



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

FP6 Priority 4

Aeronautics and Space

FP6 Priority 6.1

Sustainable Energy Systems

Research activities having an impact in the short and medium term

FP6 Priority 6.2

Sustainable Surface Transport

Research to support the European Transport Policy

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR EVALUATORS

Participating in evaluation of proposals for Call TREN-3

Fixed deadline call for proposals

Call identifier: FP6-2004-TREN-3

Contents

1	EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION	1
2	THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS	1
2.1	INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS EVALUATORS	1
2.2	COMMISSION OFFICIALS	2
2.3	INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS OBSERVERS	2
3	THE EVALUATION PROCESS (SINGLE-STAGE SUBMISSION)	2
3.1	BEFORE THE EVALUATION	3
3.2	BRIEFING OF THE EVALUATORS	3
3.3	INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	3
3.4	CONSENSUS	6
3.5	PANEL MEETING	7
3.5.1	<i>Conclusion of panel discussion without hearings</i>	8
3.6	EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESR)	8
3.7	THE PANEL REPORT	9
3.8	FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION AND SELECTION	9
	ANNEXES	10

1 Evaluation documentation

The evaluation of proposals in this Priority is based entirely on the “**Guidelines on 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 on 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 and contain the evaluation forms.

For the evaluation, the expert will also need to consult **the current Work Programme for the research area to which you are invited for the evaluation, i.e. the related research topics in Priority 4, 6.1 or 6.2**. The Work Programme provides a detailed description of the content of the research 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 **the Guides for Proposers**. These Guides – there is one for each of the instruments used in Priorities 4, 6.1 and 6.2 – are used by the proposers in preparing their proposals. They describe in detail the contents which are required in proposals for the TREN-3 Call in the different research areas, and tell proposers how their proposals should be prepared and submitted.

These documents may be found on the specific call page for these priorities:

http://fp6.cordis.lu/fp6/call_details.cfm?CALL_ID=75

Four different types of instrument are available to fund activities in Priorities 4, 6.1 and 6.2:

- Integrated Projects (IP)
- Specific Targeted Research Projects (STREP)
- Co-ordination Actions (CA)
- Specific Support Actions (SSA)

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.

Independent experts 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 on 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 on proposal evaluation and selection procedures".

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

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

Each evaluation session consists of a number of steps, as described in the "*Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures*" (with an accompanying flow chart). Briefly, the steps are as follows:

- **Step 1: Briefing of the evaluators**
All independent experts 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.

After the evaluation of proposals by independent experts, the Commission services review the results of the evaluation by independent experts, make their assessment of the proposals based on the advice from these experts and prepare the final evaluation results. These include (a) final list(s) ranked, if appropriate, in priority order of all the proposals evaluated and which pass the required thresholds, (a) reserve list(s), and (a) list(s) of proposals to be rejected.

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 independent experts 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 topic 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.

3.2 Briefing of the evaluators

Evaluators will be provided with briefings by Commission staff before the evaluation begins, covering the evaluation procedure, technical issues involved in the particular research topics 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 (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.

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

Evaluation criteria and forms

The proposal will be evaluated in terms of pre-determined blocks of evaluation criteria², 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 topics which it claims to address, or it may not actually be constructed appropriately for the type of instrument it claims to be.

If, during the reading of a proposal, an individual expert suspects that a proposal may be out of the scope of the Work programme/ Call, he/she must alert the supervising Commission official. The Commission official 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 Call, then the evaluation of the proposal will continue.

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”.

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

² “Block of criteria” refers to the main numbered headings in the work programme annex under which several evaluation issues are grouped.

Proposal marking

The independent experts 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; they may be given at the consensus 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 larger 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 call TREN-3 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 level.
- 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 independent experts 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)³.

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, SMEs, users) and the balance of

³ Note that, according to the Guides for Proposers, every proposal should include a declaration on ethical issues.

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.

Under no circumstance 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 will 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. 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, if relevant i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education, 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.

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.

