Evaluation Sheet

Criterion 1: Scientific relevance - 40% of total score
(see section B.1 of funding application)
- *Evaluate whether the problem/issue addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field.*
- *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.*
- *Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the research objectives. Are these objectives realistically achievable, measurable and verifiable?*
- *To what extent is the proposed methodological approach suitable for reaching these objectives?*
- *Evaluate to what extent the project activities will increase the research capacity / enhance the scientific performance of researchers from Republic Moldova. Does the project build the experience and the competence of the researchers /organizations involved?*

Criterion 2: Appropriateness of the methodology and feasibility - 30% of total score
(see section B.2 & B.4 of funding application)
- *Is the methodology appropriate and the project feasible?*
- *Are the proposed activities and deliverables well-structured and well-correlated?*
- *Is the budget and timetable of the project well justified (resources / time / results)?*
- *Is the impact and dissemination of project results well described? Is the sharing of project intellectual property rights between partners clearly addressed?*
- *How do you assess the structure of each team involved in the project, the proper functioning of the partnership as a whole and which is the degree of complementarity of the teams involved and research infrastructure available?*

Criterion 3: Track record and expertise of the researchers (project director, co-director, key-persons) - 30% of total score
(see section B.3 & C of funding application)
- *Evaluate to what extent the Project Director's / Co-director's research outputs are relevant for the present project.*
- *Assess the quality and appropriateness of the team members's existing professional experience in relation to the research proposal.*
- *Is each team member's role and team project partner well described?*

Recommendations for Evaluators:
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:

0	ABSENT	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to *missing or incomplete information.*
1	UNSATISFACTORY	The criterion is addressed in an *inadequate manner*, or there are *serious inherent weaknesses.*
2	SATISFACTORY	While the proposal *broadly addresses* the criterion, there are *significant weaknesses.*
3	GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion *well*, although *improvements would*

		be necessary. A number of weaknesses/shortcomings are present.
4	**VERY GOOD**	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although *certain improvements are still possible. 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 criterion 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 Consensus Report!
4. If **no weakness is identified, the score is 5**.
5. 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 criterion multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);
Final grade = 20*(c1*40/100 + c2*30/100 + c3*30/100) ci is the score for criterion i.