

## APPENDIX 5 – Evaluation sheet – Phase II

### Criteria for evaluation – Phase II

#### 1. The Project leader (60%)

**1.1 (50%)** Please evaluate **the excellency of the project leaders' research activity results** as resulted from the publications and patents list, with emphasis on the contributions as main author. Please comment the originality of the project leaders' results, their impact on the state of the art of the results in this field, and also their relevance for this project.

**1.2 (10%)** Please evaluate the capacity of the project leader to manage autonomously scientific activities as researcher and/or research group leader, and also **his/her visibility and prestige within the group he/she belong at international level**. Please comment the performance in publications of the project leader (as main author), his/her leadership, the capacity to raise funds, his/her international visibility. Please consider only the results relevant for this project proposal.

#### 2. The project proposal (40%)

**2.1 (20%)** Please evaluate **the general solution** described in the project proposal in the current context and its potential impact in the future. **Please comment** the following aspects: (1) the significance and the degree of difficulty of the issue addressed; (2) the originality of the proposed solution according to the objectives; (3) the potential to move forward the knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thinking and activity.

**2.2 (20%)** Please evaluate the method and the work plan as defined in the project proposal as a concrete approach to reach the solution provided. Please comment how well are chosen the methods, the tools for investigation, and the efficiency of the work plan related to the time and the resources proposed. Potential issues have been treated properly? There have been mentioned alternative approaches? There have been mentioned deliverables and what importance has been given to publication of the results in prestigious international journals? How do you assess the research project team structure, its functioning and what is the degree of complementarity of the team members?

**2.3** Please evaluate the adequacy of the budget proposal and suggest possible rectifications. Please comment the correspondence between the work plan and the proposed budget, and also the adequacy of the mobilities (conferences, working visits) and the infrastructure procurements included into the budget. The evaluators comments associated to this subcriterion will be used only during the negotiation and contracting process.

The final score will be calculated as a sum of the scores for each of the four subcriteria multiplied by the corresponding percentage and multiplied by 20 (maximum final score 100).

**The rating scale:**

<b>0</b>	<b>ABSENT</b>	The project proposal does not address the analyzed criterion or it cannot be assessed due to the lack or incomplete information.
<b>1</b>	<b>POOR</b>	The proposal does not meet the criterion properly or there are serious inherent deficiencies.
<b>2</b>	<b>SATISFYING</b>	The project proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant deficiencies.
<b>3</b>	<b>GOOD</b>	The project proposal addresses the criterion well but improvements are needed.
<b>4</b>	<b>VERY GOOD</b>	The project proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
<b>5</b>	<b>EXCELLENT</b>	The project proposal successfully addresses all the relevant aspects of the criterion, there may be minor shortcomings.

**Caption:**

1. Choose a score **only after** you have written the comments, sustained by scientific arguments; please make sure the comments are accurate and complete and consistent with each score, namely:
2. It is possible to use the full rating scale or **half score may be granted**.
3. If given a score of **3** or **4** (there are needed/possible improvements), please make sure that the improvements required are described! If given a score of **1** or **2**, please make sure that the important weaknesses are specifically described!