Evaluation Sheet

Criterion 1: Project Director and Partener Leader(s)   - 40% of total score
(see section B.2 of funding application)

- *Evaluate to what extent the Project Director's / partner Leader(s)'s scientific output is internationally recognized.*
- *Evaluate to what extent the Project Director's / partner Leader(s)'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.*

Criterion 2: Scientific Excellence   - 30% of total score
(see section B.3 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?*
- *How effective is the work plan (timelines, deliverables) in terms of achieving the proposed objectives?*
- *Comment on the coherence of the project's approach in terms of activities and time scales.*

Criterion 3: Project feasibility   - 30% of total score
(see section B.4 of funding application)
- *To what extent will the research infrastructure available at the host institution and human resource (research teams) ensure the successful implementation of the project?*
- *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 4: Budget; this section will not be scored
(see section B.5 of funding application)

- *Please provide an overall assessment of the requested budget and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities.*
  Note: There will be no score associated with this criterion, but the assessment will be useful to the funding agency.

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.