

JA NFP4Health

LEARNING BY DOING LAB - CANCER

Madrid, 1-2 October 2024

GROUP ACTIVITIES AND FEEDBACK SUMMARY



This presentation is part of the action "NFP4Health" which has received funding from the European Union's Health Programme (2014-2020) under grant agreement No 101035965.

Group activities and feedback summary

European projects' scouting challenges, recurring and highlighted items:

1. There is an occasional mismatch between the main goal of a call topic, expected outcomes (long term, medium term and short-term outcomes), project outputs and related work packages. Going back to the call document is sometimes the only reliable anchor for the process.
2. European ongoing research and completed projects are frequently dealing with incomplete information, often missing partner information or even a readily accessible public website (even though the main information is available in the Programmes' platform such as the "Funding&Tenders Portal"). Multiple communication outlets and platforms need to be cross-examined to optimise research.
3. Identifying the progress indicators of a project can support the comparison process, and can highlight future vulnerabilities, but might often require a proactive approach as they are not always explicitly accessible.
4. Consortium and project balance (geographic and competence-wise in particular) is sometimes not immediately clear, though some internal factors may not be publicly shared or identifiable.

Intermediate discussion, main points of challenge highlighted and potential steps forward:

1. Achieving adequate technological readiness for post-project evaluation is a relevant challenge. This will vary significantly from project to project, but it needs a dedicated focus within the work packages to begin with.
2. The integration of social sciences into projects can represent a significant and even necessary contribution depending on the project and the consortium, but consortia may not be used to involving this type of partner. Thus, it becomes crucial to involve social sciences partners, when present, already at the proposal drafting and narrative defining step of the project planning, to ensure a seamless integration and defined tasks that leverage their contributions.
3. The integration of individual and diverse research into a holistic approach creates significant additional steps. A strongly enforced framework is needed.
4. The EU projects language specificity and the need for significant efficiency within confined proposals (by both content requirements and page count) make applications quite restrictive in their drafting. The usefulness of integrating diverse experiences such as from marketing tools and from existing projects (including from other programmes) highlights the importance of multi-faceted consortia.
5. Given information on a call budget, it is necessary to determine how many projects could be funded whenever not specified.

Presentation of the Learning Labs/Working Groups' results and feedback:

Group 1: D4DPC - Dialogue for data driven patient care

Having established a coherent set of objectives and intended outputs, special attention was given to a diverse consortium composition. When it comes to KPIs, initial steps were shared and acknowledged in the feedback phase as an area of further exploration. Feedback also remarked on a need to explicitly show broad country representation balanced across Europe, on top of showcasing a broad range of institutions. Attention was



brought to the need to explicitly show the intended ethics evaluation as well. Overall, the proposal draft was deemed to be thorough and a strong start by the evaluators. A brief and open-ended discussion followed on the role of healthcare providers in the project and on the topic of synergies with other projects and programmes.

Group 2: CANCER DIALOGUE

Having established the framework and goals, an overview of intended Work Packages was provided, including intended tasks, involved actors within the consortium, outputs, and indicators where relevant. Feedback remarked on the need for explicit reference to the outcomes throughout the analysis of the various Work Packages. The analysis was otherwise deemed very thorough and well-structured in the initial evaluation feedback. A question was posed as to the current choices of KPIs, concerning the focus on quantitative project indicators, and suggesting a broader geographical approach as an addition. The acknowledgement of sustainability measures and lobbying actions was also highlighted as a useful addition to the proposal.

Group 3: HL4Cancer - Empowering Stakeholders for Better Health Literacy in Cancer prevention and Care

Having established a main goal and specific objectives, the consortium composition was analysed. Work package titles and areas of operation were overviewed. In this context, outputs were associated with the chosen WPs, and overall indicators were identified. A discussion followed on the stated goal of the project, with the aim of clarifying the language used. Attention was also brought to potential synergies outside of EU4Health, identifying an existing Horizon Europe project that deals with the same topic. A further question was raised on the role of social sciences and educators, suggesting that they should be added in explicitly considering the language and objective of the call. Feedback built on the above and stressed the need to show the reach of the project, which was acknowledged and led to highlighting the useful contribution of partners to an existing JA (CRANE in this case), which had been selected. The proposal was deemed to be a strong starting point.

Group 4: CAPABLE – Cancer Awareness Prevention and Behavioural Literacy Education

Having established the objectives of the project, target groups were identified in line with the scope of the call. The project goal and outcomes were elaborated on, and an overview of the Work Packages was explained, with comparisons to similar projects being made, building towards the identified outputs. The lack of a planned consortium was acknowledged. The need for a monitoring work package (compulsory in EU4Health) was highlighted in feedback, as was the questionable inclusion of a business plan given the context of the call. The extensive analysis of sustainability in the same context was remarked upon as very useful, with a positive outlook on the proposal as a whole being shared by the evaluators. Discussion followed on the production of target group-tailored new material within the project. The explicit attention to specific stakeholders as a starting point and the included attention to accessibility were also acknowledged as very valuable.