



THE SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Sixth Framework Programme covers Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2002 to 2006

Integrating and Strengthening the European Research Area

Priority 6.1.ii

Sustainable Energy Systems

Research activities having an impact in the medium and longer term

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR EVALUATORS

Participating in the evaluation of proposals for Call 3

Fixed deadline call for proposals

Call identifier: FP6-2004-Energy-3

Contents

1	EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION	1
2	THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS.....	2
2.1	INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS EVALUATORS	2
2.2	COMMISSION OFFICIALS	2
2.3	INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS OBSERVERS	2
3	THE EVALUATION PROCESS (SINGLE-STAGE SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION PROCEDURE) 3	3
3.1	BEFORE THE EVALUATION.....	3
3.2	BRIEFING OF THE EVALUATORS	4
3.3	INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS.....	4
3.4	CONSENSUS.....	7
3.5	PANEL MEETING	8
3.5.1	<i>Conclusion of panel discussion for instruments without hearings – STREPs</i>	9
3.5.2	<i>Panel hearings – IPs</i>	9
3.5.3	<i>Final panel discussion for instruments with hearings – IPs</i>	10
3.6	EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESR).....	10
3.7	THE PANEL REPORT.....	11
3.8	FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION AND SELECTION	11
ANNEXES	12	12

1 Evaluation documentation

The evaluation of proposals in this Priority is based entirely on the “**Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures**”, that describe the general principles and the procedures which will be used in the evaluation of proposals.

These guidance notes do not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Sixth Framework Programme, the Call for proposals or the Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures.

These guidance notes are prepared on the basis of the above Guidelines. They describe the evaluation process in practical detail, contain the evaluation forms needed to be completed at each step of the evaluation of proposals and an indicative format for the panel report which each group of evaluators will prepare at the conclusion of their work.

For the evaluation, the expert will also need to consult **the current Priority 6.1.ii Work Programme**. The Work Programme provides a detailed description of the content of the research areas and topics, and indicates which types of instruments may be used for each. The Work Programme also contains details on the eligibility and evaluation criteria which will be applied to proposals.

Additionally, it may be necessary to refer to **Guides for Proposers** for these calls. These Guides – there is one for each of the instruments – are used by the proposers in preparing their proposals. They describe in detail the contents which are required in proposals for this call, and tell proposers how their proposals should be prepared and submitted.

These documents may be found on the specific call page for this priority.

Two different types of instrument are available to fund activities in this call:

- Integrated Projects (IP)
- Networks of Excellence (NoE)
- Specific Targeted Research Projects (STREP)
- Co-ordination Action (CA)

Complete details of these instruments’ characteristics, and their application within FP6 can be found at: <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/instruments.htm>.

Evaluation criteria and evaluation forms, and in some cases the evaluation procedures, differ according to the type of instrument. For each proposal that is evaluated, ONLY THE CRITERIA, FORMS AND PROCEDURES APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF INSTRUMENT MUST BE USED.

2 The roles and responsibilities of evaluation participants

2.1 Independent experts acting as evaluators

The evaluation and selection of proposals is carried out by the Commission with the assistance of independent experts.

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They conform to the “Code of Conduct for independent experts appointed as evaluators” which is appended to the “Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures” and must sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration prior to beginning their work. These must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

Experts may also be invited by the Commission to perform the roles of rapporteur of consensus discussions and panel chairperson or rapporteur.

2.2 Commission officials

Commission staff will organise a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the criteria applicable for this specific call, in full respect of the relevant procedures, rules and regulations. They will ensure that the process runs smoothly and fairly, that access to the information pertaining to proposals is strictly controlled and that the most efficient use possible is made of the time of all concerned.

In consensus and panel meetings Commission staff may act as moderators, seeking consensus between the independent experts, without any prejudice for or against particular proposals or the organisations involved.

The work of an evaluator is under the supervision of the Commission officials organising the evaluation.

Commission staff will not attempt to influence the opinion of the independent experts. Even if asked, they may not express any opinion to the experts on the merits or otherwise of any proposal. They may however provide additional information or assistance on request.

In organising the evaluation, the Commission is assisted by contracted support staff from the Evaluation Service Provider (ESP). They play no formal part in the evaluation process, but provide logistical support.

2.3 Independent experts acting as observers

Independent experts may be appointed as observers to examine the evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The role of the observers is to give independent advice to the Commission on the conduct, fairness and equity of the evaluation sessions, ways in which the procedures could be improved, the evaluation criteria used in the sessions and the way in which the evaluators apply these criteria. They do not express views on the proposals under examination or the evaluators’ opinions on the proposals.

They conform to the “Code of Conduct for independent observers of the evaluation process” which is appended to the “Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures”.

3 The evaluation process (single-stage submission and evaluation procedure)

The evaluation of proposals for all instruments in this call is carried out using the single-stage procedure described below.

Each evaluation session consists of a number of steps, as described in the “*Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures*” (with an accompanying flow chart), independently of whether the process involves a single stage or a two-stage procedure. Briefly, the steps are as follows:

- **Step 1: Briefing of the evaluators**
All evaluators are briefed orally or in writing before the evaluation by representatives of the Commission’s service in charge of the call, in order to inform them of the general evaluation guidelines and the objectives of the research area under consideration.
- **Step 2: Individual evaluation of proposals**
Each proposal is evaluated against the applicable criteria independently by several evaluators who fill in individual evaluation forms giving marks and providing comments.
- **Step 3: Consensus**
For each proposal a consensus report is prepared. The report faithfully reflects the views of the evaluators referred to in Step 2.
- **Step 4: Panel evaluation**
A panel discussion may be convened, if necessary, to examine and compare the consensus reports and marks in a given area, to review the proposals with respect to each other and to make recommendations on a priority order and/or on possible clustering or combination of proposals. The panel discussion may include hearings with the proposers.