In cases where can not easily be achieved a clear and full consensus there is an additional form for taking fuller notes of the consensus meeting: the Consensus meeting minute form CM. This form CM will show how the conclusions developed, and on what considerations the consensus was finally based and it is useful for giving an account of the minority view(s).

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 on 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, including, if needed, CM form and/or the EIR form(s), closes this step of the evaluation.

3.5 Panel meeting

In research areas with low numbers of proposals received, the evaluators will carry out their final examination of all the proposals submitted at the same time as they prepare the consensus reports. Their advice to the Commission will be completed at this step. Further panel meetings will not be convened.

In other areas: after consensus discussions have taken place for all of the proposals within one 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 assisted by a Rapporteur.

The panel will first make an overall review of the scores and opinions on each proposal given by the consensus groups. 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 proposed changes in scoring or additional or revised comments from those originally given in the CR forms by the consensus groups will be discussed.

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 independent experts' 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 for all criteria to clarify for the proposers the reason or reasons for the proposal's failure.

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

3.5.1 Conclusion of panel discussion

The Commission services will prepare lists in order of the overall score of each proposal for each research area. 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.

3.6 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 Consensus meeting minutes and Forms EIR and HR, if used, and then reviewed and discussed by the whole panel. Thus 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 can 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.

Where no specific panel meetings were held, the ESR is based on the scores and conclusions reached in the consensus report (Form CR), together with any amendments agreed subsequently by the evaluators. [If no amendments are made, the content of the ESR will be the same as that of the Consensus Report (CR).] In those cases where a consensus group in fact failed to reach a consensus and ended only with a majority view, every effort will be made to 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.

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.

If there are a number of sub-panels within a single [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic], the sub-panels will make individual reports in the standard format, which will then be grouped together with an introductory overview section. The overview section is written by members of the sub-panels who are delegated to the task by the Commission official. This overview section will be signed, as a minimum, by three persons, which may be the sub-panel rapporteur, the sub-panel chairperson or other sub-panel members.

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 on proposal evaluation and selection procedures".

In this context they examine the evaluation results regarding above threshold proposals and on this basis decide on the final ranking for each of the tasks, taking into account further elements such as budget limitation, Work Programme coverage and prioritisation between tasks (e.g. where the need arises).

Annexes

Annex I: Forms Ethical issues EIR and (optional) Consensus meeting minute CM (all instruments)

Annex II: Evaluation Forms for Integrated Projects

- Individual Assessment Report IAR – Integrated projects
- Consensus Report CR - Integrated projects
- Evaluation Summary Report ESR - Integrated projects

Annex III: Evaluation Forms for Specific targeted research projects

- Individual Assessment Report IAR – Specific targeted research projects
- Consensus Report CR - Specific targeted research projects
- Evaluation Summary Report ESR - Specific targeted research projects

Annex IV: Evaluation Forms for Coordination actions

- Individual assessment Report IAR – Coordination actions
- Consensus Report CR - Coordination actions
- Evaluation Summary Report ESR - Coordination actions

Annex V: Evaluation Forms for Specific support actions

- Individual assessment Report IAR – Specific support actions
 - Consensus Report CR - Specific support actions
- Evaluation Summary Report ESR - Specific support actions

Annex VI: Indicative content of a panel report

Annex I :

Forms Ethical Issues Report EIR

and

(OPTIONAL)

Consensus Meeting Minute CM (all instruments)

X priority

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 _____

X priority

CM

Consensus meeting minute
All instrument types

Proposal number
Proposal acronym
Type of instrument

Describe how the decisions regarding the evaluation results were reached. Always provide comments if the consolidated evaluation differs significantly from the individual scores on given criteria and/or if scores have moved above or below thresholds. Record any dissenting views

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator's signature _____

Date _____

Rapporteur's signature _____

Annex II :
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	Mark	Score	Criterion	Mark	Score
1. Relevance			4. Quality of the consortium		
2. Potential impact			5. Quality of the management		
3. S&T excellence			6. Mobilisation of resources		
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 (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:
-------	------------	-------

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 style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" 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.		
		<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">(optional mark)*</div>
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.		
		<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">(optional mark)*</div>
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).		
		<div style="border: 1px dashed black; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">(optional mark)*</div>
Overall comments for this criterion		
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>		<input style="width: 50px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>


0=Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent

* Box and marking are optional – delete if not required.

