate Iceland to HyWays will be taken by the HyWays Steering Committee and General Assembly.

Preliminary conclusions for member states not selected

INETI (Portugal)

The added value for a European Roadmap is given for the case of Portugal as it can specifically contribute in the field of renewable energies. On the other hand the evaluators have concluded that the proposal was missing major elements which were expected, among others a clear strategy and workplan. Although INETI's central role as a governmental research institute is well appreciated, it was felt that the proposal was missing industrial commitment. Also, the co-funding could not be convincingly guaranteed. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

Risø (Denmark)

Risø is a highly respected and well-known research institute and has been central also in recent analysis work on hydrogen energy in Europe. With its experience and background it could be an ideal partner for HyWays. Denmark, being a Nordic country, is important in the hydrogen energy world with a long tradition of studies and systems analysis on the possible future role of hydrogen energy. Yet, the added value to the European Roadmap considering the contribution of the first 6 MS partners, unfortunately does not justify a central role in Phase II. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

Ovidius University (Romania)

Ovidius University has played a visible role in the hydrogen related activities of the European Commission. Personal commitment and the interest of parts of the Romanian Government were proven by letters of intent to support Ovidius University. As an Eastern European state Romania also has a priority status. Yet, the evaluators felt that Romania's profile did not yet provide sufficient elements to justify its specific added value for the European Roadmap.

VITO (Belgium)

Vito is a research institute with a long history in hydrogen energy systems. It has proven that it is capable to provide the services expected by HyWays. Also, the information that a Belgian hydrogen roadmap is in the planning stage is a promising and vital signal of the Belgian stakeholders. However, the proposal was lacking a concise workplan for the efforts to be contributed and a clear signal of broad stakeholder commitment. This, coupled with the fact that the evaluators considered that the added value Belgium might contribute in Phase II versus the member states in Phase I would be too little to justify its partnership. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

IDMEC-IST (Portugal)

Considering its role in HyWays Phase I, its expertise in hydrogen energy systems and its apparent role in Portugal as an independent research institute, the IDMEC-IST submission was considered a strong proposal. Portugal's specific assets in renewable energy would certainly added value to the HyWays

roadmap. The reason for not ranking IDMEC-IST's proposal higher was the fact that the project financing appears to be linked to another internal Portuguese hydrogen strategy project. Unfortunately, this was felt to be too vague in view of the necessity for securing the required own institute funds. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

INASMET (Spain)

INASMET is a relevant research institute to carry out the facilitation task within HyWays Phase II. As it seems to play a less central role than CIDAUT/INTA in addressing the important stakeholders, and as a member state can be represented by only one partner in HyWays, it is suggested that INASMET teams up with CIDAUT/INTA to possibly share some of the tasks for Spain. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

CEA (Czech Republic)

CEA is the national energy agency in the Czech Republic and as such has a central role to address many of the important stakeholders. However, CEA failed to clarify industry participation in the proposal and thus seems to have left out an important interest group. As such the Czech Republic being an Eastern European member state has a preferred role among the member states. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

Heat and Mass Transfer Institute (Belarus)

The proposal does not address the right topic. The evaluators felt that the hydrogen roadmap process was definitely not understood and that this institute is not yet in a position to contribute to HyWays Phase II. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

Budapest University (Hungary)

This incomplete proposal by Budapest University was apparently filed at a very late stage giving the impression that the process of HyWays was not well understood. Regrettably, this proposal could not be retained.

Final remark

Some Eastern European member states which submitted proposals to this call will be referred to the Call 4 in FP6 which specifically addresses the involvement of Eastern European member states in running FP6 project such as HyWays.

Final conclusions

The analysis of the evaluators' choice with respect to the representativeness of the joint member state group from Phase I and Phase II is shown in the table below. The table shows the coverage by population and land area, and the incremental coverage by including 4, 5 and 6 partners in Phase II.

Whilst the addition of Sweden does add a small, but significant increase in land area, the addition of both Austria and Sweden brings only a small relative addition in population coverage. Given the strain on project resources to complete / refine the Phase I analysis, it was considered that the inclusion of 4 additional partners provided the most cost-effective way to enhance HyWays coverage – without diluting the quality of the results.

	Member states	Coverage by population	Coverage by land area
Phase I:	D, F, GR, I, N, NL	49,7	39,2
Phase I+II (4)	D, E, F, FIN, GR, I, N, NL, PL, UK	80,5	71,4
Phase I+II (5)	D, E, F, FIN, GR, I, N, NL, PL, UK, S	82,4	81,8
Phase I+II (6)	AU, D, E, F, FIN, GR, I, N, NL, PL, UK, S	84,2	83,7