3.1 Before the evaluation

On receipt by the Commission, proposals are opened, registered and acknowledged and their contents entered into a database to support the evaluation process.

Basic eligibility criteria for each proposal¹ are also checked by Commission staff before the evaluation begins and proposals which do not fulfil these criteria are excluded. In accordance with Articles 3, 8 and 10.5 of the Rules for Participation and Article 114 of the Financial Regulation of the Community, each participant may not fall under any of the exclusion criteria referred to therein. Any such exclusion criteria (e.g. legal status), may still be assessed at the negotiation stage.

Depending upon the number of proposals received, the evaluation may be carried out by a single group of evaluators or in different groups or sub-groups, split according to subject and/ or instrument type. Evaluators will be informed about the precise breakdown of any groups during the briefing session.

In organising the evaluation, Commission staff assign the proposals to research areas, as appropriate, taking into account the number of proposals received. The assignment of evaluators to research areas and the allocation of proposals to evaluators will also have been carried out, taking account of the fields of expertise of the experts. If the subject matter of a particular proposal covers more than one research area, which are all open for the same instrument, appropriate means to evaluate it fairly will be established. This may involve, for example, inviting evaluators from other groups to participate in the evaluation of the proposal or forming an ad-hoc cross-cutting group of evaluators.

¹ The Commission verifies that proposals meet the eligibility criteria referred to in the call. These criteria are rigorously applied and any proposal found to be ineligible is excluded from evaluation. The decision to exclude a proposal for failing one or more eligibility criteria is taken by the Commission. Only proposals that fulfil all of the following criteria are retained for evaluation:

- receipt of proposal by the Commission on or before the deadline date and time established in the call, if applicable.
- minimum number of participants, as referred to in the call for proposals.
- completeness of the proposal, i.e. the presence of all requested administrative forms and the proposal description.

3.2 Briefing of the evaluators

Evaluators will be provided with a briefing by Commission staff before the evaluation begins, covering the evaluation procedure, technical issues involved in the particular research area and the horizontal issues to be taken into consideration in the evaluation. The briefing sessions allow time for questions and answers concerning the evaluation.

3.3 Individual evaluation of proposals

Each proposal will first be assessed by a minimum of three to five evaluators (decided by the Commission services depending upon the type of instrument) chosen from among the pool of evaluators taking part in this evaluation. Key aspects of the assessment are described below.

Evaluation criteria and forms

The proposal will be evaluated in terms of pre-determined blocks of evaluation criteria¹, as described in the Work Programme. The Annex B to the Work Programme and/or the related Calls for proposals also give any threshold marks which will be applied to each of the criteria.

The blocks of evaluation criteria list a number of detailed issues (sub-criteria or prompting questions) which the evaluator should consider during the assessment of that block.

When examining proposals, evaluators may *only* apply the evaluation criteria that are set out in the Work Programme and shown on the evaluation forms.

At this stage the evaluators are acting individually and independently; they do not discuss the proposal with each other, nor any third party. The evaluators record their individual opinions on special forms, the Individual Assessment Report (IAR) form, giving scores and comments on the evaluation criteria, and addressing the horizontal issues as described in the Work Programme/ Call (see below). These forms detail the criteria to be used.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the Form IAR for each instrument. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the Form IAR for the proposal that they are evaluating.

There are as many IAR forms as there are evaluators of the proposal. Each evaluator must provide scores for each block of criteria and justify these via precise comments. Each evaluator will sign his/ her own form. Signature on the IAR form closes this step of the evaluation. In signing the IAR, the evaluator also declares that he/she has no conflict of interest in evaluating the proposal.

Transfer of proposals between calls

Proposals can only be transferred where they are eligible under the receiving call (e.g. submitted before the call deadline) and the receiving call is in a position to evaluate (i.e. evaluations have not already been completed). In cases where programmes cannot agree to the transfer, the proposal remains with the original programme. Transfer of proposals between instruments is not possible.

Scope of the call

If, prior to the evaluation, the Commission services suspect that a proposal may be out of the scope of the Work Programme/ Call, the supervising Commission official will inform all the evaluators of that proposal and seek their views before proceeding with the evaluation.

It is also possible that, after reading by the evaluators, a proposal is found to be only partially, or indeed not at all, within the scope of the Work Programme/ Call. It may in reality not address the research areas which it claims to address, or it may not actually be constructed appropriately for the type of instrument it claims to be.

¹ "Block of criteria" refers to the main numbered headings in the work programme annex under which several evaluation issues are grouped.

If, during the reading of a proposal, an individual evaluator suspects that a proposal may be out of the scope of the Work Programme/ Call, he must alert the supervising Commission official, who will inform all the evaluators of that proposal and seek their views before continuing with the evaluation.

If there is a consensus that at least some parts of the proposal are within the scope of the Work Programme/ Call, then the evaluation of the proposal will continue, confined however only to those parts of the proposal which are in scope, without consideration of the remaining material.

If, however, the consensus is that the whole proposal is out of scope (and hence “not relevant”), the evaluators will assign a zero score to the evaluation criterion “Relevance”. The evaluation may then be stopped.

In the case of proposals where parts are in scope for one research area and parts are in scope for another, then a co-ordinated evaluation may be arranged, as appropriate.

Proposal marking

Evaluators examine the individual issues comprising each block of evaluation criteria and mark the blocks on a six-point scale from 0 to 5. In this scheme, the scores indicate the following with respect to the block under examination:

0 -	<i>the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or can not be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information</i>
1 -	<i>poor</i>
2 -	<i>fair</i>
3 -	<i>good</i>
4 -	<i>very good</i>
5 -	<i>excellent</i>

Half marks may not be given at the Individual Assessment stage.

