

Fișă de evaluare (Evaluation Sheet)

1. Principal investigator (50%)

1.1. (40%)

(see sections B1, B3.1 and B2)

To what extent **the excellence of the PI's research results** is demonstrated by the list of publications and patents?

To what extent **the originality of the PI's results** and their **impact on the state of the art** are relevant for the present project?

1.2. (10%)

(see sections B1, B3.2 and B2)

To what extent the **PI's capacity to autonomously manage scientific activities** as a researcher and/or research group leader, as well as the **visibility and prestige in her/his international peer group** is demonstrated?

To what extent are validated the **PI's leadership abilities**, the capacity to attract international funding (academic grants or contracts with industry, where the project leader was the main investigator (PI) or project coordinator), **and his/her level of international recognition** (awards, invited talks and doctoral committees in prestigious universities)?

Please take into account those facts that you consider relevant for the current proposal.

Please deliver your comments as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-).

2. Proposal (50%)

2.1 (30%)

(see sections C1, C2, C3).

To what extent the **overall solution** described in the proposal **is challenging and beyond current state-of-the-art** and which is its potential future impact?

To what extent the following aspects: **(1)** significance and the difficulty of the problem being addressed; **(2)** the originality of the proposed solution and the appropriateness of the objectives; **(3)** the potential to advance knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thought and activity are addressed in the proposal?

2.2 (20%)

(see section C4)

To what extent the **method, work plan, milestones and deliverables** as defined by the proposal are appropriate to reach the envisioned solution?

How well selected and related to the newest approaches in the field are the methods, design and investigation tools for the effectiveness of the work-plan within the proposed timescale and resources?

Have potential risks areas been appropriately discussed, and have alternative approaches been mentioned?

2.3 Please assess the adequacy of the **proposed budget** and suggest possible corrections (see sections *C5* and *C4*). Please comment on the match between the work-plan and the budget, as well as on the appropriateness of the mobility (conferences, work-visits) and infrastructure acquisitions included in the budget. (There will be no score associated with this item, but the expert opinion will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the precise financial award).

Please deliver your comments as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-).

Recommendations for Rapporteurs:

1. Propose score **only after** consensus has been reached on the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e. address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

| | | |
|----------|------------------|---|
| 0 | ABSENT | The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i> |
| 1 | POOR | The criterion is addressed in an <i>inadequate manner</i> , or there are <i>serious inherent weaknesses</i> |
| 2 | FAIR | While the proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, there are <i>significant weaknesses</i> |
| 3 | GOOD | The proposal addresses the criterion <i>well</i> , although <i>improvements would be necessary. A number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.</i> |
| 4 | VERY GOOD | The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>certain improvements are still possible. A small number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.</i> |
| 5 | EXCELLENT | The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor |

2. When scoring use the full scale, from 0 to 5 – using just one decimal, for each evaluation criterion.
3. The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments. Scores below 4.8 (i.e. also **3** – good or **4** - very good) **must be in accord with the identified weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated** in the Consensus Report!
4. Each strength and weakness must be reflected only once in the report and the scores (**no double penalty**).

Note: The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each of the four subcriteria weighed by the corresponding precentage and multiplying by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);