

APPENDIX 4 – Evaluation sheet

Criteria for evaluation:

1. The Project leader and the Mentor (50%)

1.1 The Project leader (40%) Please evaluate **the quality of the Project leader's research results**, as they are revealed by the publications and patents list. The evaluation will look in particular to the articles in which the Project leader is the main author. Please comment the Project leader's originality of the results, and their impact on the state of the art of the results in the field, as well as their relevancy for this project.

This sub-criterion corresponds to Section B from the funding application.

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

This sub-criterion corresponds to Section C from the funding application.

2. The project proposal (50%)

2.1 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 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 planning and 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?

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.

This criterion corresponds to Section D from the funding application.

The rating scale:

For each evaluation criterion, scores are given from 0 to 5. Fractions of 0.1 may be used. If the project is downgraded within a criterion, the identified deficiencies/weaknesses must be clearly described.

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

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