Evaluators may give a mark to each of the individual issues (sub-criteria) comprising the blocks of criteria. They are to help him support his eventual judgement on what score to assign to the criterion concerned when he has finished his reading, and also to remind him of issues he may wish to raise later during the discussions of the proposal. Only the marks for the blocks of criteria are taken into account for the overall score for the proposal.

A feature of the procedure as described is to allow the evaluators to reflect on the individual issues comprising the blocks of criteria. By only taking the marks for the blocks of criteria into consideration in the final evaluation of the proposals, evaluators are encouraged to “look at the bigger picture” and score the proposal against these important blocks of criteria as a whole, rather than applying a “mechanical” process of adding any marks given on individual issues.

Thresholds and weightings

For all criteria a threshold score is applied, as well as a threshold on the overall score to be achieved. Proposals which fail to achieve one or more of the threshold scores will not be considered for support.

An overall score is calculated for each proposal. For proposals in this call, all criteria will carry an equal weight, so the overall score is calculated in this case by simple addition.

Horizontal issues to be addressed

In addition to the blocks of evaluation criteria to be evaluated, the following issues also need to be addressed during the evaluation, and recommendations made if appropriate:

- **Gender** – are there any gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal and, if so, have they been adequately taken into account?

- **Ethical** and/ or **safety** aspects – have they been identified and taken into account?
- Readiness to **engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole**, to spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider **societal implications** of the work.
- The synergies with **education** at all levels.
- The justification and integration of any **third country participation** in the proposal.

The individual assessment forms include space for the evaluators' comments on these issues.

If during their reading of a proposal evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, they must flag this by using the tick box provided on the Form IAR. The issue will then be further discussed at the consensus step and, if necessary, Form EIR will be completed (see below)¹.

In general, while evaluating proposals, evaluators should bear in mind the extent of the participation in the consortium of the various actors (e.g. universities, industry and SMEs) and the balance of participation in the consortium. It should be noted that the Framework Programme particularly encourages participation by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs).

Practical guidelines for form completion

Assess and mark the proposal exactly as it is described and presented. Do not make any assumptions or interpretations about the project in addition to what the proposers themselves have written in their proposal.

- Make sure to use the correct form for the type of instrument involved.
- Keep to the evaluation criteria as stated in the forms.
- Give all required scores.
- Try to maintain consistency in your scoring throughout your work.
- Provide brief but **explicit justifications of your scores. Your comments should be concise but understandable for third persons.** Be honest but correct, in particular when scores are low – you should use polite and correct language but do not hide the facts as your remarks may be used in the report, which is sent to inform the proposers of your conclusions. It is often useful to quote short extracts from the proposal text.
- Give recommendations for modifications, if needed. These recommendations may help the negotiations with successful proposals and provide useful feedback to improve less successful proposals for any future application.
- However it should be assured that each proposal is marked on its own merits (as the proposal has been written) and not based on the assumption that the modifications are being taken into account. Recommendations are clearly oriented toward the future.
- Please write your forms clearly, so that they are readable by the Commission staff, or use the IT application provided via a PC.
- Remember to sign (and date) your forms.
- At the start of the evaluation, it is recommended that evaluators examine a number of proposals before “signing off” their first individual assessment forms. This will help to calibrate your marking.
- An example evaluation may be carried out at the start of the evaluation process to ensure that all evaluators are applying the same standards.

Conflicts of interest and confidentiality

If during the evaluation itself an evaluator discovers he/she is in some way connected with a proposal which he/she has been asked to evaluate, or has some other allegiance which impairs his/her impartiality, he/she must declare this **immediately** to the Commission official(s) supervising the evaluation, who will then take all necessary actions to remove the conflict of interest.

Nothing may be photocopied by an evaluator without specific permission from a Commission official. No documents or electronic data in any form may be taken off the evaluation premises. Phone calls to/from evaluators during the working day are strongly discouraged, and are not allowed at all in the reading and meeting rooms.

Personal laptops should not be brought onto the evaluation premises.

¹ Note that, according to the Guides for Proposers, every proposal should include a declaration on ethical issues.

Under no circumstances may an evaluator attempt to contact a proposer on his own account, either during the evaluation session or afterwards.

It may be necessary, in exceptional cases, to seek some clarification from a proposer concerning the proposal received. Any evaluator requiring some clarification of a proposal should contact the Commission official supervising the evaluation of the proposal, who will then take the necessary action.

3.4 Consensus

When all the evaluators of a particular proposal have completed their individual report forms, they may come together under the moderation of a Commission official as a “consensus group” to discuss and agree scores for the proposal. A rapporteur may be allocated to each proposal. He/ she will be responsible for recording the outcome of this discussion using the appropriate form(s).

If the IAR forms filled in by the evaluators of a proposal during the individual reading step indicate their opinions already strongly converge, the Commission official supervising the evaluation of that proposal may prepare, or ask the rapporteur to prepare, the form(s) and obtain approval of them from the others without the need for a formal meeting.

The discussion of the proposal will continue until a consensus is achieved i.e. a conclusion with which all agree regarding the marks for each criterion and the accompanying comments. Integer marks are to be awarded in general, but half marks may be used only if it is not possible to achieve consensus on an integer score. In the event of persistent disagreement, the Commission official supervising the evaluation of that proposal may bring in up to 3 additional evaluators to examine the proposal.

