

Evaluation Criteria for Centres of Excellence
(CoEx 2024)

Criterion 1: Excellence

(30%)

See sections B.1, B.6, B.7 from the funding application!

To what extent:

- *the project proposal is coherent with call objectives and fits with the main/secondary impact zone(s);*
- *the proposed research addresses important research challenges that will have great impact on international/national research themes and/or research methods;*
- *the objectives are ambitious and beyond the state-of-the-art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches, development of novel methodology or development between or across disciplines); they are clear, realistic, and measurable;*
- *the proposed research has the potential to achieve ground-breaking results;*
- *the outlined scientific approach is feasible;*
- *the proposed research methodologies are appropriate to achieve the scientific goals of the centre by the end of the project;*
- *the combination of scientific elements put forward in the proposal is crucial to address the scope and complexity of the research question;*
- *the proposed strategy and research methodology are interdisciplinary (if case);*
- *the existent research infrastructure is complementary/useful/innovative and adequate for the implementation of the project.*

Criterion 2: Performance of the research groups

(35%)

See section B.2 from the funding application and CVs for all nominated persons!

To what extent:

Centre Director

- *the Centre Director has proven the ability to conduct ground-breaking research;*
- *the Centre Director has the required scientific expertise and capacity to undertake the task of successfully leading the centre;*
- *the Centre Director has demonstrated sound leadership in training and mentoring young scientists.*

Responsible persons from the partners (Group Leaders and Key Members)

- *the Group Leaders and Key Members have demonstrated the ability to conduct ground-breaking research;*
- *the Group Leaders and Key members have the required scientific expertise and capacity to successfully execute the project;*
- *the Group leaders and Key members have adequate experience in coordination and/or implementation of national and international competitive research projects.*

Collaboration Networks

- *the partnership is sound and suitable, based on previous collaborations among research group partners (projects, patents, co-authored publications etc);*

See sections B.3 and B.5 from the funding application!

To what extent:

Centre organisation

- *the proposal goes beyond what the individual partners could achieve alone;*
- *the group successfully demonstrates in the proposal that it brings together the elements - such as skills, knowledge, experience, expertise, disciplines, methods, approaches, teams - necessary to address the proposed research question;*
- *the management structures and governance (including scientific advisory board) are appropriate;*
- *partner organizations have a valid role in the centre and adequate competencies/capacities to carry out their role;*
- *the Centre has a strategy for dynamic international collaboration in the selected domain, for the entire duration of the project;*
- *the organisation of the Centre is optimal for the scientific collaboration and a fertile environment for attracting and training new research talents (PhD candidates or postdoctoral researchers).*

Work plan and schedule

- *the expertise level of researchers nominated in the project team is good and well-correlated with their contribution in the project;*
- *the proposed activities, deliverables and milestones are well structured and ensure the achievement of the proposed objectives and expected results, with adequate means of verification and contingency plans;*
- *the responsibilities of the people involved are adequately described, including new necessary staff positions;*
- *the Gantt diagram is realistic;*
- *the research agenda is updated based on public consultation with industry, NGOs, citizens and public authorities as potential users of the research results;*
- *the Open Science practices are well demonstrated;*
- *the research data management is convincing and in compliance with the FAIR principles;*
- *throughout the project implementation, gender equality, inclusion and diversity are ensured by all organisations involved in the consortium;*
- *the ethical issues are appropriately addressed (if applicable).*

Budget

- *the requested budget is well justified and adequate in accordance with the proposed research activities, taking into consideration real costs of research activities according to the scientific domain;*
- *the requested equipment purchases are justified and relevant;*
- *the involvement of the Centre Director is significant and sufficient for a proper implementation of the project. in line with the call requirement - at least 50% of FTE (min. 4 h/day);*
- *the involvement of the Group Leaders (responsible persons of Partners) is significant and sufficient for a proper implementation of the project, in line with the call requirement - at least 50% of FTE (min. 4 h/day);*
- *the involvement of the Key Persons is sufficient for a proper implementation of the project, in line with the call requirement - at least 25% of FTE (min. 2 h/day).*

See section B.4 from the funding application!

To what extent:

- *the Centre will contribute to the development of an internationally leading research environment in Romania;*
- *the quality and scope of dissemination, communication and engagement activities with different target audiences are adequately presented;*
- *the proposal can lead to significant scientific results (scientific breakthroughs);*
- *the research results provide valid solution(s) to the challenge(s), with wide potential applications;*
- *other medium- and long-term impacts are adequately justified.*

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:

0	INSUFFICIENT	The proposal does not address this criterion under examination, thus it cannot be assessed due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i> .
1	POOR	The proposal addresses this criterion improperly, or there are <i>serious weaknesses</i> .
2	FAIR	The proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, but 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 <i>weaknesses/shortcomings</i> are present.
4	VERY GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>improvements are still possible</i> . A <i>small number of weaknesses / shortcomings</i> 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. The half point is allowed in the scores.
3. 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*[(s.1*30/100 + s.2*35/100 + s.3*20/100 + s.4*15/100)] where s.i is the score for criterion i.

- ✓ In anticipation of the discussion with the project director, the expert evaluators are requested to provide, within the individual evaluation form, possible questions addressed to the project director, for further clarification necessary to ensure the implementation of the project and the achievement of excellent scientific results.