Criterion 3. S&T EXCELLENCE

<p>3.1 The extent to which the project has clearly defined objectives.</p>		
<p>3.2 The extent to which the objectives represent clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>		
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 4</i></p>		<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

<p>4.1 The extent to which the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality.</p>		
<p>4.2 The extent to which the participants are well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them.</p>		
<p>4.3 The extent to which there is good complementarity between participants.</p>		
<p>4.4 The extent to which the profiles of the participants, including those to be included later, have been clearly described.</p>		
<p>4.5 The extent to which the real involvement of SMEs has been adequately addressed.</p>		
<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>		
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i></p>		<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" 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, 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): *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?

(OPTIONAL)

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 the resources		
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>		

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 (3)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Non-weighted 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 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 the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:	
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 24/30</i>)	Total score:	
<p>[Recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources] (if all thresholds passed):] [(Alternative text for 1st stage of a 2-stage submission) Recommendations for 2nd stage submission (if all thresholds passed):]</p>		
Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

0=Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent

II. Recommendation


Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds ?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
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 (if recommended):]		

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) Note : the threshold is 3	 <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Criterion 2. S&T EXCELLENCE

3.1 The extent to which the project has clearly defined and well focused 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	 <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

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.	
	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text" value="(optional mark)*"/>
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).	
	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text" value="(optional mark)*"/>
3. 3 The extent to which exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results.	
	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text" value="(optional mark)*"/>

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

Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

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

Criterion 5. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT

5.1 The extent to which the project management is demonstrably of high quality.		
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.		
Overall comments for this criterion		
Overall mark (out of 5) Note : the threshold is 3	➔	<input type="text"/>

Criterion 6. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

<p>6.1 The extent to which the project foresees the resources (personnel, equipment, financial, ...) necessary for success.</p>
<p>6.2 The extent to which the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project.</p>
<p>6.3 The extent to which the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.</p>
<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i></p>
<p>→ <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p>

0=Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent

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"/></p> <p>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>

(OPTIONAL)

<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 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 the resources		
Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources], if relevant i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education [, third country participation]</i>):		

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	Non-weighted 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 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):]

[(Alternative text for 1st stage of a 2-stage submission) Recommendations for 2nd stage submission (if all thresholds passed):]

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>

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

Annex VI:
Evaluation Forms
for
Coordination 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	Mark	Score	Criterion	Mark	Score
1. Relevance			4. Quality of the consortium		
2. Quality of the coordination			5. Quality of the management		
3. Potential impact			6. Mobilisation of resources		
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 30)					
<i>Note : the threshold is 21:</i>					

0=Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent

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 (if recommended):]		

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 style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

Criterion 2. QUALITY OF THE COORDINATION

2.1 The extent to which the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of demonstrably high quality.	
2.2 The extent to which the coordination mechanisms proposed are sufficiently robust for of the action.	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> (optional mark)*
Overall comments for this criterion	<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/> (optional mark)*
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 4</i>	 <input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" 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.	

<p>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.</p>		
<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>		
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i></p>		<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

** Box and marking are optional – delete if not required.*

Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE CONSORTIUM

<p>4.1 The extent to which the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality.</p>		
<p>4.2 The extent to which the participants are well suited to the tasks assigned to them.</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Overall comments for this criterion</p>		
<p>Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i></p>		<input style="width: 100px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>

0= Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very good; 5= Excellent

Criterion 5. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT

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

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.