A Consensus Report (Form CR) will be agreed together by the evaluators of each proposal as a result of their consensus discussions. The Consensus Report provides scores and precise comments for each block of criteria as well as overall remarks highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, and, if relevant gender, safety, public outreach, education and third country participation. If consensus has not been reached, the report sets out the majority view of the evaluators, but also records any dissenting views.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the Form CR. Rapporteurs should ensure they are using the correct version of the Form CR for the proposal that is being evaluated.

From the consensus scores for each criterion given on the form CR, an overall score for the proposal will be calculated by Commission services, using the weighting scheme defined in the Work Programme.

For proposals for which a hearing step is foreseen (see below), the consensus group will also complete the section of the CR form where they propose questions to be asked during this hearing. If no hearing is foreseen for the proposal (i.e. if it is an instrument type where hearings are not used, or the proposal has fallen below one or more of the evaluation thresholds) this section of the form is left blank.

There is one CR form per proposal. It will be signed by all the evaluators of the proposal in the consensus group, or, as a minimum, by the moderator and rapporteur or another independent expert.

If one or more evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, this will be discussed by the group to decide whether or not the issues require further attention. The relevant box on Form CR will be ticked and an Ethical Issues Form (Form EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues. The Commission will decide whether to conduct an ethical review of the proposal by a specialist panel at a later date, as described in the “Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures”.

If the EIR form is used, it will be signed by all the evaluators of the proposal in the consensus group, or, as a minimum, by the moderator and rapporteur or another independent expert.

Signature of the CR, and, if needed, the EIR form(s) closes this step of the evaluation.

3.5 Panel meeting

After consensus discussions have taken place for all of the proposals within the thematic research area, the Commission may convene a panel meeting. This may be immediately after the consensus step or at a later date. The panel will comprise some or, if appropriate, all of the expert evaluators from the individual assessment step. Additional experts may also be invited to participate.

The panel's discussions will be moderated by a Commission official and may additionally be chaired by an expert appointed by the Commission and assisted by a Rapporteur.

Proposals which have fallen below one or more of the evaluation thresholds will no longer continue in evaluation. For each of these below-threshold proposals, Commission officials will generate an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), on the basis of the consensus report (CR), which the Commission services will subsequently send to the proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. These will form part of the Panel Report (see below). The panel should resolve those cases where full consensus was not achieved at the previous step. For proposals which failed to reach the threshold on one or more of the evaluation criteria, the ESR will contain scores and comments only for those criteria fully evaluated, to clarify for the proposers the reason or reasons for the proposal's failure, so that if possible in a later call they may submit an improved proposal. It is however recommended that for those proposals which have fallen below one or more thresholds, at least comments are prepared for the criteria 'Potential impact' and 'S&T excellence' to provide a minimum of feedback.

Proposals which have passed all evaluation thresholds will continue through the subsequent evaluation steps.

3.5.1 Conclusion of panel discussion for instruments without hearings – STREPs and CAs

For proposals for Specific Targeted Research Projects and Co-ordination Actions, which have passed all of the thresholds, the panel continues directly with the final discussion.

The panel will first make an overall review of the scores and opinions given by the consensus groups on each above-threshold proposal. This serves both to bring the weight of the whole panel's experience and expertise to the review of each proposal, and also to ensure that the same standard of scoring is applied to each. The panel may propose to revise scores or comments given. Any changes must be traceable and justified in writing. Any agreed changes in scoring or additional or revised comments from those originally given in the CR forms by the consensus groups will be reflected in the Evaluation Summary Reports (see below).

The Commission services will prepare lists in order of the overall score of each proposal. There will be a separate list per instrument type. These lists will be reviewed by the panel, particularly addressing the question of the ordering of any proposals which have tied scores. They will thus propose priority lists to the Commission services to consider when deciding which of the proposals to implement as projects.

The panel will then prepare the ESRs for these above-threshold proposals, which the Commission services will send out to each proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. The ESR should not contain dissenting views – the panel should resolve those cases where full consensus was not achieved at the previous step.

3.5.2 Panel hearings – IPs and NoEs

For panels evaluating Integrated Project and Networks of Excellence proposals, a set of hearings is organised for all proposals which have passed all evaluation thresholds. These hearings of proposers may be conducted with the full panel or with sub-groups from the panel selected by the Commission services. Additional experts with specific expertise may also be invited to participate by the Commission.

Proposals that have failed to reach the required thresholds will receive feedback on their failure only after the panels, with the "Quick Info" letters. As the evaluation process is only half way through, it is inappropriate to write a formal letter to these co-ordinators immediately after a hearing meeting. If any of these proposers contact the Commission for information (e.g. via the HelpDesk), we will respond simply that they have not been invited to attend a hearing and that they will hear more shortly.

For each of the above-threshold proposals, the questions agreed by the consensus group will be communicated by the Commission services to the proposal co-ordinator by letter, along with the date and time of the proposal hearing and any other practical details about the hearing itself (duration, number of participants, conduct of the hearing etc).

The discussion at the hearing is based on the proposal as it was presented at the time of submission. Proposers are not permitted to change or add to their proposal after the call deadline has passed. If material representing a change to the original proposal is presented during the hearing, the experts must disregard it.

It is not intended that the hearing will involve a re-presentation of the proposal. The hearing will focus on specific questions which the experts have identified based on their reading of the proposal, and which have been communicated in advance to the proposal co-ordinator. During the hearing the experts may also ask supplementary questions which are prompted by the proposers' answers.

Shortly before entering the hearing room, proposers will be informed of the names of the persons that constitute the hearing panel. If the proposers consider that there may exist a potential conflict of interest with respect to any panel member, they should inform the Commission official organising the hearing, who will investigate the matter and then take any necessary actions to remove the conflict of interest, if it is found to exist.

