

Fișa individuală de evaluare/Raport intermediar de evaluare/Raport de consens/Raport final de evaluare

Please deliver your comments for each sub-criterion as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-). Please respond to all relevant tasks indicated in the Evaluation sheet.

1. Project Director - 40% of the total score

See Section B.1 from the funding application and CV of Project Director.

The proven scientific capacity to propose and successfully lead relevant research activities with major scientific impact.

- To what extent has the Project Director demonstrated the ability to conduct exploratory research;
- To what extent does the Project Director provide evidence of creative independent thinking;
- Evaluate to what extent the achievements of the Project Director are internationally acknowledged;
- Evaluate the experience of the Project Director to lead international and national projects, to train and mentor young researchers.
- Comment regarding the extent to which the research directions/theories/methods/strategies/techniques developed by the Project Director have been widely accepted and recognized by the international scientific/academic community.
- Evaluate to what extent the Project Director's research output is relevant for the present project. Assess the quality and appropriateness of the researcher's existing professional experience in relation to the research proposal. Comment on how the previously published work or previous projects relates to the proposed research.

The evaluation of the performance of the Project Director is done in accordance with the principles set out by CoARA¹.

2. Research Project - 60% of the total score

2.1 Ambition and feasibility - 50% of the total score of Criterion 2

See Section B.2.1 from the funding application.

- To what extent the proposed research addresses important challenges and has the scientific potential
- Comment on the originality and novelty of the proposed solution and assess the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the current state of the art in the field;
- To what extent the proposed research methodology contributes to achievement of the project's objectives;
- To what extent does the proposal involve the development of novel methodologies, if applicable;
- The effects that the proposed research may produce upon the scientific knowledge;

¹ <https://www.coara.org/agreement/the-agreement-full-text/>

- Evaluate whether the problem/issue addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field;
- If previous projects of the applicant addressing a similar topic are mentioned, comment on the novel aspects investigated in the present project.

2.2 Impact - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

See Section B.2.2 from the funding application.

- To what extent the proposal can lead to significant scientific results with impact in the broader domain;
- To what extent the implementation of the project has an impact on the host institution and the research team;
- To what extent the project objectives have an impact in the scientific, social and economic environment (the opening of new opportunities in science, technology etc).

2.3 Implementation - 20% of the total score of Criterion 2

See Section B.2.3; B.2.3.1, B.2.4 from the funding application.

- To what extent is the proposed scientific approach feasible bearing in mind that the proposed research involves high risk, if applicable;
- Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the research objectives. Are the research objectives realistically achievable, measurable and verifiable?
- To what extent are the proposed timescale and resources necessary, appropriate and adequately justified;
- Assess whether the Gantt Chart (mandatory) is consistent and complete, in relation to the whole work plan (taking into account WPs, scientific deliverables, milestones);
- Comment on the quality of the proposed measures to disseminate the scientific/scholarly output of the proposal;
- To what extent the Open Science practices are well demonstrated;
- To what extent the research data management is convincing and in compliance with the FAIR principles;
- To what extent throughout the project implementation, gender equality, inclusion and diversity are ensured by the host institution;
- To what extent the ethical issues are appropriately addressed (if applicable).
- Provide an overall assessment of the research budget requested and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities.

Recommendations for Evaluators/ Rapporteurs:

1. Propose a 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:

Table 1.

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

2. When scoring each subcriterion use the full scale, from 0 to 5 – in 0.5 increments.
3. The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments. Scores **below 5, including 4.5, must be in accordance with the identified weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated** in the evaluation sheet.
If no weakness is identified, the score is 5.
4. Each strength and weakness must be reflected **only once** in the report and the scores, i.e. there is **no double penalty, no double reward**.

Note: The final score will be calculated as a weighted sum of the scores for each subcriteria multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);

Final grade = 20*[s1*40/100 + (s2.1*50/100 + s2.2*30/100 + s2.3*20/100)*60/100], where si,j is the score for criterion/subcriterion i,j