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 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



0=Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1=Poor; 2=Fair; 3=Good; 4=Very good; 5=Excellent

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?
(OPTIONAL)
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 Coordination action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	[Group No.]
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		
1. Relevance		
2. Quality of the coordination		
3. Potential impact		
4. Quality of the consortium		
5. Quality of the management		
6. Mobilisation of the resources		
<p>Overall remarks <i>(highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources], if relevant i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education[, third country participation])</i>:-</p>		

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

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

[

Recommended for consideration

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	Non-weighted 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 coordination (<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:
<p>[Recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources] (if all thresholds passed):] [(Alternative text for 1st stage of a 2-stage submission) Recommendations for 2nd stage submission (if all thresholds passed):]</p>	

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>

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

Annex VII:
Evaluation Forms
for
Specific support actions

Individual Assessment Form for a Specific support 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	Mark	Weight	Score	Criterion	Mark	Weight	Score
1. Relevance		1		4. Quality of the management		1	
2. Quality of the support action		1		5. Mobilisation of resources		1	
3. Potential impact		1					
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 25)							
<i>Note : the threshold is 17.5:</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 recommended):]

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 proposal addresses key issues to defined in the programme/call, specific programmes or ERA, as appropriate.

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



Criterion 2. QUALITY OF THE SUPPORT ACTION

3.1 The extent to which the proposed objectives are sound and the proposed approach, methodology and work plan are sufficiently high quality for achieving the objectives.

3.2 The extent to which the applicant(s) represent(s) a high level of competence in terms of professional qualifications and/or experience.


3.3 The extent to which the proposed activities innovative and original (*if applicable*).

Overall comments for this criterion

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




Criterion 3. POTENTIAL IMPACT


3.1 The extent to which the impact of the proposed work can only be achieved if carried out at European level.	
3.2 The extent to which the Community support would have a substantial impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome.	
3.3. 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) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	 <input data-bbox="1273 878 1469 936" type="text"/>

* Box and marking are optional – delete if not required

Criterion 4. QUALITY OF THE MANAGEMENT

4.1 The extent to which the management structure is credible in terms of professional qualifications, experience, track record and capacity to deliver.	
Overall comments for this criterion	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	 <input data-bbox="1273 1393 1469 1451" type="text"/>

Criterion 5. MOBILISATION OF RESOURCES

5.1 The extent to which the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial ...) necessary for success.	
5.2 The extent to which the overall financial plan for the project is adequate.	
Overall comments for this criterion	
Overall mark (out of 5) <i>Note : the threshold is 3</i>	 <input data-bbox="1273 2016 1469 2074" type="text"/>

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** **No**

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?

--

(OPTIONAL)

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 Specific support action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :	[Group No.:]
Research area(s)/ topic(s) :		
1. Relevance		
2. Quality of support action		
3. Potential impact		
4. Quality of the management		
5. Mobilisation of the resources		
Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources], if relevant</i>) i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education [, third country participation]):		

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

Recommended for consideration

NO

YES

Evaluator names	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	Total Score
	Weight & (Threshold)	1 (4)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	1 (3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Non-weighted 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 Specific support action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Quality of the support action (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 17.5/25</i>)	Total score:
<p>[Recommendations for project negotiation, [including recommended levels of resources] (if all thresholds passed):] [(Alternative text for 1st stage of a 2-stage submission) Recommendations for 2nd stage submission (if all thresholds passed):]</p>	

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>

Annex VI:
Indicative content of
a panel report

Indicative panel report format

[Note that for two-stage evaluations, the panel report following the first stage will be less detailed than that following the second stage.]

If a single panel covered the whole [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic]

Report of evaluation panel

2nd call of the X Priority - [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic] X

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This panel report covers the following aspects of [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic] of the second call of the X Priority

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 priorities 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 1 – Panel reports

Reports of each panel in the Strategic objective.

ANNEX 2 – Evaluation Summary Reports

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

If several panels covered the [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic]

Report of evaluation panel
2nd call of the X Priority - [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic] X

1. INTRODUCTION

The second X Priority Call, published on [day month year] invited proposals for ([strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic] X). This Evaluation Report presents in this section a short description of the evaluation procedure followed, a general analysis of the response to the call for this [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic], 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 [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic].

2. RESPONSE TO THE CALL

A total of XXX proposals have been received for this [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic]. They were evaluated in a number of panels. The panels were defined in terms of instrument type/elements of the [strategic objective/ research objective/ research topic].

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 an 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 all proposals received for the call for the Strategic objective in alphabetical order by acronym.