Hearings provide input to clarify further the proposals and to help the panel to establish their final rating and marks for the proposals. They are intended to improve the understanding of the evaluators of the proposal but not to modify or improve in any way the proposal itself. The outcome of the hearing is recorded in a Hearing Report (Form HR), which provides recommendations to the panel on proposed changes to the marks and comments on a proposal given in the consensus report (CR).

There is one HR form per above-threshold proposal. It will be signed by all the evaluators of the proposal at the hearing, or, as a minimum, by the moderator and rapporteur or another independent expert.

No further material or explanations from the proposers will be taken into consideration after the end of the hearing.

3.5.3 Final panel discussion for instruments with hearings – IPs and NoEs

Following the hearings, the panel will make an overall review of the scores and opinions on each proposal given by the consensus groups (CR forms), taking account of the reports of the hearings (HR forms). This serves both to bring the weight of the whole panel's experience and expertise to the review of each proposal, and also to ensure that the same standard of scoring is applied to each. The panel may propose to revise scores or comments given. Any agreed changes in scoring or additional or revised comments from those originally given in the CR and HR forms will be reflected in the Evaluation Summary Reports (see below).

If a consortium does not attend the hearing, but replies in written form to the questions which they were sent, their written responses will be taken into account. If a consortium both fails to reply to the questions and also to attend their hearing, the panel will nevertheless come to a final score and comments for the proposal, on the basis of the originally submitted material only.

The Commission services will prepare lists in order of the overall score of each proposal. There will be a separate list per instrument type. These lists will be reviewed by the panel, particularly addressing the question of the ordering of any proposals which have tied scores. They will thus propose priority lists to the Commission services to consider when deciding which of the proposals to implement as projects.

For these above-threshold proposals the panel will then prepare the individual Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs), which the Commission services will send out to each proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. The ESR should not contain dissenting views – the panel should resolve those cases where full consensus was not achieved at the previous step.

3.6 Evaluation Summary Reports (ESR)

The Evaluation Summary Report is the document which is returned to the proposal co-ordinator to give an account of the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. This represents the advice of the evaluators to the Commission, which the Commission will take into account in the final selection of projects for negotiation.

An ESR is sent for all proposals evaluated. Co-ordinators of proposals which failed one or more eligibility criteria, and which were therefore not evaluated, receive a letter from the Commission informing them of the reasons for exclusion on eligibility grounds, rather than an ESR.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the ESR. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the ESR for each proposal.

The ESR is based on the scores and conclusions initially reached in the consensus report (Form CR), supported by any relevant information from the Forms EIR and HR, if used, and then, in the case of above-threshold proposals, reviewed and discussed by the whole panel. Thus, for above-threshold proposals, the scores and conclusions expressed on the ESR represent the combined wisdom of all evaluators. If no amendments are made, the content of the ESR will be the same as that of the Consensus Report (CR). In addition, in those cases where a consensus group in fact failed to reach a consensus and

ended only with a majority view, the panel will come to a clear conclusion without contradictory majority/ minority views, which can be conveyed to the proposers in the ESR.

For proposals which failed to reach the threshold on one or more of the evaluation criteria, the ESR will contain scores and comments only for those criteria fully evaluated, to clarify for the proposers the reason or reasons for the proposal's failure, so that if possible in a later call they may submit an improved proposal. It is however recommended that for those proposals which have fallen below one or more thresholds, at least comments are prepared for the criteria 'Potential impact' and 'S&T excellence' to provide a minimum of feedback. The ESR will only contain an overall score and overall comment if the evaluation was not stopped due to a threshold failure.

For proposals which passed the thresholds on the evaluation criteria, but failed the threshold on the overall score (if one was applied), the ESR will contain scores and comments for all of the criteria, as well as an overall score and overall comment.

For proposals which have passed the evaluation thresholds, all sections of the ESR will be completed. Evaluators should ensure that the comments contain any recommendations which they wish to have taken into account during any possible contract negotiations. These recommendations should be as clear and specific as possible.

There is one ESR per proposal. They form part of the Panel Report and are signed off at the same time as that document.

3.7 The Panel report

Each panel will conclude its work by preparing a panel report, written to a pre-determined structure, which will summarise their activities and conclusions. An indicative panel report format is shown as an annex to this document. The precise format of the report to be drafted for this Call will be notified to the experts at the appropriate time. The report will be signed, as a minimum, by three persons, which may be the Panel rapporteur, the Panel chairperson or other panel members. The ESRs for all of the proposals considered by the panel will be appended to the report.

3.8 Finalisation of the evaluation and selection

At this stage, the Commission services review the results from the evaluators, make their assessment of the proposals based on the advice from the evaluators and prepare the final evaluation results according to the provisions described in the "Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures".

Annexes

Annex I: Indicative content of a panel report

Annex II: Ethical Issues Form - EIR (all instruments)

Annex III: Evaluation Forms for Integrated Projects

- Individual assessment report IAR – Integrated projects
- Consensus report CR - Integrated projects
- Hearing report HR - Integrated projects
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Integrated projects

Annex IV: Evaluation Forms for Networks of excellence

- Individual assessment report IAR – Networks of excellence
- Consensus report CR - Networks of excellence
- Hearing report HR - Networks of excellence
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Networks of excellence

Annex V: Evaluation Forms for Specific targeted research projects

- Individual assessment form IAR – Specific targeted research projects
- Consensus form CR - Specific targeted research projects
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Specific targeted research projects

Annex VI: Evaluation Forms for Co-ordination actions

- Individual assessment form IAR – Co-ordination actions
- Consensus form CR - Co-ordination actions
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Co-ordination actions

Annex I:
Indicative content of
a panel report

Indicative panel report format

If a single panel covered the whole thematic research area

Report of evaluation panel

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This panel report covers the following aspects of the call ...

Every panel must follow the official procedures given in the “Guidelines for proposal evaluation and selection procedures”, therefore the methods of the panel need not be described in detail, unless some specific elements of the standard procedure have had a significant effect on the outcome of the Panel.

The following table gives an overview of proposals dealt with by the panel.

Total proposals in panel	Ineligible	Failed threshold(s)	Proposals above threshold

2. ANALYSIS OF RECEIVED PROPOSALS

Overview of the issues covered by the received proposals, proposal quality, important omissions or areas not covered.....

3. PROPOSAL PRIORITY

The Panel recommends that a decision of the Commission on funding of proposals be based on the priority as given in the following table(s):

(Separate tables and comments per instrument type: for the NOE table the column “Total cost proposed” is empty)

Priority	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed (K€)	Grant requested (K€)	Other countries involved*	Ethical Issues Identified (Y/N)
1							
2							
3							

*(*Countries outside of the EU and Associated States)*

Individual short comments per prioritised proposal, explaining their relevance and any considerations of the panel leading to the priority list given above.

- *Pay particular attention to the reasons for the choice of priority given here to proposals which have tied scores.*
- *For proposals involving organisations from “other countries”, comment on the significance of their participation to the project.*
- *Highlight any issues of SME participation, if relevant.*
- *Identify proposals requiring special attention due to either the importance of ethical issues raised or the inadequacy of the way ethical issues are addressed.*

4. KEY ISSUES

a) Clustering/merging/overlapping of priority proposals

Any suggestions concerning proposals to be implemented together as a cluster; to be negotiated together as a merged project; which overlap in activity and where therefore one is first choice and one is “backup”

b) Comments on coverage

Comments concerning the relevance/coverage of the proposals which have reached the priority list, in

terms of the technical area to be covered by this panel.

c) Recommendations for future calls

Recommendations/corrective action in future calls e.g. future need to target particular technical areas, instrument types, types of organisation, SMEs, countries....

5. BELOW THRESHOLD/INELIGIBLE PROPOSALS

The following table provides the list of proposals which have not been prioritised due to exclusion on eligibility grounds or the score of at least one of the criteria falling below threshold, or the proposal falling below the overall threshold..)

(Separate tables per instrument type)

Proposal no.	Acronym	Failing

ANNEX – Evaluation Summary Reports

Attach proposal Evaluation Summary Reports for all proposals received for the call in alphabetical order by acronym.

If several panels covered the thematic research area:
--

Report of evaluation panel

1. INTRODUCTION

The Call (...), published on (...) invited proposals for IPs, NoEs, STREPs and CAs. This Evaluation Report presents in this section a short description of the evaluation procedure followed, a general analysis of the response to the call, as well as general conclusions that could be drawn. There then follows the individual reports of the various panels which participated in the evaluation of proposals for this thematic research area.

2. RESPONSE TO THE CALL

A total of XXX proposals have been received for this thematic research area. They were evaluated in a number of panels. The panels were defined in terms of instrument type/ elements of the thematic research area.

The proposals were distributed to the panels as follows:

Panel name	No. of proposals

A total of XXX proposals were excluded on eligibility grounds (late submissions, incomplete proposals, insufficient participation). Following evaluation by the independent experts, XXX proposals were eligible and achieved scores on all criteria above the thresholds. These proposals were listed in priority order by each panel.

3. REMARKS ON THE PRIORITISATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals for each type of instrument were evaluated in a separate panel, therefore the priority list given in each Panel report represents the final outcome of the evaluation process.

(or)

Proposals for *(name instrument type)* were evaluated in more than one panel, however each panel represents a distinct technical area to be treated separately within the Strategic objective, therefore the priority lists for *(name instrument type)* from each panel are not merged, the list given in the individual Panel reports represent the final outcome of the evaluation process

(or)

Due to the number of proposals received, proposals for *(name instrument type)* were evaluated in more than one panel. Following the prioritisation process within each of these panels, the following merged priority list has been generated.

(for a NOE table the column "Total cost proposed" is empty)

Prior-ity	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed (K€)	Grant requested (K€)	Other countries involved*
1						
2						
3						
4						

*(*Countries outside of the EU and Associated States)*

In addition it should be noted that.....

If priority lists in different instrument panels now generate an overlap (e.g. a prioritised STREP proposal in one panel covering work already comprised in a prioritised IP in another panel), provide recommendations for handling.

4. COMMENTS ON COVERAGE

Highlight main issues raised in Panel reports section 4b) "Comments on coverage"

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CALLS

Highlight main issues raised in Panel reports section 4c) "Recommendations for future calls"

ANNEX 1 – Panel reports

Reports of each panel in the Strategic objective.

ANNEX 2 – Evaluation Summary Reports

Attach proposal Evaluation Summary Reports for the Strategic objective in alphabetical order by acronym.

Annex II:
Ethical Issues Report EIR
(all instruments)

Priority 6.1.ii**EIR****Ethical issues report form**
All instrument types

Proposal number:
 Proposal acronym:
 Type of instrument:

Ethical issues – *(List the ethical issues and comment)*

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator's signature _____

Date _____

Rapporteur's signature _____

**Annex III:
Evaluation Forms
for
Integrated Projects**

Individual Assessment Form for an Integrated Project

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

I. Evaluation summary

Please carry out the detailed evaluation on the following pages and then summarise your results here. Scores for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the proposers.

Criterion	Threshold	Mark	Criterion	Threshold	Mark
1. Relevance	3		4. Quality of the consortium	3	
2. Potential impact	3		5. Quality of the management	3	
3. S&T excellence	4		6. Mobilisation of resources	3	
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 30)					
<i>Note : the threshold is 24:</i>					

II. Recommendation

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall comments (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant</i>):		
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Specific questions to be asked to proposers at a hearing (<i>if all thresholds passed</i>):		

III. Declaration

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Criterion 1. RELEVANCE

1.1 The extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme.		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	⇒	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 2. POTENTIAL IMPACT

2.1 The extent to which the proposed project is suitably ambitious in terms of its strategic impact on reinforcing competitiveness (including that of SMEs) or on solving societal problems.		
		<input type="text"/>
2.2 The extent to which the innovation-related activities and exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results.		
		<input type="text"/>
2.3 The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).		
		<input type="text"/>
Overall comments for this criterion		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	⇒	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 3. S&T EXCELLENCE

3.1 The extent to which the project has clearly defined objectives.

3.2 The extent to which the objectives represent clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art.


3.3 The extent to which the proposed S&T approach is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 4



Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

4.1 The extent to which the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality.	<input type="text"/>	
4.2 The extent to which the participants are well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them.	<input type="text"/>	
4.3 The extent to which there is good complementarity between participants.	<input type="text"/>	
4.4 The extent to which the profiles of the participants, including those to be included later, have been clearly described.	<input type="text"/>	
4.5 The extent to which the real involvement of SMEs has been adequately addressed.	<input type="text"/>	
Overall comments for this criterion		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>		<input type="text"/>

Criterion 5. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT

5.1 The extent to which the organisational structure is well matched to the complexity of the project and to the degree of integration required.

5.2 The extent to which the project management is demonstrably of high quality.

5.3 The extent to which there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



Criterion 6. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

6.1 The extent to which the project mobilises the minimum critical mass of resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) necessary for success.

6.2 The extent to which the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project.

6.3 The extent to which the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



HORIZONTAL ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED (but not marked): *provide comments and recommendations, where appropriate*

Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal? If so, have they been adequately taken into account?
Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If “no”, which ethical and/ or safety issues have not been identified?
To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

Consensus Report for an Integrated Project

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.:
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		
1. Relevance		
2. Potential impact		
3. S&T excellence		
4. Quality of the consortium		
5. Quality of the management		
6. Mobilisation of resources		
<p>Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant. Include comments on the horizontal issues addressed in the evaluation i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education, third country participation</i>):</p>		

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? *If yes, fill in Form EIR* Yes No

Specific questions to be asked to proposers at a hearing *(if all thresholds passed)*:

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?

NO

YES

Evaluator names	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Score
	Weight & (Threshold)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Marks (out of 5)						
Date :	Initial averages:							
	Consensus marks:							
Moderator signature :								
Rapporteur signature :								

Hearing Report for an Integrated Project

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
-----------------------	------------------

General comments on the outcome of the hearing *(particularly as regards the answers provided by the consortium to the questions notified to them)*

Recommendations for changes to the marks awarded on the Consensus Report *(with reasons)*

Recommendations for changes to the comments made on the Consensus Report *(with reasons)*

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator's signature _____

Date _____

Rapporteur's signature _____

Evaluation Summary Report for an Integrated Project

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
6. Mobilisation of resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 24/30</i>)	Total score:	
Recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources (if all thresholds passed)		
Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO	YES
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES

Annex IV:
Evaluation Forms
for
Networks of Excellence

Individual Assessment Form for a Network of Excellence

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

I. Evaluation summary

Please carry out the detailed evaluation on the following pages and then summarise your results here. Scores for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the proposers.

Criterion	Threshold	Mark	Criterion	Threshold	Mark
1. Relevance	3		4. Degree of integration and the JPA	4	
2. Potential impact	3		5. Organisation and management	3	
3. Excellence of the participants	3				
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 25)					
<i>Note : the threshold is 20:</i>					

II. Recommendation

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds ?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------	------------------------------

Overall comments (*highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant*):


Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? Yes No

Specific questions to be asked to proposers at a hearing (*if all thresholds passed*):


III. Declaration

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Overall comments for this criterion	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	 <input type="text"/>

Criterion 3. EXCELLENCE OF THE PARTICIPANTS

3.1 the extent to which the participants are currently conducting excellent research relevant to the topic of the network or are capable of important contributions to the joint programme of activities..	<input type="text"/>
3.2 The extent to which the participants are well suited to the tasks assigned to them..	<input type="text"/>
3.3 The extent to which the collectively have the necessary critical mass of expertise and resources to carry out the joint programme of activities successfully.	<input type="text"/>
Overall comments for this criterion	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	 <input type="text"/>

Criterion 4. DEGREE OF INTEGRATION AND THE JPA

4.1 The extent to which the expected degree of integration justifies supporting the proposal as a network of excellence.

4.2 The extent to which the joint programme of activities is sufficiently well designed to achieve the expected degree of integration.

4.3 The extent to which the participating organisations have made a convincing commitment towards a deep and durable integration beyond the period of Community support.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 4



Criterion 5. ORGANISATION AND MANAGEMENT

5.1 The extent to which the organisational structure of the network provides a secure framework for any necessary structural decisions to be taken.

5.2 The extent to which the management of the network is demonstrably of high quality.

5.3 The extent to which there is a well-considered plan for promoting gender equality in the network.

<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>		
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i></p>		

HORIZONTAL ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED (but not marked):

<p>Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal? If so, have they been adequately taken into account?</p>
<p>Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If "no", which ethical and/ or safety issues have not been identified?</p>
<p>To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?</p>
<p>Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?</p>
<p>If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?</p>

Consensus Report for a Network of Excellence

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.:
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

<p>1. Relevance</p>
<p>2. Potential impact</p>
<p>3. Excellence of the participants</p>
<p>4. Degree of integration and the JPA</p>
<p>5. Organisation and management</p>
<p>Overall remarks <i>(highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant. Include comments on the horizontal issues addressed in the evaluation i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education)</i></p>

Hearing Report for a Network of Excellence

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
----------------	-----------

General comments on the outcome of the hearing *(particularly as regards the answers provided by the consortium to the questions notified to them)*

Recommendations for changes to the marks awarded on the Consensus Report *(with reasons)*

Recommendations for changes to the comments made on the Consensus Report *(with reasons)*

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator's signature _____

Date _____

Rapporteur's signature _____

Evaluation Summary Report for a Network of Excellence

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Excellence of the participants (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Degree of integration and the JPA (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Organisation and management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 20/25</i>)	Total score:
Recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources (if all thresholds passed):	

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO	YES
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES

Annex V:
Evaluation Forms
for
STREPS

Individual Assessment Form for a STREP

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

I. Evaluation summary

Please carry out the detailed evaluation on the following pages and then summarise your results here. Scores for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the proposers.

Criterion	Threshold	Mark	Criterion	Threshold	Mark
1. Relevance	3		4. Quality of the consortium	3	
2. S&T excellence	4		5. Quality of the management	3	
3. Potential impact	3		6. Mobilisation of resources	3	
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 30)					
<i>Note : the threshold is 21:</i>					

II. Recommendation

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds ?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall comments (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant</i>):		
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

III. Declaration

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Criterion 3. POTENTIAL IMPACT

3.1 The extent to which the proposed project is likely to have an impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal problems.

3.2. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).

3.3 The extent to which exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

4.1 The extent to which the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality.

4.2 The extent to which the participants are well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them.

4.3 The extent to which there is good complementarity between participants.

4.4 The extent to which the opportunity of involving SMEs has been adequately addressed.

Criterion 6. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

6.1 The extent to which the project foresees the resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) necessary for success.

6.2 The extent to which the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project.

6.3 The extent to which the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



HORIZONTAL ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED (but not marked):

Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal? If so, have they been adequately taken into account?
Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If “no”, which ethical and/ or safety issues have not been identified?
To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

Consensus Report for a STREP

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.:
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

1. Relevance
2. S&T excellence
3. Potential impact
4. Quality of the consortium
5. Quality of the management
6. Mobilisation of resources
<p>Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant. Include comments on the horizontal issues addressed in the evaluation i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education, third country participation</i>)</p>

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? If yes, fill in Form EIR Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
--

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO	YES
--	-----------	------------

FORM CR – Consensus: STREP

Evaluator names	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Score
	Weight & (Threshold)	1 (3)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Marks (out of 5)						
Date :	Initial averages:							
	Consensus marks:							
Moderator signature :								
Rapporteur signature :								

Evaluation Summary Report for a STREP

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:
Recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources (if all thresholds passed):	

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO	YES
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES

Annex VI:
Evaluation Forms
for
Co-ordination Actions

Individual Assessment Form for a Coordination action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	Group No.
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		

I. Evaluation summary

Please carry out the detailed evaluation on the following pages and then summarise your results here. Scores for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the proposers.

Criterion	Threshold	Mark	Criterion	Threshold	Mark
1. Relevance	3		4. Quality of the consortium	3	
2. Quality of the co-ordination	4		5. Quality of the management	3	
3. Potential impact	3		6. Mobilisation of resources	3	
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 30)					
<i>Note : the threshold is 21:</i>					

II. Recommendation

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds ?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Overall comments <i>(highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources, if relevant):</i>		
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		

III. Declaration

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

Name:	Signature:	Date:
-------	------------	-------

Criterion 1. RELEVANCE

1.1 The extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme/ call.		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	➡	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 2. QUALITY OF THE CO-ORDINATION

2.1 The extent to which the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of demonstrably high quality.		
		<input type="text"/>
2.2 The extent to which the coordination mechanisms proposed are sufficiently robust for ensuring the goals of the action		
		<input type="text"/>
Overall comments for this criterion		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 4</i>	➡	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 3. POTENTIAL IMPACT

3.1 The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).

3.2 The extent to which the Community support would have a real impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome.

3.3 The extent to which the project mobilises a critical mass of resources in Europe?

3.4. The extent to which the exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the project

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

4.1 The extent to which the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality.	<input type="text"/>
4.2 The extent to which the participants are well suited to the tasks assigned to them.	<input type="text"/>
4.3 The extent to which the project combines the complementary expertise of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes.	<input type="text"/>
Overall comments for this criterion	
<hr/>	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 5. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT

5.1 The extent to which the project management is demonstrably of high quality.	<input type="text"/>
5.2 The extent to which there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities.	<input type="text"/>
Overall comments for this criterion	
<hr/>	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 6. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

6.1 The extent to which the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial ...) necessary for success.

6.2 The extent to which the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project.

6.3 The extent to which the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.

Overall comments for this criterion

Overall mark (out of 5)
Note : the threshold is 3



HORIZONTAL ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED (but not marked):

Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal? If so, have they been adequately taken into account?
Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> If “no”, which ethical and/ or safety issues have not been identified?
To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

FORM CR – Consensus: Coordination Action

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? If yes, fill in Form EIR Yes No

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?

NO

YES

Evaluator names	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Score
	Weight & (Threshold)	1 (3)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Marks (out of 5)						
Date :	Initial averages:							
	Consensus marks:							
Moderator signature :								
Rapporteur signature :								

0= Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very good; 5= Excellent (Half marks may be given)

Evaluation Summary Report for a Coordination action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Quality of the co-ordination (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:
Recommendations for project negotiation, including recommended levels of resources (if all thresholds passed):	

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO	YES
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES